DOE RL Safety Culture Good Practices Evaluation Report

September 11, 2012

Approved:

J. E. Parsons

M. R. Steelman

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS

ATL	ATL International Inc.
BNI/WTP	Bechtel National Inc./ Waste Treatment Project
CAS	Contractor Assurance System
CHPRC	CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company
CONOPS	Conduct of Operations
CWB & CTC	Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board
DOE-HSS	Department of Energy – Office of Health, Safety and Security
DOE-ORP	Department of Energy – Office of River Protection
DOE-RL	Department of Energy - Richland Operation Office
EMS	Environmental Management System
ESH&Q	Environmental, Safety, Health & Quality
ESRB	Executive Safety Review Board
HAMTC	Hanford Atomic Metals Trade Council
HGU	Hanford Guards Union
HILLS	Hanford Information Lessons Learned System
HRB	Hazard Review Board
ICAP	Integrated Corrective Action Plan
ISMS	Integrated Safety Management System
JSV	Joint Safety Vision
LOI	Lines of Inquiry
MSA	Mission Support Alliance
OA	Operational Awareness
PAAA	Price-Anderson Amendments Act
PFP	Plutonium Finishing Plant
PNL	Battelle (Pacific Northwest Laboratories)
POP	Personal Observation Program
PRCNS	Plateau Remediation Company Notification System
PP&I	Project Planning and Integration
RIMS	Richland Integrated Management System
RM	Responsible Manager
SCWE	Safety Conscious Work Environment
SGRP	Soil & Groundwater Remediation Project
SIPs	Safety Improvement Plans
SPOC	Single Point of Contact
VPP	Voluntary Protection Program
WCH	Washington Closure Hanford
WRPS	Washington River Protection Solutions

1.0 Executive Summary

DOE-Richland Operations Office (RL) and its prime contractors (Mission Support Alliance (MSA), CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) and Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) conducted a Safety Culture Review to (1) gather "good practices" in regards to safety culture at DOE-RL and (2) perform a first look at RL and its' Prime Contractors in as a follow on to the June 2012, DOE Site-Wide Safety Culture Survey. The review was conducted during July and August 2012. The team interviewed over 250 individuals, reviewed 500 documents and attended greater than 70 meetings and/or work evolutions in the field.

The DOE-RL and Prime Contractor's generally has a healthy respect for safety that is not compromised by production, budget or schedule priorities. The majority of personnel interviewed believes in always doing work safely and was found to embrace the concepts and precepts of Safety Culture, Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS), Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) and a variety of Company/Organization specific practices that serve to improve safety behaviors.

The Safety Culture at Hanford under the DOE-RL purview has matured and grown. The Review Team believes that most of the personnel interviewed at Hanford understand the value and importance of a robust safety culture and are eager to offer ways of performing work better and safer. Management has discussed expectation for safety behaviors that will lead to a culture of safety first even if stand downs or stop work is required. *(During the review, one Prime Contract initiated a one day stand down on a project due to indication that safety was not the priority. This was initiated by the President).* Most felt they had the freedom, support and expectation to raise issues to supervision and management without fear of retaliation. Although there were a few "pockets" where personnel interviewed had not raised issues, those instances were identified and turned over to the appropriate organization.

During the course of this review, 46 Safety Culture "Good Practices" were identified across all organizations. These are listed below by Company/Organization: Additional details for each of these good practices are provided in Section 3.0 and Appendix A, Good Practices Database.

Appendix C was utilized to organize the good practices into a structured format. (See Appendix C, Good Practices Guidelines, for the reference code description at the end of each good practice below.)

1.1 Site Wide

- *Hanford Information Lessons Learned System (HILLS) (6.a)*
- *DOE Voluntary Protection Program (7.b)*
- *HAMTC Safety Representatives (8.i)*
- *Safety Councils (2.f)*
- *Site Wide Safety Standards (3.b)*
- *Site Wide Executive Safety Review Board (ESRB) (8.g)*
- *Interface Management for the Hanford Site (8.f)*
- *Site Wide Traffic Safety (7.i)*
- *Standardized Stop Work Policy (7.c)*

1.2 DOE-RL

- *Maturity of Contractor Assurance System (CAS) (5.c)*
- *DOE Field Office Safety Culture Survey (5.b)*
- *National support for ISM (2.f)*
- *Organization functions and authorities built on healthy tension model (3.b)*
- *Richland Integrated Management System (RIMS) (4.b)*
- *HAMTC – RL monthly meetings (1.c)*
- *RL ESH&Q scheduled open door meeting (8.b)*
- *Operational Awareness (6.a)*

1.3 CHPRC

- *Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Personal Observation Program (POP) (6.b)*
- *Worker Involvement at the engineering level (8.d)*
- *QMap (1.e)*
- *Single Point of Contact (SPOC) (1.b)*
- *Responsible Manager (8.c)*
- *Project Hazard Review Board (6.b)*
- *Advanced Dress/Undress Instruction (2.f)*
- *Plateau Remediation Company Notification System (1.b)*
- *Conduct of Operations (CONOPS) Mentors/Coaches (2.a)*
- *Target Zero (3.c)*
- *Joint Safety Vision (8.g)*
- *Integrated Corrective Action Plan (6.d)*

1.4 WCH

- *Disciplined Operations Plan (3.c)*
- *Performance Excellence Training (2.d.)*
- *Management walk-thru process (5.c)*
- *Presidents expectations (8.g)*
- *WCH Event Notification Form (1.b)*
- *Safety Culture Policy (3.b)*
- *Closure coaches (2.a)*
- *IWCP Pre-Evolution feedback process (6.c)*
- *Communication (1.b)*

1.5 MSA

- *Project Planning and Integration (PP&I) (4.a)*
- *Crane and Rigging Reference Guide (1.e)*
- *Water Utilities Director one-on-one sit downs(8.i)*
- *Information Management Dedicated HAMTC Safety Representative (2.f)*
- *ISMS Surveillance Team (5.c)*

- *Company New Employee Orientation (2.b)*
- *VPP Mini Assessments (7.b)*
- *Integrated Approach to Management of Risks (8.f)*

Table 1 – Good Practices Distribution by Organization

	(1) Communication Mechanisms	(2) Knowledge Sharing	(3) Organizational Goals & Objectives	(4) Resource Allocations	(5) Monitoring and Oversight	(6) Feedback	(7) Improvement Initiatives	(8) Leadership
Site-Wide		1	1			1	3	3
DOE-RL	1	1	1	1	2	1		1
CHPRC	3	2	1			3		3
WCH	2	2	2		1	1		1
MSA	1	2		1	1		1	2
TOTAL	**7**	**8**	**5**	**2**	**4**	**6**	**4**	**10**

For additional information regarding these Safety Culture Good Practices, contact the following individuals:

DOE- RL: Ed Parsons: joe.parsons@rl.doe.gov 509-376-2876

MSA: Lanette Adams: lanette_k_adams@rl.gov 509-373-9669

CHPRC: Mike Hassell: harold_m_hassell@rl.gov 509-376-3108

WCH: Gary Grant: gmgrant@wch-rcc.com 509-372-9568

2.0 Introduction

DOE-Richland Operations Office (RL) and its prime contractors (Mission Support Alliance (MSA), CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) and Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) conducted a Safety Culture Review to (1) gather "good practices" in regards to safety culture at DOE-RL and (2) perform a first look at RL and its' Prime Contractors as a follow on to the June 2012, Safety Culture Site-Wide Survey.

The review focused on the attributes associated with a strong safety culture described within the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Guide in Attachment 10 and key lessons learned from independent assessments of safety culture performed by DOE HSS. This Guide provided the following focus statement regarding safety culture within DOE:

> "Safety culture is an organization's values and behaviors modeled by its leaders and internalized by its members, which serve to make safe performance of work the overriding priority to protect the workers, public, and the environment. "

Attachment 10 of the Guide identified the following three safety culture focus areas and associated attributes (those that support a Safety Conscious Work Environment (SCWE) are highlighted in yellow).

2.1 Leadership

a. Demonstrated safety leadership
b. Risk-informed, conservative decision making
c. Management engagement and time in field
d. Staff recruitment, selection, retention, and development
e. Open communication and fostering an environment free from retribution
f. Clear expectations and accountability

2.2 Employee/Worker Engagement

a. Personal commitment to everyone's safety
b. Teamwork and mutual respect
c. Participation in work planning and improvement
d. Mindful of hazards and controls

2.3 Organizational Learning

a. Credibility, trust and reporting errors and problems
b. Effective resolution of reported problems
c. Performance monitoring through multiple means
d. Use of operational experience
e. Questioning attitude

Lines of inquiry (LOIs) were developed in accordance with ISMS Guide and "key lessons learned" from the HSS review. The Safety Culture Review Plan is included in Attachment B.

2.4 Review Team

The review team was selected for their experience in evaluation activities and techniques, familiarity with the Hanford Site and related experience in understanding and assessing safety culture at both DOE and commercial nuclear activities. In addition, the review team participated in preparing the Review Plan, Safety Culture Training and interviewing techniques specific to this review. Team membership included representation from the Hanford Atomic Metals Trade Council (HAMTC), the Hanford Guards Union (HGU) and exempt staff as identified below:

RL Independent Evaluation Team Members

- Ed Parsons, Co-Lead, Organizational Liaison (DOE-RL)
- Mark R. Steelman, Co-Lead, Consultant (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Gary Grant, Organizational Liaison (WCH)
- Mike Hassell, Organizational Liaison (CHPRC)
- Barbara Williams, Exempt (CHPRC)

- Lanette Adams, Organizational Liaison (MSA)
- Emily Millikin, Organizational Liaison (WCH)
- Rocky Simmons, HAMTC (MSA)
- Gordon Denman, HGU (MSA)
- Dennis Hurshman, Exempt (WCH)

MSA ISMS Surveillance Team:

- Art Garcia, Exempt (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Henry Sparks, HAMTC (MSA)
- Robin Quinton, HAMTC (MSA)
- Hoyt Mitchell, HAMTC (MSA)
- Terri McEvoy, Database Administrator (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Caitlin Gordon, Administrative, (Summer Intern, MSA)

3.0 Safety Culture Good Practices

3.1 Site Wide

- **Hanford Information Lessons Learned System (HILLS)**

  HILLS is a collaborative effort lead by the Department of Energy Richland Operations and Office of River Protection for management of operating experience to prevent adverse operating incidents and to expand the sharing of information among Hanford contractors. The HILLS web application provides a single management tool for storage, delivery and retrieval of both internal and external operating experience including: lessons learned, good work practices, and safety and health information.

- **VPP**

  The Department of Energy created the DOE Voluntary Protection Program (DOE-VPP) to recognize and encourage excellence in occupational safety and health protection. The Hanford site has embraced this concept and has maintained a high level of participation. VPP continues to be one of the cornerstones of the Hanford safety culture.

  DOE has long recognized that compliance with OSHA standards and DOE Orders cannot by itself accomplish all the goals desirable in a comprehensive health and safety program. No matter how carefully conceived and properly developed, DOE Orders and regulatory standards will never address all unsafe activities and conditions. At the same time, contractors and their employees at all levels possess valuable firsthand knowledge of the processes, materials, and hazards involved in their own operations. This knowledge, combined with the ability to quickly evaluate and address unique hazards, can improve facility health and safety in ways which are simply not available through DOE or other oversight agencies.

  DOE contractors and subcontractors who participate in the DOE-VPP must have incorporated these minimum elements:

- Management Leadership

  Managers at all levels need to be involved in the VPP process, and show their commitment to worker safety and health by identifying worksite hazards and reducing the danger of injury and illness to employees.

- Employee Involvement

  Getting everyone involved is the key to success. A number of programs exist in organizations such as safety councils, that can share ownership and foster an active management / employee role in the programs and policies that are in place to protect them.

- Worksite Analysis

  Every task and jobsite needs to be carefully reviewed to identify potential hazards and the ability to recognize and correct hazards as they arise.

- Hazard Prevention and Control

  Comprehensive health and safety surveys should be conducted by trained and qualified safety and health professionals at intervals appropriate for the nature of workplace operations, to identify existing hazards and potentially significant risks and to ensure employer awareness and control of those risks.

- Safety & Health Training

  Safety and health training is provided to Hanford employees.

- **HAMTC Safety Representatives**

  The HAMTC Safety Representatives Program was initiated in July 1997 to establish a group of worker representatives that focus on health and safety. Worker representatives are appointed to HAMTC/HGU safety group and formally serve as full-time safety and health representatives for the work force. The program includes all Hanford contractors and affiliated unions.

  As a result of this program, there has been fewer safety and health related concerns which has translated into better worker health and safety, as well as substantial cost savings. This program has created a greater degree of worker involvement at all stages of work planning and execution, increased ownership of safety, and a partnering culture between union and management.

- **Safety Councils**

  Employee and management Safety Councils work to protect and improve the health and safety culture of all employees. They do this by demonstrating commitment to affect positive change within the five elements of the U.S. DOE VPP. They strive to achieve a single safety program, and provide the leadership to influence positive behavior and continual improvement toward the achievement of zero accidents. This is a cooperative

effort by all Hanford Contractors to provide a healthy, safety and injury-free workplace. Across the Hanford site, there are numerous councils including the Employees Zero Accident Council (EZAC), President Zero Accident Council (PZAC), and many lower tier councils and programs (e.g., Safety Log).

- **Site Wide Safety Standards**

  The Hanford Site-Wide Standards Management Plan (MSC-MP-41080) established site-wide standards and standardized training where similar hazards, requirements, and worker expectations exist throughout the Hanford Site. This effort was directed by the DOE-HSS in 10 CFR 851.11 of the Worker Safety and Health Program.

  Since Hanford Site workers perform work in facilities controlled by multiple Hanford-Site contractors, safety was improved by having such standards and training in place. The desired outcome of the Plan is to establish site-wide standards and standardized training that provides a consistent approach for workers to perform work safely on the Hanford Site.

  The process defined in the Plan is designed to achieve collaboration from the U.S. DOE, all affected contractors, the HAMTC, HGU, and the CWB & CTC on the Hanford Site.

- **Site-Wide Executive Safety Review Board (ESRB)**

  The DOE-RL Prime Contractors (MSA, CHPRC, and WCH) have developed an ESRB. The purpose of the ESRB is to oversee and monitor the effectiveness of programs and processes associated with the Safety Management Programs, Quality Assurance Program, ISMS/EMS Implementation activities and the PAAA program.

