

**PRICE ANDERSON AMENDMENTS ACTS WORKING GROUP (PAAAWG)
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DIRECTORS
(FY 2005)**

1. Introduction

The primary focus of the Working Group is on nuclear/radiological safety in the context of PAAA enforceable regulations throughout the entire life cycles of facilities and activities. Price-Anderson relationships to other laws and regulations (e.g., DOT 49 CFR provisions) will be included in the scope of the Working Group to the extent necessary to assist in the understanding of the relationships and interfaces. Coordination with other EFCOG Working Groups is appropriate and encouraged, especially where the technical aspects of the other Working Groups relate to PAAA enforceable regulations.

The Price-Anderson Working Group is an Energy Facility Contractors Group (EFCOG) working group that focuses on nuclear/radiological safety regulatory activities. The purpose of the working group is to enhance communications and cooperation with the DOE Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement and to promote excellence at DOE facilities through the implementation of Price-Anderson Amendments Act (PAAA) nuclear safety laws and regulations, information sharing, and application of lessons learned.

The objectives of the Price-Anderson Working Group are to:

- Provide planning and actions necessary to achieve the overall objectives of the EFCOG in the area of nuclear/radiological safety regulatory activities.
- Promote, coordinate, and facilitate the active exchange of programs, practices, procedures, lessons learned, and other pertinent information on nuclear/radiological safety regulatory activities.
- Provide an avenue for communications to and from the DOE Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement on matters of enforcement programs, expectations, clarifications, complex-wide issues, and guidance.
- Promote training and learning on nuclear/radiological safety regulatory activities by sharing of management and technical information among DOE contractors through mechanisms such as workshops, task teams, and conferences.

The Price-Anderson Working Group operates within the scope of EFCOG. Areas that can benefit from focused and coordinated contractor attention are as follows:

- PAAA compliance assurance, including noncompliance reporting.
- Conduct of Enforcement Investigations, Conferences, and Program Reviews.
- Graded or tailored approaches to PAAA regulation implementation, including appropriate benchmarking activities.
- Working relationships with regulatory counterparts (e.g., DOE PAAA Coordinators and DOE-HQ Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement personnel).
- Addressing other issues as identified by the DOE Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement, EFCOG Executive Directors, EFCOG Sponsor, and/or the Working Group Strategic Planning Committee.

2. Membership

Membership in the PAAA Working Group varies from meeting to meeting, based on the topics being discussed, the location of the meeting, and the nature of the work being accomplished. In general, approximately 90 to 100 professionals attend our semi-annual meetings with about 85% claiming membership in the Working Group. For the most part, the PAAA Coordinators from each of the company sites within the DOE complex are a part of the PAAA Working Group membership. Additionally, subject experts in the area of quality assurance, rad control, safety analysis, root cause analysis, regulatory compliance, project management, and program management are important members of the Working Group.

Of the forty-five (45) member companies within EFCOG, approximately thirty (30) companies are represented on the PAAA Working Group. Those companies not represented are generally those with little or no direct Price Anderson reporting or liability issues.

The PAAA Working Group is sponsored by:

- Stephen M. Sohinki (stephen.sohinki@dp.doe.gov)
DOE Sponsor
Director, Office of Price Anderson Enforcement
US Department of Energy

The EFCOG Executive Director sponsor:

- David B. Amerine (dave.amerine@parsons.com)
EFCOG Sponsoring Director
Senior Vice President
Parsons

The PAAA Working Group is managed by:

- Stephen Filipowicz (sfilipow@pantex.com)
Co-Chair
Performance Assurance Manager and PAAA Coordinator
BWXT Pantex
- Brinley Varchol (brinley.varchol@fernald.gov)
Co-Chair
QA Program Manager and PAAA Coordinator
Fluor Fernald, Inc.
- William L. Luce (Bill) (william.luce@srs.gov)
Strategic Planning Committee Lead
Manager, Regulatory Services
Washington Savannah River Company
- Ron Simonton (rsimont@sandia.gov)
Strategic Planning Committee Member
Manager, Nuclear Safety Rules and DNFSB
Sandia National Laboratories
- Rick Hughes (RAHughes@mail.bhi-erc.com)
Strategic Planning Committee Member
PAAA Program Manager
Bechtel Hanford

- Al Elliot (alverton@lanl.gov)
Strategic Planning Committee Member
PAAA Coordinator
Los Alamos National Laboratory
- Sandy English (sl.english@pnl.gov)
Strategic Planning Committee Member
PAAA Coordinator
Battelle-Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
- Conard Stair (staircl@y12.doe.gov)
Strategic Planning Committee Member
PAAA Program Manager
BWXT Y-12

During CY05 Mr. Adam Chen stepped down as a member of the strategic planning committee. Mr. Al Elliot, PAAA coordinator at LANL was recommended as a replacement by the Strategic Planning Committee and approved by EFCOG Executive Director.