  The result of this process has been an effective exchange of ideas and concepts between organizations. Additionally, the ESRB is an accepted forum for ESH&Q to air issues that are cross-cutting on the Hanford site.

- **Interface Management for the Hanford Site**

  DOE-RL and DOE-ORP require prime contractors enter into interface agreements with one another to ensure the effective delivery and performance of site services. MSC and prime contractor Interface Management staff and Project Liaisons conduct interface management discussions to ensure the delivery of services in a safe, timely, cost-efficient, and quality driven manner. All prime contractors manage interfaces so that potential issues are resolved at the lowest level possible.

  Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) were established as the primary inter-contractor working level team for responding to and resolving specific issues on an as-needed, case-by-case basis. This is a valuable process that has prevented some possible undesired results.

- **Standardized Stop Work Policy**

  The Hanford site has established a uniform policy that ensures that any Hanford worker has both the responsibility and authority to stop work when the worker believes that a situation exists that places them, their coworker(s), contracted personnel, or the public at risk or in danger; could adversely affect the safe operation or cause damage to the facility; or result in a release of radiological or chemical effluents to the environment above regulatory requirements or approvals. The Stop Work policy also provides the expectations on the resolution and communication of the issue for both the worker and his/her management.

- **Site-Wide Traffic Safety**

  The Hanford Site Traffic Safety Enhancement Committee (TSEC) was established to serve as the advisory group providing consensus direction for Hanford Site Highway and vehicle issues affecting Site Contractors. The DOE-RL, DOE-ORP and affected Contractors acknowledge that a joint committee provides the best approach for identification, evaluation, and recommendations for implementing traffic safety related issues. The parties agreed to cooperate in a teambuilding manner to ensure that the full intent of the Committee's mission is met and will be responsibly carried out by their respective organizations. The committee was comprised of Hanford Site Contractors, DOE personnel and Site Labor groups.

  The committee helped to create the Hanford Transportation Safety Initiative. The purpose of this initiative was to identify near and medium-term improvements in road infrastructure, traffic operations, traffic safety education, and traffic enforcement to address traffic safety issues on the Hanford Site. The overall goal of this initiative is to get Hanford employees safely to work and home each day. The committee has also developed a positive relationship with the Benton County Sheriff's Office that has led to improvements in regard to Site enforcement activities.

3.2 DOE-RL

- **Maturity of Contractor Assurance System (CAS)**

  For fiscal year 2012, the expectation of a defined contractor performance monitoring system has matured to a point that the RL office is shifting its emphasis from leading the development and use of a CAS to simply monitoring the contractor's use of the CAS as an effective management tool. Both RL and the prime contractors now recognize the value in a performance monitoring system that is both comprehensive and flexible.

- **DOE Field Office Safety Culture Survey**

  RL has organized a Hanford site organizational climate and safety conscious work environment survey that included both the RL and ORP, including the prime contractors and their subcontractors. This survey utilizes an independent survey management and

analysis company to minimize biasing and ensure the workforce that the input to the survey will allow anonymous participation.

By using an independent survey organization, the survey was structured to provide comparison to national norms. The comparisons will be against the following categories:

- US Transitioning Companies Performance Norm
- US National Norm
- US Engineering & Construction Industry Norm

The results of the survey (expected in October 2012) will be used to establish a base line for future surveys and to measure continuous improvements.

- **National Support for ISM**

  The RL assistant manager for environmental, health and safety co-chairs the ISM Champions Council at the national level. Through chairmanship as a field manager, the RL Assistant Manager for ES&H provides a first-hand perspective of the field organizations when integrated safety management policy is debated at a national level.

- **Organization Functions and Authorities Built on Healthy Tension Model**

  RL has established a fundamental operational concept that the balance between operations (security, legal, human resources, safety, etc.) and production is through the management of risks. Each organization within RL is expected to perform their specific, delegated functions in support of the site missions and provide RL manager with information and recommendations that represent their organizational position (i.e., risk). RL organizations are expected to function within their assigned authorities and shall be accountable to the RL manager for their assigned responsibilities. Additionally, each supporting organization will manage their specific assigned functions as defined within the RIMS processes.

  Ideally, the consensus of the RL organizations will guide the RL manager in the decision-making process. While each RL organization is expected to advocate those specific, delegated functions by the FEM, all organizations are expected to integrate the fundamental RL mission into the execution of their specific duties.

  The expected result of this organizational approach is to establish a healthy, professional tension where both safety and production are evaluated and managed with the RL manager balancing the overall risks and priorities. Each RL organization is to ensure that safety is integrated into management and work practices at all levels so that RL's mission is accompanied efficiently while protecting the workers, the public, and the environment.

- **Richland Integrated Management System (RIMS)**

  The RIMS provides the Richland Operations Office with structured approach to doing business. The RIMS is organized around 16 different management systems that reflect

the conduct of RL operation. Each management system is comprised of a related set of requirements-based processes and procedures used by the RL staff to perform their assigned work activities. This documented set of systems, processes, procedures, and program descriptions is kept current and accurate and is deployed electronically for easy access by all RL employees.

This system establishes clear expectations for the DOE-RL workforce and provides a unified direction to the RL staff.

- **HAMTC – RL monthly meetings**

  On a monthly basis, the RL ES&H manager meets with safety representatives from HAMTC. The purpose of these meetings are to provide an additional communications tool that allows the exchange of viewpoints and clarifications of site safety issues, including noted changes in organizational behaviors. This direct communication tool reduces loss of insight and provides immediate feedback. These meetings are not intended to usurp the conventional contractor management authorities, but to obtain a broader understanding of the issues.

- **RL ESH&Q scheduled open door meeting**

  The deputy RL manager has scheduled a weekly, one hour, open door period that is devoted exclusively to ES&H issues. During this time, any ES&H SME may discuss any issue of their concern, inform the deputy RL manager of any notable events, or bring to his attention any potential risks that may be up-coming in the future.

  This communication mechanism has provided the ES&H SME staff with a better understanding into what goes into decisions made by the manager's office as well providing the manager's office with a better understanding of technical issues through verbal discussion.

- **Operational Awareness (OA)**

  RL's operational awareness program is an informal oversight of contractor business and functional activities; baseline/fee performance; environment, safety, and health; legal; support; and program/project activities. Routine operational awareness is performed by facility representatives for day-to-day facility operations, subject matter experts for functional area implementation, project managers for performance against cost, scope, and schedule commitments, and RL management for oversight of field activities.

  RL's operational awareness program executes the RL manager's commitment to promoting management awareness of project and facility conditions, and maintaining a DOE presence at field work sites. To this end, all project managers and operational support managers having responsibility for oversight of contractor projects, facilities, and activities must establish an effective monitoring program. The monitoring program should include periodic walkthroughs by RL staff and management. RL staff and managers are expected to identify field walkthrough objectives and prioritize their field

oversight activities based on risk, significance to organizational performance, and to maintain operational awareness.

The Operational Awareness Database is used to document walkthrough and field oversight results. Results are typically entered directly into the Operational Awareness database. Each RL manager is expected to track their time performing operational awareness as necessary to support their commitments. Time spent in the field may be documented in the oversight summary portion of the Operational Awareness template.

Operational awareness focuses on performance and effectiveness, rather than simple compliance with requirements. Monitoring activities may also involve reviewing baseline information, contractor fee and other performance information, contractor work products, contractor self-assessments, and contractor corrective action management activities. In addition, RL monitoring provides operational awareness of project and facility conditions, and demonstrates RL field presence and involvement.

3.3 CHPRC

- **Caught in the Act**

  A program called "Caught in the Act" (Soil & Groundwater Remediation Project [SGRP]) is a peer to peer program that rewards individuals who are observed by their peers performing a safe act. A nomination is written that describes the safety act and placed in a lock box. Individual slips are then drawn from the box and selected individuals are given two movie tickets. Examples include performing a 360 walk-around of vehicles, moving items that are a potential tripping hazard, and use of proper safety gloves for the hazard. For the month of July, the SGRP nominated 74 individuals.

- **Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Personal Observation Program (POP)**

  PFP's POP is used to conduct Observations/Behaviors at risk. An individual fills out a card and turns it in. After five cards per month for an individual are submitted, they are entered for a safety award drawing. These drawings are conducted weekly with strong worker participation. The behavior questions on the cards change quarterly.

- **Worker Involvement at the engineering level**

  Worker involvement at the engineering level was observed throughout CHPRC. A representative example involved a group of craft workers who were given the opportunity by management to implement their idea that resulted in both a safer and more productive task. The task involved the inspection of a large shaft. The workers presented their concept to management and were given an opportunity to construct the apparatus. The apparatus was successful.

  Additionally, the expected end users of the sludge removal equipment were involved during the design phase. From this involvement, over 60 changes were made to the design. With the utilization of the craft worker's concepts by management, the craft

workers felt ownership of the improvements and appreciated the trust instilled in them by management.

- **QMap**

  CHPRC has designed a software package that gives first responders the location of workers in remote locations. Q Map locates the worker via GPS. The emergency dispatcher uses Q Map to determine their location.

- **Single Point of Contact**

  SGRP has developed a process to capture issues/notifications at a single point by project and then disseminate the information to employees/workers. One of the duties performed by the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for SGRP is to communicate issues/notifications to the VP, Facility Representatives, HAMTC Safety Representatives and others, as needed. A few examples of issues that employees would call the SPOC are: First Aid/Injuries, Stop Work, and Leaks/Spills

- **Responsible Manager**

  CHPRC has developed and implemented a Responsible Manager (RM) program. The RM, as described in PRC-PRO-WKM-12115, Work Management, is accountable and responsible for the implementation of work management of a specific work scope, from its inception to completion. The RM by provides continuity throughout the work planning and implementation process.

- **Project Hazard Review Board**

  The project Hazard Review Board (HRB) as described in PRC-PRO-WKM-40004, *Hazard Review Board*, provides a method for the review of select, planned work activities (particularly complex, high-hazard tasks) and a review of hazard controls to be implemented for the work. The HRB Chairperson is a Project Manager, Vice President, or designee that has overall authority for implementation of the HRB process.

  Personnel assigned to the work activity are expected to attend the HRB to ensure, that work instructions have adequately addressed job hazards. The Field Work Supervisor (FWS) presenting the work package to the HRB must be the FWS who will oversee the high risk portion of the work and is knowledgeable of the hazards and emergency response actions. HRBs are convened to promote positive contributions toward performing work safely and provide an opportunity for the project management team to demonstrate their standards and expectations towards work instruction.

- **PFP Advanced Dress/Undress Instruction**

  The PFP Advanced Dress/Undress instruction for entering and exiting Very High Contamination Areas and Airborne Areas was developed through a collaborative effort between a Nuclear Chemical Operator (NCO) and Radiological Control Technician

(RCT). The length of time it was taking to dress and undress was created two problems; extended duration of dressing/un-dressing and unacceptable numbers of personnel contaminations. The enhanced instruction now informs all radiological workers of the expectations for entry and exiting a highly contaminated and/or airborne area, thereby reducing time and contamination events.

- **Integrated Corrective Action Plan (ICAP)**

  The Integrated Corrective Action Plan (ICAP) was an integrated improvement strategy developed and approved by CHPRC and DOE-RL leadership to address performance gaps associated with four focus areas:

  Corrective Action Management
  Work Management
  Organizational Performance
  Self-Assessment and Performance Trending

  The ICAP was put together in the midst of ARRA funding impacts and was critical in helping CHPRC establish expectations in these four areas which ultimately shaped the organizational culture that exists today. The ICAP went through two independent verification and validation processes (CH2MHill Corporate and DOE-RL) and was found to effectively influence the organization's behaviors and performance.

- **Plateau Remediation Company Notification System (PRCNS)**

  The PRCNS is a web-based software application that allows CHPRC to notify and transmit information to selected personnel about CHPRC events. The PRCNS system pulls contact information from the Hanford PeopleCore (HPC) into pre-defined distribution lists and ad-hoc notification contacts for an event notification message. The PRCNS system can send an event notification message to each recipient's, pager, cell phone, work e-mail, and home e-mail.

- **CONOPS Mentors**

  CHPRC has put into place Conduct of Operations Mentors where a cadre of senior mentors is assigned to selected CHPRC projects to mentor and promote continual improvement in conduct of work across the broad spectrum of CHPRC work activities. The goal of Conduct of Work mentoring is to affect behaviors and habits that reliably implement the principles of Human Performance Improvement (HPI) and conduct of work to ensure continuous improvement in implementation of ISMS/EMS and conduct of work.

  Objectives of the program include the following:
  - Error prevention is fundamental in work performance
  - Awareness and questioning are ingrained habits
  - Conduct of work and HPI techniques are understood and applied
  - Work is performed as authorized

- Stopping work when changes or uncertainties exist is a fundamental practice
- Management expectations for safety and compliance are ingrained, measured, and rewarded

- **Target Zero**

  Target Zero is a CH2M HILL initiative to foster a culture based on individual commitment to eliminating injuries, illnesses, environmental impacts, and errors/omissions. CHPRC embraces the "Target Zero" culture. Target Zero, adopted by all CH2M HILL projects and offices, is an operational and educational program that cultivates a safe work environment, fostering a 24/7 culture of safe behavior, and a continual drive towards no adverse environmental impact. CHPRC has incorporated Target Zero in its Integrated Safety Management System/Environmental Management System (ISMS/EMS) to promote a culture emphasizing a desire to have zero illnesses, injuries, environmental impacts, errors, or omissions in the performance of the PRC scope of work.

  CHPRC ESH&Q policies provide management expectations for implementing this philosophy and build it into the CHPRC safety culture. To achieve Target Zero, the ISMS/EMS includes safety initiatives such as the Voluntary Protection Program, Human Performance Improvement, and the Earned Value Management System. CHPRC Safety Communications developed to promote the Target Zero culture include the Thinking Target Zero, a weekly bulletin to keep employees informed of relevant topics and objectives, and the Thinking Target Zero: Special Safety Bulletin, a real-time communication published for health, safety and environmental emergent issues.

- **Joint Safety Vision (JSV)**

  The JSV is a joint document developed between CHPRC and DOE-RL to address specific areas where CHPRC has been struggling in the implementation of project activities. These areas include behaviors of management, organizational structure of the project, and empowerment of the Environmental, Safety, Health, and Quality organizations. The JSV was written to document these three agreed upon areas of concern with expectations established that provided added clarification for each area.

  The JSV itself is not a requirements document in contract space, nor is it intended to supersede or conflict with any program or process, but rather to help focus energy in specific areas of programs and processes that are already in place to support improvement. In general, the JSV's implementation is integrated into various CHPRC processes; the most visible is the monthly Contractor Assurance System where process and program health is monitored. Additionally, key elements are rolled into a separate monthly document titled "CHPRC Safety Performance Metrics & Objectives" which provides a joint CHPRC-RL agreed upon goals and status of achievement.

3.4 WCH

- **Disciplined Operations Plan**

  The Disciplined Operations Plan serves as the single document that outlines how WCH is strengthening performance as the WCH project progresses towards closure. This Plan provides the strategy and general actions being taken to ensure reasonable sustainable performance to closure.

- **Performance Excellence Training**

  WCH senior leadership had conducted or received a number of assessments results over the previous months indicating respectable results however, the WCH leadership team was not completely satisfied with these results and has taken upon itself the need to drive safety to the next level. This drive for continuous improvement is necessary to ensure WCH work teams do not become complacent given the hazardous work that needs to be performed safely to complete the contract mission through 2015. Over the past several months a number of initiatives, both internal to the company and external, along with several internal issues have identified a need to have an integrated approach and common understanding of human performance improvement and safety culture.

- **Management walk-thru process (Procedure QA-1-1.14)**

  This procedure describes how Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) establishes and implements an effective management walkthrough process. This procedure describes the process for management to perform and document structured operational awareness walkthroughs of projects and facilities. In addition, WCH senior leadership has established minimum expectations for each manager to perform walk-throughs each month. This expectation is in addition to that established by the parent company. These walk-throughs are tracked each month and reported as part the contractor assurance systems.

- **President's Expectations**

  The WCH President & Project Manager published and promulgated her expectations for performance in a clear and concise manner. These expectations are found in posters and other media that start with safety performance relative to stop work, disciplined operations, individual accountability and caring for fellow employees. These expectations are discussed and provided to the workforce in company safety messages and other communications media.

- **WCH Event Notification Form**

  WCH has on its webpage, under Safety & Health, Safety a notification process (text message). This process allows the sender to distribute a brief summary of an event to a pre-determined list of WCH personnel. *For Example**:** Vehicle accident 100N. Dump truck struck private vehicle. No injuries. < $1000 damage. Call 373-0000 for more info*.

This notification process is described in procedure SEM-3, *Incident Response and Investigation, Event Management*. There are no access limitations to those that can create a message.

- **Safety Culture Policy**

  WCH developed and formalized its Nuclear Safety Culture Policy in document PM-ESHQ-15. This policy documents the expectation WCH management has relative to developing and strengthening its nuclear safety culture and safe work environment for all work conducted in all facilities, all areas, and by all employees on the WCH Project.

- **Closure Coaches**

  Given the nature of the WCH as closure project, WCH management has determined that it is essential to support the safe, cost-effective completion of the mission of the RCCC, retain the necessary talent until the right time, and assist employees in moving to the next phase of their career of life. To accomplish this, WCH established closure coaches staffed from the HR organization and assigned to each company organization to help the work force transition as their specific project comes to an end. These coaches help as needed and in many activities to enable and support project personnel in the transition process. WCH has been able to find available work for 80% of the exiting staff as of September 1, 2012.

- **IWCP Pre-Evolution Feedback Process**

  As part of the revised Integrated Work Control Process, WCH improved the Pre-Evolution briefing checklist (WCH-FS-210) to proactively identify issues or improvements, work technique issues or improvements, or good practices that could be useful to future work, work in other projects or to improve safety. These lessons learned that are identified proactively during the Pre-Evolutions are evaluated and used to improve future work package content or procedure activities or other routine work activities.

- **Communication**

  WCH utilizes diverse communication forms and media to ensure safety messaging reaches all employees. These forms and media include The Howler a periodic newsletter from the Local Safety Improvement teams, Weekly Safety Roundup that is a computation of daily safety messages, Daily Safety messages that provide daily safety related information from recent events, i.e., accidents, injuries, Local Safety Improvement Teams, the President Safety Committee, and Contractor Assurance Reports. In addition, WCH provides communiqués from the president. As an example, a recent president message discussed a Stop Work called by the president due to potential adverse trend in lock and tag performance.

3.5 MSA

- **Project Planning and Integration (PP&I)**

  MSA's Project Planning & Integration (PP&I) organiztion utilizes a good practice on how Employee Performance Appraisals are conducted. To facilitate the performance appraisal, PP&I has developed a list of Employee Objectives that, when completed, will reinforce the attributes associated with a good safety culture.

- **Crane and Rigging Reference Guide**

  Crane & Rigging has developed and uses a reference guide (checklist) to ensure that all steps are performed prior to initiating a lift. The checklist is adhesive and can be attached to a hardhat, note pad, equipment, etc. and remain visible during the evolution.

- **Water Utilities Director one-on-one sit downs**

  The Public Works Director has executed an open communication policy within his organization. As an example, he has conducted one-on-one conversations with each employee assigned to Water & Sewer Utilities. Initially, this dialogue served as an introduction between employee and manager. His goal is to further foster a relationship where employees feel free to bring forth safety issues, concerns, and opportunities for improvement, or anything that may cause distraction.

- **Information Management Dedicated HAMTC Safety Representative**

  The Information Management organization, which includes approximately 450 Lockheed Martin Services Incorporation (LMSI) employees, was introduced to ISMS and VPP in fiscal year 2010. MSA assigned a HAMTC Safety Representative to mentor and educate appropriate management, employees, and bargaining unit personnel on the core functions and guiding principles of ISMS and VPP tenets.

  Engaging a HAMTC Safety Representative to mentor employees not previously involved in ISMS or VPP is viewed as a good practice. Their involvement was instrumental in the success of this organization's implementation of ISMS and VPP.

- .**ISMS Surveillance Team**

  The MSA ISMS surveillance team consists of HAMTC bargaining unit workers and subcontracted technical experts that provide ongoing evaluation/ feedback/ mentoring of field work activities. This activity is performed to enhance the sustainability and maintainability of the MSA ISMS program elements, consistent with the ISMS System Description, the Annual ISMS Declaration of Readiness, and the FY 2012 ISMS Surveillance Team Plan.

  MSA endorses continual in-depth evaluations, mentoring, and coaching of MSA personnel performing and supervising work processes at the facility, project, sub-project, and/or activity level, including construction activities. The team evaluation strategy is

designed to provide immediate feedback to MSA management (including senior leadership) relative to ISMS implementation in the field and complete a "reality check" on ISMS process use and efficiency.

- **Company New Employee Orientation**

  It was recognized that new employees and those who transferred to MSA through the "bump and roll" process were not adequately briefed on the company's expectations for "do work safely", Target Zero, and associated safety culture attributes. To remedy this, a new employee safety orientation presentation was developed and added to MSA's Human Resource's "on-boarding" agenda. When assigned to their organization, new employees also receive orientation specific to their workgroup or project.

- **VPP Trimester Assessments**

  Participating VPP sites are required to conduct an annual self-assessment. To conserve time and resources, MSA subdivided the focus areas for the annual VPP evaluation into three manageable assessments to be performed on a trimester basis. Immediate feedback of strengths and weaknesses are communicated to the respective Vice President which allows for ongoing improvements and focus areas as opposed to a once a year "snapshot in time". Results of the trimester evaluations will be consolidated into the annual VPP self-assessment report and subsequently submitted to DOE HQ in February the following year. This process was viewed as commendable by MSA's DOE-RL customer.

- **Integrated Approach to Management of Risks**

  MSA is responsible for implementing an integrated approach to the management of risks that supports successful execution and completion of the contract work scope. The Risk Analysis, Processing and Reporting process establishes the requirements and work process for management of risks associated with the execution of work scope under the Mission Support Contract (MSC). Risk analysis includes key processes to accomplish efficient and cost-effective measures to manage risks.

- **Worker Involvement**

  The Hanford Fire Department (HFD) established a committee that addresses issues regarding the use and safety of required PPE. Whenever there is an issue with their PPE, fire fighters feel free to report their concerns to the Committee. The Committee evaluates the affected PPE and researches how to best improve the situation. This is a good practice and demonstrates involvement of the workers.

  MSA maintains a robust Zero Accident Council that is structured and operates on a "bottoms up" approach. As issues are identified in the field or office environment, information provided by workers is elevated to appropriate safety and management personnel. The originator of the issue is involved in the resolution process.

MSA management encourages all employees to submit safety or environmental topics they feel worthy of incorporating into weekly “Safety Starts”. These topics do not necessarily have to be related to work place hazards; MSA strongly endorses a 24/7 safety culture. “Safety Starts” are shared at Monday morning back-to-work meetings and intended to stimulate conversation within work groups on safety or environmental related issues.

The Fire Systems Maintenance group includes workers in the planning of preventive maintenance packages, which includes both corrective maintenance and acceptance testing packages.