3. Objectives and Achievements

PAAA Working Group Co-Chairs: The PAAA WG restructured its organization in late CY04 to better focus on the key issues important to our DOE Sponsoring Director and to be responsive to the needs and expectations of the EFCOG Directors. Leadership was shifted from a single WG Chair to two Co-Chairs and a leader assigned from the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). Additionally, the SPC was expanded from four to six representatives.

The Co-Chair arrangement has been much more successful than originally anticipated. The co-chairmanship allows more flexibility and spreads the workload such that the periodic crisis, and times of escalated workload, does not occur to both Co-Chairs simultaneously. However, the success of the Co-Chair arraignments is truly personality dependent in that the Co-Chairs must be able to work together and share a common vision. It is recommended that the Co-Chairmanship structure remain intact.

To assure continuity the tenure of the Co-Chairs will be split. Mr. Brinley Varchol will step down as a Co-Chair at the April 2006 WG meeting and will be replaced. Mr. Steve Filipowicz will continue his tenure until December 2006. This will result in always having an experienced Co-Chair, leadership continuity, and reducing the learning curve for the next Co-Chair.

Working Group Meetings: The PAAA WG held two working sessions during CY 2005; one in the spring at the Nevada Site Office, and the other in the fall at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Both meetings were very productive and attended by approximately 90 representatives from companies throughout the DOE Complex. At both meetings, extensive presentations and discussions were held on Price Anderson issues, including Lessons Learned from recent Enforcement Actions, Enforcement Conferences, Program Reviews and other interactions with the DOE Office of Price Anderson Enforcement.

During the Spring of 2005, the WG meeting was held in conjunction with the DOE sponsored PAAA Coordinator training conducted by the Office of Price Anderson Enforcement. The training also included active participation from members of the SPC and other selected contractor PAAA coordinators, as well as extensive presentations from Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement personnel. Following the two day training the WG held a one-day lessons learned discussion

concerning recent enforcement actions, program reviews, enforcement letters and other items of interest to the working group. Short presentations from the *extent of condition* and *10 CFR 851 reporting threshold* task teams were made to update the WG on the progress that had been made.

The revised meeting structure continued during the Fall of 2005 Working group meeting at ORNL, which included full day "Breakout sessions" on hot topics including, Extent of Condition Reviews & Performance Trending/Indicators, PAAA Implications for the Procurement Process, PAAA Implications of Readiness Reviews, 10 CFR 851 Impacts and Implications, and PAAA Screening/Documentation Process and NTS Self Identified.

A presentation was made by the task team dealing with Extent of Condition Reviews including some examples of effective causal analysis and trending tools. The team, led by Dick Steele from Sandia National Lab, is well represented by contractors throughout the DOE Complex, has formulated its scope of work, held several teleconferences and discussions with the staff of our DOE Sponsor, and presented a draft product which was discussed at our Spring 2005 PAAA Working Group Meeting. Comments were incorporated and the paper was handled jointly with the ISSM working group. The final product was presented at the Fall 2005 Working Group meeting.

The task team handling Reporting Thresholds under 10 CFR 851 is led by Sandy English from Battelle-Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Rich Hughes from Bechtel Hanford. The team complied comments from member companies within the complex, which with input from DOE-OE was published in the form of Reporting thresholds in the Fall of CY2005. It is anticipated that additional discussions and reviews will be conducted during the early part of CY 2006 in preparation for the anticipated publication of 10CFR 851 in the spring of 2006.

In order to ensure positive lessons learned and enhance communications between PAAA Coordinators, all of the WG presentations from our most recent meeting are available on the EFCOG Website, along with publications that we have issued over the last several years. Additionally, the PAAA WG is soliciting comments and suggestions through an online questionnaire (at our website), in order to improve our effectiveness and enhance the value to participating companies and our DOE sponsor.