Appendix A

Good Practices Database

Safety Culture Evaluation Good Practices

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-001	GP	Tailgate Meeting/SAC Call	7/30/12	CHPRC/ S&GW/ 200W Pump & Treat	None	N/A	Program called "Caught in the Act" is a peer to peer program that rewards individuals who are observed by their peers performing a safe act. Nominations are written that describes the safety act and placed in a lock box. Individual slips are then drawn from the box and selected individuals are given two movie tickets. Examples include performing a 360 walk-around of vehicles, moving items that are a potential tripping hazard, and use of proper safety gloves for the hazard. For the month of July, the groundwater project nominated 74 individuals.	Observed that audience participation was limited. There was good participation on the SAC call.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-002	GP	Plateau Remediation Company Notification System (PRCNS)	7/30/12 - 8/3/12	CHPRC	Senior Management	N/A	The PRCNS is a web-based software application that allows CHPRC to notify and transmit information to selected personnel about CHPRC events. The PRCNS system pulls contact information from the Hanford PeopleCORE (HPC) into pre-defined distribution lists and ad-hoc notification contacts for an event notification message. The PRCNS system can send an event notification message to each recipient's, pager, cell phone, work e-mail, and home e-mail.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-003	GP	PFP morning plan-of-the-day meeting and day visit	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP	Plan of the day/ site visit/ facility personnel	N/A	The PFP morning brief is very robust with a great approach to include everyone in attendance. All the work assigned for the day was discussed and resources aligned to meet the needs for the day. A great opportunity with an open exchange for ideas and issues with peer/ leadership groups before the day gets started. Very good practice with daily brief OS/IH team every morning. This group discusses common subject area content which fosters a collaborative understanding between each of these CHPRC safety departments work/project groups. The team can communicate/ distribute the information that has relevance to all the workers in the work groups in an immediate fashion.	None
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-004	GP	PFP POP Program	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP	HAMTC Safety Rep	N/A	PFP has a program called the Personal Observation Program (POP). This program is used to conduct Observations/ Behavior at risk. An individual fills out a card and turns it in to the appropriate individual. After turning five cards per month they are put in a drawing for a pair of movie tickets. These drawings are conducted weekly with good worker participation. The questions on the cards change quarterly.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-005	GP	Work Management	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure/ PFP	Plan of the day with management	N/A	Attended plan-of-the-day (POD) meeting held in MO-273. A safety topic was continued from the day before concerning a HEPA filter change out or removal from a glovebox. The job sounds simple and routine but there were complications concerning wire mesh on the filter. The wire mesh was protruding out and poking through the plastic bags and duct tape used to seal the contamination in the bag. The NCO's were very careful and packaged the filter with added layers without spreading contamination and injuring themselves. A success story and example of a good safety culture. There were three pages of work planning covered in the POD with each page representing 15-20 jobs for the day. The leader went through each job and confirmed the readiness and resources to complete the work. This happened quickly and was very useful. All present were attentive and down to business, very professional. If anyone had a problem it was talked about and help was given to some who	This is an example of the Safety Culture that was observed. It shows the good practice CHPRC is utilizing at PFP and this helps the workers keep a good and healthy safety culture on the job.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-006	GP	Work Management	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure/ PFP	Plan of the day with management	N/A	A post-job review presentation was given to the group. The presenter explained the reason for post-job reviews and how to conduct them, who should conduct a post-job review. The presenter also quoted the procedure attachment that lists requirements for giving post-job review. The presenter explained this is unsatisfactory and all workers should be involved that are working a job that requires a post-job.	This is an example of the safety culture that was observed. It shows the good practice CHPRC is utilizing at PFP and this helps the workers keep a good and healthy safety culture on the job.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-007	GP	Work Management	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure/ PFP	Plan of the day with management	N/A	While interviewing a craft worker the Safety Culture team heard how the worker and a few of his peers were given the opportunity to approach management with a better idea. The workers needed a way to hold a large shaft while inspecting it so they designed a mechanism to do this. The workers presented it to their management and engineers, and were given a green light to build the apparatus. The workers built the apparatus and it worked well. The workers appreciated this respect and felt ownership in their work.	This is an example of the Safety Culture that was observed. It shows the good practice CHPRC is utilizing at PFP and this helps the workers keep a good and healthy safety culture on the job.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-008	GP	Soil & Ground Water Monday back-to-work meeting	7/30/12	CHPRC/ S&GW/ 2268E	None	N/A	CHPRC designed software that gives first responders the location of the workers in remote locations. Q Map locates the worker via GPS and well number identification. The emergency dispatcher uses Q Map and uses information from caller about which well they are to determine from their location from Q Map if QMAP needs to be identified and explained.	This is a good practice and by practicing it the organization will keep injuries and hazards under control.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-009	GP	Soil & Ground Water Monday back-to-work meeting	7/30/12	CHPRC/ S&GW/ 2268E	None	N/A	Soil & Ground Water discovered a new resin they could use to treat the contaminated water. The new resin lasts much longer than the old and this saves operators from replacing the old resin as often. Reducing the work load reduces associated hazards plus it saves large amounts of money in product, manpower, and shipping.	This is a good practice and by practicing it the organization will keep injuries and hazards under control.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-010	GP	Shift Office Single Point of Contact	7/30/12	CHPRC/ S&GW	Rep from Operations Assurance	N/A	Soil & Groundwater Remediation Project (SGRP) has developed a process to capture issues/ notifications at a single point and then disseminate the information to employees/workers. One of the duties performed by the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for SGRP is to communicate issues/ notifications to the VP, Fac Rep, HAMTC Safety Rep and others as needed. A few examples of issues that employees would call the SPOC for would be: - First Aid/Injuries - Stop Work - Leaks/Spills - Well Access Problems	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-014	GP	Responsible Manager	7/30 - 8/2/12	CHPRC	(3) Responsible Manager, Managers, (2) Planners, (2) FWS	N/A	Based on several interviews with Responsible Managers (RM), planners, and FWSs at S&GW, PFP, and 100K it appears that CHPRC has established a "Good Practice" in the development and implementation of the RM program. The process for the RM program is described in PRC-PRO-WKM-12115, Work Management, Section 2.8. The RM is an individual accountable and responsible for the implementation of work management for specific body of work from its inception to completion by providing continuity of purpose and understanding throughout the work planning and implementation process. The RM must meet the qualification requirements specified in a CHPRC training course and Project specific qualification courses. Some of the basis responsibilities include the following: - Implements Integrated Safety Management (ISM) Core Functions and Guiding Principles and Environment Management System (EMS) Core Elements through the work management process. - Confirms that work is/is not radiological work according to the definition in CHPRC requirements documents. - Determines if work activities are skill-based or beyond skill-based with input from the FWS, Planner and workers, as needed. - Performs final arbitration for comment resolution. - Supports FWS in resolving issues when performing work.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-020	GP	Hanford Job Specific Beryllium Work Permit	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure/ PFP	Industrial Hygienist	N/A	On Tuesday afternoon a training meeting was held at MO-273 for employees at PFP. These employees were exempt employees. The meeting was to train them on the new Beryllium Work Permit (BWP). The Industrial Hygienist (IH) manager and IH Technician (IHT) lead presented the training. The BWPs (three) were reviewed with employee's present. After explaining to the group present the employees were given the opportunity to ask questions. There were numerous questions and by a majority of the employees. The questions were very good and the IH manager could not answer them all. The IH manager explained that the BWPs were written downtown without input from these employee's or others that will be using them at PFP. After much discussion and controversy, the conduct of operations manager spoke up and declared there is action to take and that the employee's present were not going to be able to clear up the issues that were brought up. The problem is that these BWPs are finalized and that the IH manager and lead were to go and train another group immediately following this meeting.	This is an example of good practices, using the questioning attitude to clear up issues before the changes are made. The IH manager and lead went to the safety manager and were explaining the issues. It appears they will be revising or rewriting the BWPs. This will help with the concerns of the workers.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-022	GP	Workers Promoted to Field Work Supervisor	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure/ PFP	Electrician FWS, RCT FWS	N/A	Based on interviews with workers, HAMTC FWSs and FWSs, it appears that PFP has implemented an effective process that enables promoting workers to FWS. PFP has promoted six HAMTC members to FWSs. These selected individuals are required to pass the same qualification program as the exempt FWSs. This program ensures that enough qualified FWSs are available to account for planned or unplanned absences and heavy schedules. Because these individuals are not only qualified and have actual hands on experience, the workers have confidence in their capabilities and trust their input and decisions.	None
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-023	GP	Good Practice at PFP	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	NCOs in the Operations Mobile Office	N/A	PFP has enlarged blue prints of rooms placed on magnetic eraser boards that are used in pre-job briefs. The boards identify the placement of CAMS, phones with listed numbers, bottle carts, etc. This is a great visual tool.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-025	GP	PFP Training Information Bulletin #2012-001	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP	Plan of the Day/ Site Visit/ Facility Personnel		The PFP fan incident story was told to us by a worker who was involved from cradle to grave. The situation was not favorable as the fan failed and broke due to, workers opinion, lack of preventive maintenance. The good practice in the mind of the employee was the response f rom the PFP team to engage knowledgeable and qualified workers along with the engineering department to decipher the potential problem and create a fix that will be long lasting and safety based. This employee said he has never been part of such good work and caring process before. This all happened from a post-job discussion.	Lots of good examples and discussion across the board with the opportunity of this is evident in briefings - most of those interviewed gave positive comments on this practice.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-026	GP	Good Practice at PFP	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	NCOs		The 4H program for workers performing a peer check of equipment prior to entering an ARA. The 4H stands for inspection of Housing, Hose, HEPA (filter) and Hood. After completing the peer check a four leaf clover is place on their co-workers.	CHPRC has some great programs.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-028	GP	Interview with QA Employees, CHPRC Work Site Assessment Report	8/2/12	CHPRC/ STP/ Fed Bldg.	QA Employees	N/A	D&D/ STP (DWF&RS) QA employees work to a PRC-PRO-QA-40091, Revision 3. This is a review of STP assessments/ surveillances/ observations and CR's generated FYTD to identify any potential trends. A review of STP MA's, WSA's, MOP's, QA's and CR's resulted in a list of many OFI's. These OFI's were then binned to enable a track and trend process. The QA employees entered this information into a data base and are also given to the managers of the respective work groups.	This is a good practice and should be noted as so.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-030	GP	Good Practice Hazard Review Board	7/30/12 - 08/02/12	CHPRC	HRB Chairpersons, FWS, Administrative Support, Workers	N/A	Based on interviews with HRB chairpersons, FWSs, administrative support (supports with minutes, schedules the meeting, etc.) and workers, it appears that CHPRC has effectively implemented a "Good Practice", the Project Hazard Review Board. This board provides a method for the review of select planned work activities (particularly complex, high-hazard tasks) and a review of safety measures that are implemented to support this work. HRB Chairperson is the Project Manager, Vice President, or designee that carries overall authority for implementation of the HRB process as described in PRC-PRO-WKM-40004, Hazard Review Board. Bargaining unit personnel attend the HRB and are expected to provide additional information, as needed, regarding work planning assumptions, workability of the work documentation. They will also ensure, for a worker's standpoint, that work instructions have adequately addressed job hazards. The FWS presenting the work package to the HRB must be the FWS who will oversee the high risk portion of the work and is knowledgeable of the hazards and emergency response actions. HRBs are convened to promote positive contributions toward performing work safely and provide an opportunity for the project management team to demonstrate their standards and expectations towards work instruction, and for personal who lead the work activities.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-031	GP	Plan-of-the-day Meeting	8/1/12	CHPRC/ 100K/ Sludge Retrieval	Sludge Retrieval Managers	N/A	Attended meeting in the 3rd floor conference room at the Federal Building with managers from 100K Basin Sludge Removal. The meeting was professional and the participants were knowledgeable. The list of activities for the next 30 days was lengthy. It had approximately 294 items on the list. The Lead went through each item and the corresponding manager reported the status. It was impressive.	This communication is a good practice and beneficial to all with interest in the project.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-032	GP	WESF Plan-of-the-day Meeting	8/1/12	CHPRC/ WESF	Manager, EZAC Chair, BU Worker	N/A	Attended the plan-of-the-day meeting and the Employee Zero Accident Counsel (EZAC). The manager communicated activities for the day. Good information. The EZAC meeting was held and run by a bargaining unit worker. The worker did an excellent job. The worker had an agenda and shared extra safety information with the group. The EZAC gave a large number of awards and voted on Employee of the Month. There were seven candidates nominated with various reasons of nomination, all safety related. An ALARA presentation was given and the lead asked for volunteers to reassess some areas and several volunteers stepped forward. Safety Project good news 3.5 million hours, without lost work day. They have gone one year without a DART injury.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-039	GP	Good Practice at PFP	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	NCOs	N/A	The PFP Advanced Dress/ Undress Instruction: a. A NCO and RCT put this program together for entering and exiting Very High Contamination Areas/ Airborne Areas. They had observed the length of time it was taking to dress and undress and the problems that were occurring during this process. b. This training allows workers who are inexperienced with highly contaminated work to know exactly what to expect and that the NCOs and RCTs will be there to support them.	CHPRC has some great programs.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-050	GP	100K Sludge Treatment Best Practice	8/6/12	CHPRC/ Sludge Treatment/ 100K	Manager of Operations	N/A	Upon visiting with the Manager of Operations, the Safety Culture team asked for good practices to report on. The manager spoke of how the NCOs asked for better PPE. The NCO's wear double Anti-C's and with the high temperature and humidity in the basin, this made for very hot and uncomfortable working conditions. Management decided to look for a better PPE to provide for the workers. A garment was found that is supposed to be more breathable and water resistant. The suits have only been here a short time and the group is still deciding on how well the suits work.	The fact that the company is willing to help the workers do their jobs better and in more comfort builds a culture of mutual respect that also helps workers want to do a better job safely and by procedure.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-051	GP	CSB/ LEF CHPRC	8/2/12	CHPRC/ CSB/ LEF	Work Planners, supervisors, workers	N/A	The maintenance department has developed a very realistic goals chart for CSB. The document is on the wall of the foray of the facility - using a high visible transparent poster for everyone to review. This allows everyone in the facility to see the actions taken and the status of these actions. The companion documents show where the goals charts are listed since the department is spread out over several buildings. This is also another companion document that tracks the status of evidence based for the closure items. Great job on this piece - it shows activity and truism to the team's efforts for improvements. REAP Bulletin B2010-003, April 2010, was posted up at CSB and LEF so we assumed this document "Expectations of the Management Team" was in play all over the CHPRC. However, this may be limited to select Waste and Fuels facilities. We believe this is a very good document to steer management and others to positive steps in reaching a "stronger safety culture through continued improvement" words from the poster. A great document to update and continue to grow. Poster "Guide to Safe Work Environment" is a commitment to free flow of information, "A letter to all members of my work group". This poster is signed by all of the CHPRC executive leadership team. Its principal doctrine is how to and what is expected when addressing presentation to the work force that spells out clear expectation for management/ worker relations for employees that have serious concerns. In its summary it offers a plea that says my goal is to be your choice for resolutions. Again a clear	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
							statement from management for a trying to be part of the safety process to workers. We did hear good things from the planning department on how they review and incorporate lessons learned in the planning process. There are some post-job reviews being conducted in certain jobs that have provided some great feedback for improvement. Planners do walk-downs of the jobs with the subject matter experts and workers in some cases.	
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-054	GP	Good practice at PFP	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	NCOs	N/A	The CAC (Congested Area Checklist) is used to ensure congested area work hazards are identified and mitigated to avoid injuries.	CHPRC has some great programs.
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-055	GP	Good Practice at PFP	7/31/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	NCOs	N/A	The Operational Guidance Document provides best practice developed from lessons learned and corrective actions of several supplied breathing air work evolutions. This is a great document and has put numerous procedures into one document. It describes the following aspects of the supplied breathing air process: - Roles and Responsibilities - Dress and undress - Containment tent configuration - Hose management - Emergency Response - Notifications	CHPRC has some great programs.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-056	GP	Best Practice of Process Equipment Removal Team (PERT)	8/27/12	CHPRC/ PFP Closure Project/ PFP	N/A	N/A	PFP utilizes the PERT (Process Equipment Removal Team) approach to perform D&D work. This appears to be a good practice as the team members form a close and congenial working group to achieve the same goal. The team must consist of workers that are able to work well together. Team members attend the Hazard Review Board for input on the work package and together perform a field walk-down of the work to be performed.	None
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-059	GP	Integrated Corrective Action Plan (ICAP)	7/30/12 - 8/3/12	CHPRC	Senior Management	N/A	The ICAP was an integrated improvement strategy developed and approved by CHPRC and DOE-RL leadership to address performance gaps associated with four focus areas: Corrective Action Management Work Management Organizational Performance Self-Assessment and Performance Trending The ICAP was put together in the midst of ARRA funding impacts and was critical in helping CHPRC establish expectations in these four areas which ultimately shaped the organizational culture that exists today. The ICAP went through two independent verification and validation processes (CH2MHILL Corporate and DOE-RL) and was found to effectively influence the organization's behaviors and performance.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-060	GP	Con Ops Mentor	7/30/12 - 8/3/12	CHPRC	Senior Management	N/A	CHPRC has put into place Conduct of Operations Mentors where a cadre of senior mentors are assigned to selected CHPRC projects to mentor and promote continual improvement in conduct of work across the broad spectrum of CHPRC work activities. The goal of Conduct of Work mentoring is to affect behaviors and habits that reliably implement the principles of Human Performance Improvement (HPI) and conduct of work to ensure continuous improvement in implementation of ISMS/EMS and conduct of work. Objectives of the program include the following: • Error prevention is fundamental in work performance • Awareness and questioning are ingrained habits • Conduct of work and HPI techniques are understood and applied • Work is performed as authorized • Stopping work when changes or uncertainties exist is a fundamental practice • Management expectations for safety and compliance are ingrained, measured, and rewarded	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-061	GP	Joint Safety Vision	7/30/12 - 8/3/12	CHPRC	Senior Management		The JSV is a joint document developed between CHPRC and DOE/RL to address specific areas where CHPRC has been struggling in the implementation of project activities. These areas include behaviors of management, organizational structure of the project, and empowerment of the Environmental, Safety, Health, and Quality organizations. The JSV was written to document these three agreed upon areas of concern with expectations established that provided added clarification for each area. The JSV itself is not a requirements document in contract space, nor is it intended to supersede or conflict with any program or process, but rather to help focus energy in specific areas of programs and processes that are already in place to support improvement. In general, the JSV's implementation is integrated into various CHPRC processes, the most visible is the monthly Contractor Assurance System where process and program health is monitored. Additionally, key elements are rolled into a separate monthly document titled "CHPRC Safety Performance Metrics & Objectives" which provides a joint CHPRC/RL agreed upon goals and status of achievement.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-CHPRC-2012-SC-062	GP	Target Zero	7/30/12 - 8/3/12	CHPRC	Senior Management	N/A	Target Zero is a CH2M HILL initiative to foster a culture based on individual commitment to eliminating injuries, illnesses, environmental impacts, and errors/omissions. CHPRC embraces the "Target Zero" culture. Target Zero, adopted by all CH2M HILL projects and offices, is an operational and educational program that cultivates a safe work environment, fostering a 24/7 culture of safe behavior, and a continual drive towards no adverse environmental impact. CHPRC has incorporated Target Zero in its Integrated Safety Management System/Environmental Management System (ISMS/EMS) to promote a culture emphasizing a desire to have zero illnesses, injuries, environmental impacts, errors, or omissions in the performance of the PRC scope of work. CHPRC ESH&Q policies provide management expectations for implementing this philosophy and build it into the CHPRC safety culture. To achieve Target Zero, the ISMS/EMS includes safety initiatives such as the Voluntary Protection Program, Human Performance Improvement, and the Earned Value Management System. CHPRC Safety Communications developed to promote the Target Zero culture include the Thinking Target Zero, a weekly bulletin to keep employees informed of relevant topics and objectives, and the Thinking Target Zero: Special Safety Bulletin, a real-time communication published for health, safety and environmental emergent issues.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-001	GP	Transition of Contractor Assurance System (CAS) Maturity	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	For fiscal year 2012, the expectation of a defined contractor performance monitoring system has matured to a point that the RL office will shift its emphasis to monitoring the RL prime contractor's CAS in lieu of driving the need for a system requiring quarterly briefings. Both RL and the prime contractors now recognize the value in a performance monitoring system that is both comprehensive and flexible.	None
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-002	GP	First DOE Field Office Safety Culture Survey	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	RL has organized a Hanford site organizational climate and safety conscious work environment survey that covered both the RL and ORP, including the prime contractors and their subcontractors. This survey utilizes an independent survey management and analysis company to minimize biasing and ensure the workforce that the input to the survey will allow anonymous participation. By using an independent survey orgaznization, the survey can be structured to provide comparison to national norms. The comparisions will be against the following categories: - US Transitioning Companies Performance Norm - US National Norm - US Engineering & Construction Industry Norm The results of the survey will be used to establish a base line for future surveys and to measure continuous improvement.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-003	GP	Standardized Stop Work Policy	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	The Hanford site has established a uniform policy that ensures that any Hanford worker has both the responsibility and authority to stop work when the worker believes that a situation exists that places them, their coworker(s), contracted personnel, or the public at risk or in danger; could adversely affect the safety operation or cause damage to the facility; or result in a release of radiological or chemical effluents to the environment above regulatory requirements or approvals. The Stop Work policy also provides the expectations on the resolution and communication of the issue for both the worker and his/her management.	None
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-004	GP	National Support for ISM	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	The RL assistant manager for environmental, safety and health co-chairs the ISM Champions Council at the national level. Through chairmanship as a field manager, the RL assistant manager for ES&H provides a first-hand perspective of the field organizations when integrated safety management policy is debated at a national level.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-005	GP	Organization Functions and Authorities Built on Healthy Tension Model	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	RL has established a fundamental operational concept that the balance between operations (security, legal, human resources, safety, etc.) and production is through the management of risks. Each organization within RL is expected to perform their specific, delegated functions in support of the site missions and provide RL manager with information and recommendations that represent their organizational position (i.e., risk). RL organizations are expected to function within their assigned authorities and shall be accountable to the RL manager for their assigned responsibilities. Additionally, each supporting organization will manage their specific assigned functions as defined within the RIMS processes. Ideally, the consensus of the RL organizations will guide the RL manager in the decision-making process. While each RL organization is expected to advocate those specific, delegated functions by the FEM, all organizations are expected to integrate the fundamental RL mission into the execution of their specific duties. The expected result of this organizational approach is to establish a healthy, professional tension where both safety and production are evaluated and managed with the RL manager balancing the overall risks and priorities. Each RL organization is to ensure that safety is integrated into management and work practices at all levels so that RL's mission is accompanied efficiently while protecting the workers, the public, and the environment.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-006	GP	Richland Integrated Management System (RIMS)	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	The RIMS provides the Richland Operations Office with structured approach to doing business. The RIMS is organized around 16 different management systems that reflect the conduct of RL operation. Each management system is comprised of a related set of requirements-based processes and procedures used by the RL staff to perform their assigned work activities. This documented set of systems, processes, procedures, and program description is kept current and accurate and is deployed electronically for easy access by all RL employees. This system establishes clear expectations for the DOE-RL workforce and provides a unified direction to the RL staff.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-007	GP	Site Wide Safety Standards	9/5/12	DOE-RL	None	N/A	The goal of the DOE-RL Site-Wide Organization's governing document, the Hanford Site-Wide Standards Management Plan (MSC-MP-41080) is to have site-wide standards and standardized training where there are similar hazards, requirements, and worker expectations. This effort is directed by the DOE Office of Health, Safety, and Security (HSS) in 10 CFR 851.11 of the Worker Safety and Health Program. Since Hanford Site workers may perform work in facilities controlled by multiple Hanford Site contractors, safety can be improved by having such standards and training in place. The desired outcome of the Plan is to establish site-wide standards and standardized training that provides a consistent approach for workers to perform work safely on the Hanford Site. The process defined in the Plan is designed to achieve collaboration from the U.S. DOE, all affected contractors, the Hanford Atomic Metals Trades Council (HAMTC) and the Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council (CWB & CTC) on the Hanford Site.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-DOE-2012-SC-008	GP	Operational Awareness	8/20/12	DOE-RL	Assistant Manager for Safety and Environmental	N/A	RL's operational awareness program is an informal oversight of contractor business and functional activities; baseline/fee performance; environment, safety, and health; legal; support; and program/project activities. Routine operational awareness is performed by facility representatives for day-to-day facility operations, subject matter experts for functional area implementation, project managers for performance against cost, scope, and schedule commitments, and RL management for oversight of field activities. RL's operational awareness program executes the RL manager's commitment to promoting management awareness of project and facility conditions, and maintaining a DOE presence at field work sites. To this end, all project managers and operational support managers having responsibility for oversight of contractor projects, facilities, and activities must establish an effective monitoring program. The monitoring program should include periodic walkthroughs by RL staff and management. RL staff and managers are expected to identify field walkthrough objectives and prioritize their field oversight activities based on risk, significance to organizational performance, and to maintain operational awareness. The Operational Awareness Database is used to document walkthrough and field over-sight results. Results are typically entered directly into the Operational Awareness database. Each RL manager is expected to track their time performing operational awareness as necessary to support their commitments. Time spent in the field may be documented in the	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
							oversight summary portion of the Operational Awareness template. Monitoring field operations is useful for evaluating contractor performance to ascertain program status and compliance with the contract in the facilities. Operational awareness focuses on performance and effectiveness, rather than simple compliance with requirements. Monitoring activities may also involve reviewing baseline information, contractor fee and other performance information, contractor work products, contractor self-assessments, and contractor corrective action management activities. In addition, RL monitoring provides operational awareness of project and facility conditions, and demonstrates RL field presence and involvement.	

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-001	GP	Performance Appraisal	8/7/12	MSA/ PP&I/ PM	Project Management	N/A	Based on interviews with Project Management personnel it appears that Project Planning & Integration (PP&I) has a good practice on how Employee Performance Appraisals are conducted. To facilitate the performance appraisal, PP&I has developed a list of Employee Objectives that when completed will reinforce the attributes associated with a good safety culture. Some of the objectives are: - Leadership Focus Area * Safety Complete projects (activities) with NO INCIDENTS * Conduct weekly Project Team meetings with minutes * Become a champion of a project related procedure and develop a presentation to present to the group * Develop detailed, accurate, and useful project schedules in the project planning stage (this will assist in preventing schedules over safety) - Employee Engagement Focus Area * Attend and actively participate in PZAC/EZAC meetings * Communications - Good; Correct Form - Organizational Learning Focus Area * Develop and foster integrated teams * CAMS/IIFs - Lead corrective actions and have no delinquent actions. * Produce transaction requests and BCRs in a timely fashion to record project changes.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-005	GP	Crane and Rigging Reference Guide	8/8/12	MSA/ SI&L/ C&R	Crane and Rigging Manager	N/A	Crane & Rigging has developed and uses a reference guide (checklist) to ensure that all steps are performed prior to initiating a lift. The checklist is adhesive and can be attached to a hardhat, note pad, equipment, etc. Some of the items on the checklist are: - The work package or work instructions are complete and understood by all personnel involved with the lift. - Special written requirements, work procedures, manufacturer's requirement or other required information pertaining to the lift has been considered. - Pre-lift meeting held with participating personnel. Lifting points or attachment points have been inspected. - Spotter has been assigned for mobile crane working within extendable boom length of power lines and Utilities have been notified the day the work takes place. - Lifting points or attachment points have been inspected. - Do not proceed with lift until work area is clear of personnel that are non-essential to the lift.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-006	GP	WSCF	8/8/12	MSA/ WSCF	WSCF Analytical Lab Worker, and WSCF Environmental Site Services	N/A	WSCF extends beyond the minimum requirements of the Lock and Tag Program. Not all work requires a robust LOTO practice but this facility still applies the practice in most cases for a safer behavior process.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-009	GP	Maintenance Services	8/9/12	MSA/ Maintenance Services	Manager	N/A	Maintenance Services personnel think the Lock and Tag Controlling Organization team (consisting of supervisors, technical authority, etc.) have a questioning attitude in the field all the time and makes our program sound. Senior Management keeps them all receiving consistent information in routine staff meetings and gives them his expectations and keeps the three managers together as a team. They feel Senior Managements' mentoring is needed to learn new things and this keeps them clear on new requirements, etc.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-011	GP	Maintenance Services	8/9/12	MSA/ Maintenance Services	FWS		There is open feedback from workers (crafts) and FWS and Managers in the maintenance services organization. They keep the dialogue friendly and open which allows 2-way communication.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-012	GP	Maintenance Services	8/9/12	MSA/ Maintenance Services	Sign Painter		The worker thinks that safety culture is very good here and the managers are doing what they need to do in order to come to conclusions and get safety issues rectified.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-021	GP	MSA Custodial	8/8/12	MSA/Custodial	Supervisors/Workers	N/A	The workers felt very strong about the shared good ideas everyday in their kick off meetings. This approach allow for future discussions on basic ideas about safety and anything else.	We believe the group would not be successful without the current relationship with their supervisors and manager.
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-039	GP	WSCF PCB Screenings	8/8/12	MSA/ WSCF	WSCF Analytical Lab Worker and WSCF Environmental Site Services	N/A	They perform screenings on every sample in the lab now identified as containing PCBs and by doing this it helps segregate where the sample needs to go for the right work group to perform analysis. Screenings also present the potential for a clearer hazard analysis up front; this helps determine with certainty the level of hazardous waste process which helps with the material stream process. NOTE: This process has been sanctioned by the Dept. of Ecology as well.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-046	GP	Good Practice Employees List of Issues	8/8/12	MSA/ SIL/ WU	Manager	N/A	When current Director was assigned to Public Works, one of his first endeavors was to sit down one-on-one with each employee within Water & Sewer Utilities. In addition to wanting to better know the employee, he asked each person to relate to him, anonymously if necessary, any safety issues or concerns, safety improvements, and anything that is bothering them. A few weeks ago, the director presented to the employees (based on results from the interviews) "this is where we were and a list of what needs to be done". Based on actions they have completed and what needs to be done, this is the list of where they are today. Each employee was asked to report back 2-3 issues that are most important to them. From this, a list of approximately twenty issues was identified and prioritized. This list will be tracked and trended and periodically reviewed with the employees.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-053	GP	MSA Information Management	8/7/12	MSA/ IM/ Cyber Security	HAMTC Safety Rep., Manager, Bargaining and Exempt Personnel	N/A	Information Management was new to ISMS and the VPP program in 2010. A dedicated HAMTC Safety Representative was provided to the organization to mentor management and bargaining personnel about ISMS and VPP. This is considered a Best Practice due to the success of this organization. Having a VP that make workers feel they care about their safety. The groups have participated in Kizan workshops.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-054	GP	ISMS Surveillance Team	8/15/12	MSA/ ESH&Q/ SC&A	ISMS Team Members	N/A	MSA utilizes an ISMS surveillance team, comprising of HAMTC bargaining unit representatives and technical experts, to provide ongoing evaluation/ feedback/ mentoring of field work activities to enhance the sustainability and maintainability of the MSA ISMS program elements, consistent with the ISMS System Description, the Annual ISMS Declaration of Readiness, and the FY 2012 ISMS Surveillance Team Plan. MSA continues to sponsor in-depth evaluations, mentoring, and coaching of MSA personnel performing and supervising work process at the facility, project, sub-project, and/or activity level including construction activities. The team evaluation strategy is designed to provide continuing feedback to MSA management (including senior leadership) relative to ISMS implementation in the field and complete a “reality check” on ISMS process use and efficiency.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-055	GP	MSA Custodial	8/8/12	MSA/ Custodial	Supervisors/ Workers	N/A	A positive relationship among the group (days and swing). With this in place anyone and everyone feels they can bring up issue or participate in any conversation to help solve problems.	We believe the group would not be as successful without the current relationship with their supervisors and manager.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-058	GP	MSA New Employee Orientation	8/22/12	MSA	Industrial Safety SME	N/A	Due to the nature of business in their support of DOE RL and the "bump and roll" process of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, MSA experiences many new employees and transfers from OHC. MSC recognized that new employees typically receive a new employee orientation from their assigned project and may be missing the overall company safety culture attributes and safety requirements. To ensure this does not happen, a company new employee orientation presentation was developed. The HR organization has an agenda for all new employees and has added this orientation to that list. When assigned to their projects, new employees then get another orientation relative to the project.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-059	GP	VPP Trimester (Mini Assessment)	8/22/12	MSA/ SH&Q/ SC&A	Technical Specialist	N/A	VPP assessments are required to be done yearly, MSA completed a mini VVP assessment to check and see how they looked, DOE saw what they had done and liked it. MSA decided to perform three mini assessments a year and roll the three mini assessments into one yearly assessment. Each Vice President receives an update after each mini assessment. By performing the three mini VPP assessments: • saves resources such as time and money • allows the discovery of any problem areas sooner • each follow the same format, but change the criteria in each focus area	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-060	GP	MSA Lockheed at 1981 Snyder	8/7/12	MSA/ IM/ Safety	Lockheed Exempt Personnel	N/A	The organization has a scrolling Reader Board to display the monthly EZAC minutes, the Safety Performance information and other pertinent information.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-061	GP	MSA LMSI at 1981 Snyder	8/7/12	MSA/ IM/ Safety	Exempt Personnel	N/A	The organization has a computer program that reminds individuals to take breaks when doing computer work.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-062	GP	MSA LMSI	8/7/12	MSA/ IM/ Infrastructure/ Cyber Security	Exempt personnel, Radio Maintenance Tech. and Computer Tech.	N/A	The groups have participated in Kizan workshops to improve their work processes.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-064	GP	WSCF Response to Medical Needs	8/8/12	MSA/ WSCF	WSCF Analytical Lab Worker, and WSCF Environmental Site Services	N/A	Workers are impressed with the response and timeliness of dealing with a recent employee needing medical assistance at the project. A lot of great team work and quick response times from employees lending a hand.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-065	GP	Safety Start	8/27/12	MSA	None	N/A	MSA implemented the MSA Weekly Safety Start on October 29, 2009, anticipating that employees would use these safety starts during Monday morning safety briefings to stimulate group discussions about safety. MSA's intent was to cover and feature a different safety topic, which consists of feedback from the field, each week. Since publishing its first safety start, MSA has found that holding weekly safety starts prior to going back to work after a weekend, or any other substantial time off work, is beneficial to all of us in getting back into concentrating on the task at hand. The use of the Weekly Safety Start, which consists of a subject, EMS topic, and includes our core functions, to open the Monday Back to Work Meeting which serves to open up conversation concerning safety and more times than not, workers will add additional safety topics, which starts the group to thinking safety.	None
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-066	GP	Leadership Training	8/27/12	MSA/ Management	None	N/A	MSA management personnel were sent to a twelve week leadership training class. The training consisted of exercises to strengthen communication skills in various situations. The course involved impromptu speeches, problem solving scenarios, and group discussions dealing with different behaviors both on and off the worksite. The training is for VPs, managers, supervisors and some employees who work in lead positions.	A good practice to help management with their communication skills and leadership.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-067	GP	Hanford Fire Department PPE Committee	8/28/12	MSA/ EST/ F&ER/ Stn. 92	Deputy Chief, Captain, HAMTC Safety Rep	N/A	Hanford Fire Fighters have organized a committee to address concerns regarding PPE they wear while on duty and while fighting fires or responding to emergency calls. The PPE committee is a joint effort with the Bargaining staff, Safety and Health org., and the Executive command staff. The committee meets when there is a concern brought to them and then the concern is evaluated and substantiated. When the decision is made to change the PPE it is studied and shopped for with approval from the Senior Management. The committee meets only when needed.	A good practice for safer and more comfortable PPE depending on conditions.
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-068	GP	Activity Level/ On the Floor EZACs	8/28/12	MSA	None	N/A	MSA's Zero Accident Council consists of: • 46 EZAC Chairs • 25 EZAC Co-Chairs • Covers 46 work groups • EZAC Headcount is 2509 workers MSA uses an EZAC for each work group to strive to achieve a single safety program, and provide the leadership to influence positive behavior and continual improvement toward the achievement of zero accidents. EZAC Chairs are able to encourage use of the Safety Log Book to identify workplace safety hazards, team with management to actively support timely resolution of all entries, and follow up on resolution with concerned employees.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-MSA-2012-SC-069	GP	MSA Risk Assessment	8/28/12	MSA	None	N/A	MSA is responsible for implementing an integrated approach to the management of risks that supports successful execution and completion of the contract work scope. The Risk Analysis, Processing and Reporting establishes the requirements and work process for management of risks associated with the execution of work scope under the Mission Support Contract (MSC). Risk analysis includes key processes to accomplish efficient and cost-effective measures to manage risks. Some of those processes are listed below: The RMB performs a review of the current project risks to determine if project conditions have changed warranting risk re-evaluation. • Risk planning consists of the up-front activities necessary to define and implement the risk management process. • Risk assessment includes the overall process of risk identification and analysis. • Risk identification is an organized approach for determining which risk events are likely to negatively impact performance or provide benefit and improvement for the MSC Project. • Risk prioritization is vital in determining which risks get handled and when and is accomplished through the MSA Risk Assessment Form by scoring risks based on Probability and Consequence and with the MSA Risk Prioritization Assignment Matrix.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-001	GP	Hanford Site VPP Webpage, VPP Mentoring, and Safety Improvement Plans (SIPS)	8/27/12	DOE RL/ CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	Focus Area 1 - Leadership Focus Area 2 - Employee	The DOE-RL contactors meet monthly at a Hanford Site Champions forum. Other companies included in this meeting are: Battelle (Pacific Northwest Laboratories (PNL), Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS), ATL International Inc. (ATL), Bechtel National Inc./ Waste Treatment Project. (BNI/WTP). This forum meets to share employee involvement activities and Good Practices and to mentor and support each other in performing self assessments in VPP. Examples of shared information include: Safety campaigns and posters, safety improvement plans (SIPS) which captures a company's goals and involves the employee safety councils to develop goals at the worker level that help achieve the overall company goal. The establishment and development of the new DOE-RL contractors VPP webpage was initiated on November 3, 2011 at a DOE-RL VPP POC kick off meeting introducing the new VPP POC for the DOE-RL and for CHPRC/MSA/WCH contractors. At the Hanford Site VPP Champions Committee meeting on December 12, 2011 it was discussed and agreed upon by the contractors to form a subcommittee to develop this webpage. SITE VPP WEBPAGE DEVELOPMENT: The VPP webmaster reports monthly on the efforts of the webpage subcommittee. The website is now active as of July 13, 2012. The website is open to the public and is populated with information to help commercial companies or other contractors learn about VPP. The goal for the website is for 80% of the information to remain	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
							static and about 20% to be updated routinely.	
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-002	GP	Hanford Site Wide Stop Work Policy	8/27/12	DOE RL/ CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	N/A	This procedure is applicable to all contractors and subcontract personnel working at the Hanford site. The employee has responsibility and authority to initiate a Stop Work IMMEDIATELY, without fear of reprisal, when the employee believes a situation exists which places himself/herself, a coworker(s), or the environment in danger or at risk. This procedure describes the responsibilities of the employee, Supervisor, Safety Professional, and Union Safety rep. (if filed by a bargaining employee). The procedure list appendixes that have requirements for DOE reporting.	This is a site wide safety procedure and is an effective way of keeping our work force safe and it also gives the workers a feeling of ownership that in turn supports a stronger safety culture.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-003	GP	HILLS	8/27/12	DOE RL/ CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	N/A	The HILLS/OPEX Web site contains Hanford related operating experience articles including Lessons Learned, Safety Bulletins, Recalls, and other types of information that can be used for preventing recurrence of events, and sharing of good work practices. All Hanford contractors, DOE-RL and DOE-ORP use the Hanford Information and Lessons Learned Sharing (HILLS) Web application. They use it as a vehicle to learn and share operating experiences, lessons learned and other safety- and health-related information. Those who read, share and apply HILLS information are doing their part to improve the overall safety culture at Hanford.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-004	GP	ISMS "Flippy Book" for MSA and CHPRC	8/27/12	MSA/ CHPRC	None	N/A	MSA Employee Guide to ISMS is now called the MSA Safety Toolbox. The book has 54 pages and walks the employee through the 5 Core Functions and the 9 Guiding Principles. The book defines ISMS, VPP, and HPI. The book incorporates helpful information the employee may use during their daily work such as Stop Work, Rad Con, Hazard Communication, Reporting Injuries and Emergency Numbers to name a few. This is a very helpful resource that is pocket size. The ISMS/EMS Pocket Guide for CHPRC is also a great tool to aid the worker in the field. It has 70 pages broke into 12 “chapters” of Personal Safety, 10 CFR 851, ISMS, EMS, VPP, HPI, Conduct of Operations, EWP, EVMS, SMP, Acronyms, and My Safety Information. The guide has the SAFER dialogue and STAR Prevention Tool so the worker will have access to these two reminders and not have another card to carry. Both pocket guides are an excellent source of information for the workers in the field or office.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-005	GP	HAMTC Safety Representatives Program for MSA and CHPRC	8/28/12	MSA/ CHPRC	None	N/A	The HAMTC Safety Rep Program started in 1997 which includes all Hanford contractors and affiliated unions. The HAMTC Safety Reps have designated Responsibilities listed on both the MSA and CHPRC HAMTC Safety Representative web page. CHPRC 's list of benefits primarily describe issue resolutions, whereas MSA's list describes the benefits of the program to both the worker and management. WCH's HAMTC Safety Representative Program could not be accessed and therefore a review could not be performed. The HAMTC Safety Representative Program is unique only to the Hanford Site. It has proved to be a worthwhile program in as it has increased production due to the mitigation of Stop Works and other safety concerns. There is more worker involvement in work planning and a better partnership between management and workers. The Safety Reps attend top- and mid-level project staff meetings to provide assistance in resolving environmental, safety and health issues. This is a good practice that would benefit other DOE Sites and Contractors.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-006	GP	Site Wide Safety Standards	8/28/12	DOE RL/ CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	N/A	The goal of the Plan is to have site-wide standards and standardized training where there are similar hazards, requirements, and worker expectations. MSA has the lead responsibility for managing this developmental process and ensuring appropriate, consistent and implementable site wide procedures and programs. MSA accomplishes this in conjunction with the Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC), and the Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council (CWB&CTC) other Hanford Contractors. The Site Wide Standards completed to date are: • DOE-0336 Hanford Site Lockout/Tagout Procedure • DOE-0342 Hanford Site Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (CBDPP) • DOE-0342-001 Hanford Site Beryllium Work Permit (BWP) and Hazard Assessment Procedure • DOE-0343 Stop Work • DOE-0344 Hanford Site Excavating, Trenching and Shoring Procedure (HSETSP) • DOE-0346 Hanford Site Fall Protection Program (HSFPP) • DOE-0352 Hanford Site Respiratory Protection Program (HSRPP) • DOE-0355 Hanford Standardized HAZWOPER Training Program Description • DOE-0359 Hanford Site Electrical Safety Program (HSESP) • DOE-0360 Hanford Site Confined Space Procedure (HSCSP) • DOE-0361 Hanford Site-Wide Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA) Procedure • DOE-RL-92-36 Hanford Site Hoisting and Rigging Manual	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-007	GP	Site Wide ESRB	8/28/12	CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	N/A	The DOE-RL Prime Contractors, MSA, CHPRC and WCH have developed an Executive Safety Review Board (ESRB). The purpose of the Executive Safety Review Board (ESRB) is to oversee and monitor the effectiveness of programs and processes associated with Safety Management Programs, Quality Assurance Program, Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS)/Environmental Management System (EMS) implementation activities and the Price-Anderson Amendments Act (PAAA) program. The ESRB will perform the following: • Oversee the cause evaluation and corrective action plan development for issues identified as PAAA/Worker Safety and Health (WSH) reportable into the Noncompliance Tracking System (NTS) and other Significant Issues, as determined by the ESRB Chair and/or Sponsor. On a case by case basis, review the results of effectiveness reviews performed on these issues. • Provide senior management feedback and direction concerning the focus and conduct of assessments. • Periodically (annually) review Safety Management Program performance through scheduled management presentations focused on demonstrating program status and health. • Review events, issues, and adverse trends with safety, quality, or environmental significance and/or programmatic implications, as determined by the ESRB Chair or Sponsor.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-008	GP	Contractor Assurance Program	8/28/12	CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	None	N/A	The DOE RL Prime Contractors MSA, CHPRC and WCH have developed a Contractor Assurance System (CAS). The CAS outlines the programs, processes, and mechanism that the Prime Contractors use to implement the requirements of DOE O 226.1B. The overall objective for health, safety, and quality is to develop and implement a CAS program which effectively monitors performance to prevent recurring events and proactively identifies performance issues through development and analysis of leading indicators. Fulfillment of these objectives will ensure the Prime Contractors' mission is being achieved; the workers, the public, and the environment are protected; that operational, facility, and business systems are effectively managed; and that contract/legal requirements are being fulfilled.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-009	GP	Interface Management for the Hanford Site	8/28/12	MSA Interface Management	None	N/A	RL and DOE's Office of River Protection (ORP) require prime contractors enter into interface agreements with one another to ensure the effective delivery and performance of Site services. MSC and prime contractor Interface Management staff and Project Liaisons will conduct interface management discussions to ensure the delivery of services in a safe, timely, cost-effective, and quality driven manner. All prime contractors will manage interfaces so that potential issues are resolved at the lowest level possible. Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) will be established as the primary inter-contractor working level team for responding to and resolving specific issues on an as-needed, case-by-case basis. This is a valuable process that has prevented some possible undesired results. When and if conflicts occur a resolution process is performed: Step 1 – Interface technical POCs attempt to resolve the issue. Step 2 – If the issue is not resolved it will be elevated to the Senior Functional Manager level. Step 3 – If still no resolution it will be elevated to the senior functional managers for resolution. It is expected the majority of issues will be resolved at this level. Step 4 – If disputes are not resolved it will be elevated to the company's President or designee. Step 5 – For issues that are not resolved either party may elevate the issue to DOE Contracting Officers for resolution.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-SW-2012-SC-010	GP	Site Wide Traffic Safety	8/28/12	CHPRC/ MSA/ WCH	Industrial Safety Manager	N/A	In response to increased traffic safety concerns, the Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) asked the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) to establish a site wide committee to help address traffic safety issues on the Hanford Site. The committee worked with a traffic safety consultant to conduct the study. The study offered several recommendations to enhance safety. DOE-RL has directed MSA to implement the following recommendations that are expected to have the most immediate and greatest positive impact on improving traffic safety. The Hanford Site Traffic Safety Enhancement Committee (TSEC) is established to serve as the advisory group providing consensus direction for Hanford Site Highway and vehicle issues affecting Site Contractors. The DOE Richland Operations Office (RL), Office of River Protection (ORP), and affected Contractors acknowledge that a joint committee provides the best approach for identification, evaluation and recommendations for implementation of traffic safety related issues. The parties agree to cooperate in a teambuilding manner to ensure that the full intent of the Committee's mission is met and will be responsibly carried out by their respective organizations. The committee is made up by Hanford Site Contractors, Department of Energy personnel and Site Labor groups. The committee helped to create the Hanford Transportation Safety Initiative. The purpose of this initiative was to identify near and medium-term improvements in road infrastructure,	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
							traffic operations, traffic safety education, and traffic enforcement to address traffic safety issues on the Hanford Site. The overall goal of this initiative is to get Hanford employees safely to work and home each day. The committee has also developed a positive relationship with the Benton County Sheriff's Office that has led to improvements in regard to Site enforcement activities.	
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-005	GP	ERDF Can Cycle	8/14/12	WCH/ ERDF/ ERDF Land Fill	Industrial Hygienist Manager	N/A	A video of the life of a can was filmed and shared with all who have interest in the scope of work. The film explains how and what happens to the ERDF cans.	This is a good practice as the workers coming to ERDF will understand through a learning tool how the worker will be doing their job and why.

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-006	GP	Maintenance of Discipline Operations	8/14/12	WCH/ Stoller/ ERDF / 6250	Industrial Hygienist Manager	N/A	The WCH Ops Manager stated the Stoller organization has developed a MODO (Maintenance of Discipline Operations). The WCH manager is responsible for the group of Eberline and Stoller employees. The program identifies training that the management and workers believe is needed for their work scope. The training is reviewed periodically depending on the priority given for each fundamental. The program is unique to the Company and is not procedurally driven. The organization owns the program and tracks the continuing training of each individual and in each fundamental. The categories are; Critical Procedure review, Hazard Reviews, IWCP Reviews, and Con Ops. Training requirements are annual, some are bi-annual, and some are quarterly depending on exposure and level of hazard.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-007	GP	Shipping Manifest	8/14/12	WCH/ ERDF	First Line Manager	N/A	Waste shipments require that an Onsite Waste Transfer Form (OWTF) be filled with pertinent shipping data provided by the waste shipper. Teamsters are required to review the data that pertains to their responsibilities in the OWTF and sign their name at the bottom and to the right of the form acknowledging that the information provided in the OWTF is correct. The waste shipper's signature is also required at the bottom of the form; however it is on the left side and is the first signature. There have been numerous instances when the teamsters have not signed the form. Discussions with the teamsters and SMEs determined that maybe the shipper's signature causes distractions and/or forgetfulness, which results in the form not being signed. The team decided to redesign the form and have one signature line (about the middle of the form) for the information that the teamster is held accountable for correctness. This appears to be working and very few instances occurs when teamsters fail to sign the form.	None
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-014	GP	100 Area Exempt	8/15/12	WCH/ 100 Area/ D4	Exempt Workers	N/A	Workers think that "People are encouraged to voice their opinions and ask questions and management will answer them."	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-022	GP	Good Practice at 105B	8/15/12	WCH/ 105B	Manager	N/A	Plastic is placed underneath regulated equipment when it is not being used to prevent a possible spread of contamination.	None
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-024	GP	Good Practice at D4 300 Area	8/15/12	WCH/ D4/ 300 Area	RCT, D&D Worker	N/A	A RCT explained to a new D&D Worker the importance of changing gloves after each evolution of work. The way it was explained showed the worker that the dose to his hands increased each time he performed a work evolution. That made such an impression on the worker that he now tosses his co-worker's gloves to prevent dose build up. A Safety Culture Team member suggested the D&D Worker explain to his co-workers the significance of tossing their gloves.	None
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-031	GP	Disciplined Operations Plan	8/23/12	WCH	None	N/A	The WCH leadership team has taken upon itself the need to drive safety to the next level (beyond VPP Star Status). This drive for continuous improvement will ensure that WCH work teams do not become complacent given the hazardous work that needs to be performed safely to complete the contract mission through 2015. The results of the number of highly critical self-assessments served as a basis for the activities to strengthen Disciplined Operations, Integrated Work Control, Human performance and Safety Culture.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-032	GP	Performance Excellence Training	8/27/12	WCH	Quality Assurance Manager	N/A	WCH has developed a training program “Tools & Approaches to Take Safety to the Next Level” to provide the leadership team with proven tools and associated knowledge t improve performance through the prevention of events, near misses and occurrences that hinder effective delivery. The training outline consists of: • Overview of safety culture attributes, their relationship to ISMS, and the leadership principles that affect safety culture • How recent WCH occurrences, issues, and assessment results provide an insight into the WCH safety culture and our “at-risk” behaviors • How a targeted use of Human Performance tools can “break the chain” or sequence of at-risk actions/behaviors that lead to events/occurrences • How to effectively leverage management walkthroughs with target coaching and mentoring of work teams relative to event prevention	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-033	GP	Work/ Area Observation Checklist	8/27/12	WCH	Quality Assurance Manager	N/A	WCH uses a Work/Area Observation Checklist to ensure FWSs and workers are aware of their behavior and hazards associated with the work prior to initiating the activity. Some of the topical areas and associated hazards are: • Environment o Clear access/egress o Slip-Trip hazards o Adequate lighting o Changed conditions • Tools and Equipment o Correct tools for the job o Tool/ladder inspections o Rigging Inspections • Heavy Equipment Operation o Use of spotters o Travel path inspections o Loads secured o Unattended operation • Electrical Safety o Extension cords protected o Electrical panel access o LOTO o Arc flash protection • Disciplined Operations o FWS/RM presence in the field o Procedure compliance o Clear scope of work o Distractions	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-034	GP	Continued Employment of Building Trades during Work Stoppages	8/17/12	WCH	WCH President, Field Remediation Manager	N/A	Due to the local building trade's contract agreement, the use of the Stop Work Policy by local building trades is considered a negative incentive to bring safety issues forward. This is due to when a project is halted for any reason, the local building trades are sent home, without pay, until the project is re-started. Therefore, any stop work for safety reasons that requires some duration of time results in a loss of pay for the building trades. However, WCH is aware of the loss of pay impact and are taking positive actions to mitigate the impact. WCH does provide the building trade personnel with other work activities when possible to encourage participation as part of the WCH team.	The management awareness of the negative incentive to bring up safety issues by the building trades is noteworthy. While not completely resolvable, efforts to minimize the impact of a stand-down does improve the brining forward of safety issues.
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-035	GP	Management Walk-Through Process (Procedure QA-1-1.14)	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	This procedure describes how Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) establishes and implements an effective management walk-through process. This procedure describes the process for management to perform and document structured operational awareness walk-throughs of projects and facilities. In addition, WCH senior leadership has established minimum expectations for each manager to perform walk-throughs each month. This expectation is in addition to that established by the parent company. These walk-throughs are tracked each month and reported as part of the contractor assurance systems.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-036	GP	Carol's Expectations	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	Carol Johnson, WCH President & Project Manager published and promulgated her expectations for performance. These expectations are found in posters and other media that start with safety performance relative to stop work, disciplined operations, and individual accountability and caring for fellow employees. These expectations are discussed and provided to the workforce in company safety messages and other communications media.	None
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-037	GP	RCC Event Notification Form	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	WCH has its webpage under Safety & Health Safety a notification process (text message). This process allows the sender to distribute a brief summary of an event to a pre-determined list of WCH personnel. For Example: Vehicle Accident 100N. Dump Truce struck Private Vehicle.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-038	GP	Safety Culture Policy	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	WCH developed and formalized its Nuclear Safety Culture Policy in document PM-ESDH-15. This policy documents the expectation WCH management has relative to developing and strengthening its nuclear safety culture and safe work environment for all work conducted in all facilities, all areas, and by all employees on the WCH project. The policy has defined traits or attributes based on DOE-M 450 Attachment 10 that include the following: - Leadership Safety Values and Actions - Personal Accountability - Work Processes in accordance with ISMS principles - Continuous improvement - Environment for Raising Concerns, a safety conscious work environment - Effective Safety Communications - Respectful Work Environment, trust, and respect permeate the organization - Questioning Attitudes.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-039	GP	Closure Coaches	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	Given the nature of the WCH as closure project, it is essential that management support the safe, cost-effective completion of the mission of the RCCC, retain the necessary talent until the right time, and assist employees in moving to the next phase of their career of life. To accomplish this WCH established closure coaches staffed from HR organization and assigned to each company organization to help the work force transition as their specific project comes to an end. These coaches help as needed and in many activities to enable and support project personnel in the transition process.	None
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-040	GP	IWCP Pre-Ev Feedback Process	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	As part of the Integrated Work Control Process (IWCP), WCH improved the Pre-Evolution briefing checklist (WCH-FS-210) to proactively identify issues or improvements, work technique issues or improvements, or good practices that could be useful to future work, work in other projects or to improve safety. These lessons learned that are identified proactively during the Pre-Ev are evaluated and used to improve future work package content or procedure activities or other routine work activities.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-041	GP	Robust Fact Finding Process	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	The Fact Finding process at WCH, LLC, is a subset of the Incident Response and Investigation process and is described in SEM-3-2.2, "Event Management". From this procedure, the definition of a Fact Finding is "A meeting of people involved in an event that seeks to understand the precursors leading to the event including an evalaution of immediate actions taken, potential causes, and the extent of conditions". The purpose of the fact finding process is to determine facts associated with an event/off-normal condition, not fault. Fact findings generally occur during the discovery stage in an inquiry or investigation where more information is needed to accurately assess the extent or severity of an event/off-normal condition. The procedure allows for the Project/ Functional Director (P/FD) to determine if an event investigation is warranted and, if so, conduct a Fact Finding. They also have the latitude to not conduct a Fact Finding if the facts of the incident are self-evident and clearly understood. Once the P/FD or RM determines that more information is needed, the next step in the procedure is to conduct a Fact Finding Meeting. The process is led by the P/FD or RM, this helps reduce the administrative burden on the Field Work Supervisor. In addition WCH utilizes a Performance Assurance Manager in an effort to ensure a robust feedback and improvement function exists with each project. The person also helps with fact finding and cause analysis activities.	None

Evaluation No	Type of Evaluation	Subject	Evaluation Dates	Co/Proj/ Facility Reviewed	Personnel Contacted	Focus Area/ CRAD/LOI	Evaluation Summary	Comments
ISMS-WCH-2012-SC-042	GP	Communication	9/4/12	WCH	None	N/A	WCH utilizes diverse communication forms and media to ensure safety messaging reaches all employees. These forms and media include The Howler, a periodic newsletter from the Local Safety Improvement Teams (LSIT), the Weekly Safety Roundup that is a computation of daily safety messages, Daily Safety messages that provide daily safety related information from recent events, accidents, injuries, etc., LSITs, the President Safety Committee, and Contractor Assurance Reports. In addition, WCH provides communiques from the President. A recent president message discussed a Stop Work called by the president due to potential adverse trend in lock and tag performance.	None

Attachment B

Safety Culture Review Plan

DOE RL Safety Culture

Evaluation Plan

July-August 2012

Approved: Mark R. Steelman for _____ J. E. Parsons

Mark R. Steelman _____ M. R. Steelman

1.0 Purpose & Scope

The Department of Energy (DOE)-Richland Operations Office (RL) and its prime contractors (Mission Support Alliance (MSA), CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) and Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) conducted a Safety Culture Review to (1) gather "good practices" in regards to safety culture at DOE-RL and (2) perform a first look at RL and its' Prime Contractors in as a follow on to the June 2012, DOE Site-Wide Safety Culture Survey.

The evaluation focused on the attributes associated with a strong safety culture described within the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Guide, Attachment 10 and key lessons learned from independent assessments of safety culture performed by DOE Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS). The ISMS provides the following focus statement regarding safety culture within DOE:

> *"Safety culture is an organization's values and behaviors modeled by its leaders and internalized by its members, which serve to make safe performance of work the overriding priority to protect the workers, public, and the environment. "*

Attachment 10 of the Guide identified the following three safety culture focus areas and associated attributes (those that most clearly support SCWE are highlighted):

1. Leadership
   g. Demonstrated safety leadership
   h. Risk-informed, conservative decision making
   i. Management engagement and time in field
   j. Staff recruitment, selection, retention, and development
   k. Open communication and fostering an environment free from retribution
   l. Clear expectations and accountability
2. Employee/Worker Engagement
   e. Personal commitment to everyone's safety
   f. Teamwork and mutual respect
   g. Participation in work planning and improvement
   h. Mindful of hazards and controls
3. Organizational Learning
   f. Credibility, trust and reporting errors and problems
   g. Effective resolution of reported problems
   h. Performance monitoring through multiple means
   i. Use of operational experience
   j. Questioning attitude

The lines of inquiry (LOIs) described in Attachment 1 were developed in accordance with ISMS Guide and "key lessons learned" from the HSS review.

2.0 Team Members

The evaluation team is shown below. The team has experience in evaluation activities and related experience in assessing safety culture at both DOE and commercial nuclear activities.

RL Independent Evaluation Team Members

- Ed Parsons, Co-Lead, Organizational Liaison (DOE-RL)
- Mark R. Steelman, Co-Lead, Consultant (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Gary Grant, Organizational Liaison (WCH)
- Mike Hassel, Organizational Liaison (CHPRC)
- Barbara Williams, Exempt (CHPRC)
- Lanette Adams, Organizational Liaison (MSA)
- Emily Millikin, Organizational Liaison (WCH)
- Rocky Simmons, HAMTC (MSA)
- Gordon Denman, HGU (MSA)
- Dennis Hurshman, Exempt (WCH)

MSA ISMS Surveillance Team:

- Art Garcia, Exempt (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Henry Sparks, HAMTC (MSA)
- Robin Quinton, HAMTC (MSA)
- Hoyt Mitchell, HAMTC (MSA)
- Terri McEvoy, Database Administrator (Steelman Associates, Ltd)
- Caitlin Gordon, Administrative, (Summer Intern, MSA)

3.0 Methodology

The evaluation team will utilize Attachment 1 as a guide for categorizing good practices. The team may also determine that other items outside of the attachment 1 categories may also constitute a good safety culture practice and worthy of inclusion into the final report.

The lines of inquiry (LOIs) described in Attachment 2 were developed from the ISMS Guide, DOE G 450.4-1C, and "key lessons learned" from the HSS review. This set of LOIs have been developed for use by the team to perform to perform the secondary objective of providing a first look at RL and its' Prime Contractors in as a follow on to the June 2012, DOE Site-Wide Safety Culture Survey.

To develop a complete picture of performance associated with each LOI, it is necessary for the evaluation team to use a combination of data collection methods. These include document analysis, personnel interviews and observation of group situations (e.g., meetings, fieldwork).

3.1 Direct observation of work place behavior:

The team will evaluate workforce activities that implement mechanisms/processes that could impact safety culture/behaviors for all work activities from the planning stages to feedback, including reviews of work packages and hazard analysis/controls, attendance at pre and post-job briefings, and field observation of work performances.

3.2 Face-to-face interviews:

The evaluation team will use semi-structured interviews in which the main questions to be discussed are defined based on the LOIs. However, because it is important to make interview situations natural and easy for the interviewee, interviews will also be conducted while the employee is in their normal work setting.

3.3 Review of key safety culture related processes:

The evaluation team will review the following types of documentation. Specific documentation to be reviewed includes, but not limited to:

- Employee concerns policies.
- HR related policies and procedures relative to harassment and retaliation.
- Procedures and policies related to stop work authority
- Assessment procedures, schedules and completed assessments, management observations and associated training materials
- Issues management/corrective action procedures, problem/condition reports, checklists and associated training materials
- Organizational improvement training materials
- Records from the Contractor Assurance systems and associated management review meetings
- Records and other documentation from project/program Corrective Action Review Boards
- Communication plans and associated products associated with safety
- Performance measures/indicators
- Differing Professional Opinions (DPO)
- Contract mechanisms

Team members will document each observation on the Safety Culture Evaluation Report (see Attachment 2) and include the following:

- A clear purpose of the evaluation and the evaluation performed is concisely covered
- Include any noteworthy practices observed during the evaluation
- Include recommendation(s) to responsible management
- Document the pertinent evaluation information in the Data Base.

As a matter of best utilization of field time, and to reduce impact on the organizations, the team should refrain from requesting documents while in the field. The team should note any

references to documents from field observations on the Safety Culture Evaluation Form (see Attachment 3) for later evaluation.

4.0 Schedule

The performance period for this evaluation campaign is from July 16, 2012 to August 25, 2012. The Co-Team Leads will issue a final report no later than September 12, 2012. The team leads will hold a weekly status briefing every Friday to interested parties.

- July 16-20, 2012 – Review plan, team training, best practices presentations.

  During the week of July 16, 2012, the team leads are expecting each DOE-RL Prime Contractor to provide a presentation on the current status of their Safety Culture, including best practices. The Organizational Liaisons will be responsible for coordinating and scheduling each contractor specific presentation regarding the status of their safety culture.

- July 23-27, 2012 – Organization #1 Field Evaluation
- July 30-August 3, 2012 – Organization #2 Field Evaluation
- August 6-10, 2012 – Organization #3 Field Evaluation
- August 13-25, 2012 – Organization #4 Field Evaluation
- August 26-September 12, 2012 – Develop and approve report

The Organizational Liaisons will be responsible for developing and managing the detailed schedule for their specific organizations' review.

Final Report

The team leaders will develop a report to document the results of the evaluation. This report will identify safety culture good practices and opportunities for improvement. These will be reported to RL and Prime Contractor Management.

The team leaders will transmit the report to DOE-RL AMSE.

The Safety Culture Evaluation report will be written with this format as a guide:

> TITLE PAGE – The title page is the report cover and will state the subject of the Safety Culture Evaluation.
>
> SIGNATURE PAGE – The signature page will be for the signatures of the Safety Culture Evaluation team members.
>
> EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – This is a brief summary of the review process including the most significant best practices identified during the Safety Culture Evaluation.
>
> INTRODUCTION – The introduction will provide information regarding the process reviewed the reason for the review, and the purpose and the scope of the Safety Culture

Evaluation. It will also contain a brief discussion of the overall objectives of the Safety Culture Evaluation, the review process, and team composition.

SAFETY CULTURE EVALUATION – For each functional area, the report will discuss the Safety Culture evaluation results for the 15 attributes and a summary of each attribute.

Attachment 1

Good Practices Guidelines

Good Practices Guidelines

The approach to be used by this team to gather best practices will consist of two steps. The first step will be to gather information on methods, processes, improvement initiatives and leadership actions that define the safety culture of the organization.

The team is expected to share on a peer-to-peer level experiences and current practices that enhance overall safety behavior. The overall objective is for all organizations to benefit from this evaluation.

Areas that should be investigated for best practices include, but not limited to:

1. Communication mechanisms
    a. Tailoring of communication regarding safety behavior/culture
    b. Message delivery mechanisms and consistency
    c. Two way communication
    d. Response to requests
    e. Information access

2. Knowledge sharing
    a. Teaching of behavioral/cultural norms
    b. Training tailoring
    c. Training verses knowledge
    d. Knowledge utilization and re-enforcement
    e. Organizational learning methods
    f. Peer-to-Peer knowledge sharing

3. Organizational goals and objectives
    a. Ownership and development sharing
    b. Clarity and non-ambiguous
    c. Goals and objectives integration

4. Resource allocations
    a. Materials, methods, staffing, and time allocation
    b. Balanced priorities mechanisms

5. Monitoring and Oversight
    a. Metrics development and utilization
    b. Safety behavior/culture assessment mechanisms
    c. Critical self-evaluation
    d. Unsafe behavior management

6. Feedback
    a. Using and sharing operating experience
    b. Constant re-enforcement of safety behavior expectations
    c. Feedback integration
    d. Corrective action mechanisms and effectiveness

7. Improvement initiatives
    a. Human Performance Improvement
    b. Voluntary Protection Program
    c. Behavior Based Safety
    d. Conservative Decision Making
    e. International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Standard 9001, Quality Management System
    f. Total Quality Management
    g. Six Sigma quality programs
    h. ISO Standard 14001, Environmental Management System.
    i. Other

8. Leadership
    a. Participation of leaders in safety behavior
    b. Leaders create an engaged, thinking organization
    c. Ownership of issues
    d. Personnel motivation
    e. Minority opinion and dissent engagement mechanisms
    f. Approaches to balancing safety, risk, quality and production
    g. Unification of expectations
    h. Responsiveness, flexibility and adaptation
    i. Management and worker relationship development

Attachment 2

Lines of Inquiry

The following number codes are noted after each LOI to guide the evaluator on what organizational level the inquiry should be focused. Note that these are guidelines only and it is the evaluator's discretion on what level to apply the questioning.

1. Upper management
2. Middle Management
3. Front line management
4. Non-management/work teams

Focus Area 1: Leadership

1. Demonstrated safety leadership
    a. Does management, from immediate supervisor to senior managers, demonstrate their commitment to safety through their actions and behaviors? (2,3,4)
    b. Is safety more important than schedule in action and words? (3,4)
    c. How do you balance safety and production? (1,2)
    d. What are some examples that demonstrate the balance between safety and schedule? How did you derive that balance conclusion? (1,2)

2. Risk-informed, conservative decision making
    a. What processes/tools do you use to make decisions regarding safe work performance when faced with unexpected or uncertain conditions? (1,2,3)
    b. Before beginning work, how do you know the work is properly authorized? (2,3,4)
    c. What are your organization's expectations or requirements for stopping work? (1,2,3,4)
    d. When would you stop work? (1,2,3,4)
    e. Do you have a process/tool that supports your decision making regarding ESH risk? (1,2)
    f. Does contract incentives create budget or schedule pressures that impair the effectiveness for identifying and resolving safety and quality concerns or issues raised by employees? (1,2)

3. Management engagement and time in field
    a. What are the organizations expectations or requirements for management spending time in the field? (1,2,3)
    b. What are Management's expectations for observing field activities? (1,2,3)
    c. Do changes happen as a result of management time in field? (3,4)
    d. What is the value of management field presence? (3,4)

4. Staff recruitment, selection, retention, and development
    a. What are your organizations expectations or requirements to ensure you are capable to perform your job? (1,2,3,4)
    b. What are your organizations expectations for broadening and enhancing your capabilities or professional development? (1,2,3,4)
    c. How do you maintain technical proficiencies given budget uncertainties? (1,2)

5. Open communication and fostering an environment free from retribution
    a. When you raise a safety concern, what happens? (3,4)
    b. When a safety concern is raised, what happens? (1,2)
    c. Do you feel free to raise safety concerns without fear of retaliation? (1,2,3,4)
        - Are you aware of any un-reported safety concerns?
    d. Do individuals at all levels of the organization actively listen to each other to ensure they understand the meaning, intent, and viewpoints that are being communicated? (1,2,3,4)

6. Clear expectations and accountability
    a. Does my supervisor set clear expectations for safety and hold people accountable? (2,3,4)
    b. Is safety covered during my performance review? (2,3,4)
    c. How do my peers react to my bringing forward a safety issue? (3,4)
    d. Expectations are clearly communicated without conflicting messages from other communications/sources. (Mixed messages) (2,3,4)
        - Discuss a specific example.

Focus Area 2: Employee/Worker Engagement

1. Personal commitment to everyone's safety (Must ask in order)
    a. What is your personal commitment to safety? (1,2,3,4)
    b. Who makes technical decisions relative to safety? (1,2,3,4)
    c. Who makes the final decision regarding technical safety issues? (1,2,3,4)
    d. What is your responsibility relative to safety technical authorities' decisions? (1,2,3,4)
    e. Who owns safety? (1,2,3,4)

2. Teamwork and mutual respect
    a. Do conversations with my peers and my supervisor concerning safety occur? (3,4)
    b. When disagreements about safety are brought up, what happens? (1,2,3,4)
    c. When bad news is discussed, what is the tone of the discussion? (1,2,3,4)
    d. Does company or organizational boundaries affect how we work as a team? (1,2,3,4)

3. Participation in work planning and improvement
    a. Were you involved in developing the strategy in regards to your organization's work scope? (1,2,3)
    b. Describe your involvement in work planning? (3,4)
    c. Do you need/use "work-arounds" to be successful? (be honest) (1,2,3,4)

4. Mindful of hazards and controls
    a. What are your organization's expectations for performing pre-job briefings and performance of work in the field? (2,3,4)
    b. Before you start work, what is done to ensure that hazards are identified and adequately controlled? (3,4)
    c. What happens when a Stop Work is invoked? (2,3,4)

Focus Area 3: Organizational Learning

1. Credibility, trust and reporting errors and problems
    a. Do you trust your supervisor to make good decisions in regards to you and your peer's safety? (2,3,4)
    b. When someone makes an honest mistake that affects safety, what happens to that person? What about mistakes that affect production? (1,2,3,4)
    c. Describe your organization's process for reporting issues, errors and problems. (2,3,4)
    d. When an issue is reported to management, what happens? (3,4)
    e. Do managers respond in a timely manner to issues that are brought to their attention? (2,3,4)

2. Effective resolution of reported problems
    a. How does the corrective action management program communicate feedback and closure to individuals who have identified issues related to safety? (1,2,3,4)
    b. Does the organization encourage and solicit input from workers when seeking to resolve problems or to define potential improvements? (1,2,3,4)
    c. Describe your organization's event investigation expectation including membership, timeliness, and thoroughness. Is this expectation being met? (2,3,4)

3. Performance monitoring through multiple means
    a. What mechanisms are used to monitor safety performance? (1,2)
    b. What are some recent safety performance items shared/discussed by your supervision? (3,4)
    c. Does supervision share safety or other information in a timely manner? (1,2,3,4)
    d. How is safety performance measured? (1,2,3)
    e. How is safety performance information used to improve overall company performance? (1,2,3)

4. Use of operational experience
    a. Are lessons learned incorporated into the work planning/implementation process? (2,3,4)
    b. Is self-identification/self reporting viewed as part of the work scope? (1,2,3,4)
    c. Is effort given to collecting and sharing lessons learned? (2,3)
    d. What are some lessons learned you use when performing your job? (3,4)
    e. How have lessons learned influenced the work performed by your team? (2,3,4)

5. Questioning attitude
    a. Does your organization encourage discussion on different approaches before work is performed? (1,2,3,4)
    b. Does my supervision actively seek out and support different opinions on how to get the job done? (1,2,3,4)
    c. Is challenging “status quo” a valued and expected practice? (1,2,3,4)
    d. Are discussions, either formally or informally, held about how tasks can be improved? (1,2,3,4)
    e. Describe your organizations post-job review process? (2,3,4)
    f. Is there time given to communicate improvements/ideas? (1,2,3,4)
    g. Does my workgroup avoid complacency by constantly questioning “what” and “how” we perform our work? (3,4)

Attachment 3

Safety Culture Evaluation Form Example

SAFETY CULTURE EVALUATION REPORT			
Evaluation No.:			
Subject:			
Evaluation Dates:			
Evaluation Lead / Team Members:			
Organization / Project / Facility Reviewed:			
Personnel Contacted:			
Focus Area/CRAD/LOI:			
Associated Document(s):			
Evaluation Summary:			
Comments:			
Reviewer (Print & Sign)	**Date**	**Team Lead (Print & Sign)**	**Date**

Appendix C

Good Practices Guidelines

Good Practices Guidelines

The approach used by the team to gather best practices was to gather information on methods, processes, improvement initiatives and leadership actions that define the safety culture of the organization.

Areas that were considered for best practices included:

1. Communication mechanisms
   a. Tailoring of communication regarding safety behavior/culture
   b. Message delivery mechanisms and consistency
   c. Two way communication
   d. Response to requests
   e. Information access

2. Knowledge sharing
   a. Teaching of behavioral/cultural norms
   b. Training tailoring
   c. Training verses knowledge
   d. Knowledge utilization and re-enforcement
   e. Organizational learning methods
   f. Peer-to-Peer knowledge sharing

3. Organizational goals and objectives
   a. Ownership and development sharing
   b. Clarity and non-ambiguous
   c. Goals and objectives integration

4. Resource allocations
   a. Materials, methods, staffing, and time allocation
   b. Balanced priorities mechanisms

5. Monitoring and Oversight
   a. Metrics development and utilization
   b. Safety behavior/culture assessment mechanisms
   c. Critical self-evaluation
   d. Unsafe behavior management

6. Feedback
   a. Using and sharing operating experience
   b. Constant re-enforcement of safety behavior expectations
   c. Feedback integration
   d. Corrective action mechanisms and effectiveness

7. Improvement initiatives
    a. Human Performance Improvement
    b. Voluntary Protection Program
    c. Behavior Based Safety
    d. Conservative Decision Making
    e. International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Standard 9001, Quality Management System
    f. Total Quality Management
    g. Six Sigma quality programs
    h. ISO Standard 14001, Environmental Management System
    i. Other

8. Leadership
    a. Participation of leaders in safety behavior
    b. Leaders create an engaged, thinking organization
    c. Ownership of issues
    d. Personnel motivation
    e. Minority opinion and dissent engagement mechanisms
    f. Approaches to balancing safety, risk, quality and production
    g. Unification of expectations
    h. Responsiveness, flexibility and adaptation
    i. Management and worker relationship development