4. Planning for the Next Year

Working Group Organization and Meetings: During 2006, the PAAA WG will continue to monitor and report on the effectiveness of the new PAAA WG organization and the meeting structure initiated during 2005. Special emphasis will be placed on continuing to enhance and improve on our already effective working relationship with our DOE Sponsor.

Plans have already been made not to coordinate the Spring 2006 PAAA WG Meeting with DOE's Annual PAAA Training Session for new PAAA Coordinators. The two meetings will be held at separate times and locations in order to better serve the needs of the working group (see lessons learned discussion below). The DOE-OE training joint meeting is scheduled for the week of April 3, 2006, which will be supported by working group and SPC members as assistants to DOE-OE.

The Spring 2006 Working Group meeting will be held at the Nevada Test Site Offices in Las Vegas the week of April 24 and will include a number of breakout session. The breakout session format has proven to be highly effective at engaging many personnel in several areas thereby getting the most out of our resources.

In addition to the task team efforts already underway, the PAAA WG plans to focus on methods/processes/practices needed to move from an 'event driven' to an 'assessment driven' PAAA program. This could include a more thorough discussion of Management Systems, enhanced guidance on what constitutes a programmatic breakdown, the new order DOE 226.1, and the DOE implementation plan associated with DNFSB recommendation 2004-1. Additionally, we hope to review and discuss the process for measuring nuclear safety excellence and how we know if we're making a difference in regards to nuclear safety, along with a better method to capture and report data that measures nuclear safety performance.

The Strategic Planning Committee following the spring meeting will make plans for the Fall 2006 working group meeting.

Coordination with other Working Groups: The PAAA WG plans to continue its strong interaction and coordination with other EFCOG Working Groups. Both of the task team efforts described above have been developed and implemented with membership from other Working Groups, especially the ISM WG and several of its Subgroups. We will also continue our interaction with other groups within DOE and the contractor community as we deal with issues and topics of special interest to the success of the PAAA Program.

Sub-Groups: At this time, the PAAA WG has plans to commission a Subgroup on 10CFR851 Implementation either in the PAAA Working group or the ES&H subgroup of the ISM working group. The subgroup will be formed following publication of 10CFR851 in the Federal Register with the goal of aiding all contractors in implementing this crosscutting statutory requirement

EFCOG and INPO: The Working Group's DOE Sponsor, Mr. Steve Sohinki, challenged the PAAA WG to become more INPO-like in our approach in order to drive improvements in nuclear safety. As discussed above the SPC has taken the initial steps to move in the direction to become more proactive in our approach. The Working group will complete development of the process to spread the best practices within the PAAA process and determine how best to move forward in driving improvements complex-wide. The SPC consider this a two to five year commitment and is attempting to develop a path forward. The results will be communicated to our EFCOG Director and will be reported at the 2007 Executive Directors meeting and every meeting thereafter until complete.

5. Lessons Learned

There was one lesson learned by the PAAA WG during 2005 that required resolution or further discussion. As discussed above, the Spring 2005 Working Group meeting was held in conjunction with the DOE sponsored PAAA New Coordinator training. This two-day training resulted in shortening the time available to discuss lessons learned from enforcement activities etc, from 12 hours to 4 hours. Comments were received from many Working Group constituents that the lessons learned portion of our meetings was the most valuable part and that four hours was not an adequate time to discuss the important lessons learned. As a result the SPC determined that the training and the working group meetings would be held separately in order to best serve the needs of the working group.

The WG continues to benefit from a strong DOE Sponsor and his commitment to our success and effectiveness. Increased participation by the EFCOG Sponsoring Director during 2004 contributed to the smooth transition of leadership and demonstrated, to both our customer and to

our members, a positive and proactive commitment from the EFCOG Directors to the continued viability of the PAAA WG.

6. Effectiveness Evaluation

The PAAA WG continued its excellent interaction with the DOE Office of Price-Anderson Enforcement (DOE-OE) during calendar year 2005. The PAAA WG enhanced our working partnership with DOE by restructuring our meetings to effectively deal with key issues and hot topics important to both DOE-OE and the contractor community. During this period and with significant involvement of DOE-OE, we developed the Extent of Condition Guide, which highlights the attributes of an effective extent of condition reviews and trending. The ultimate goal of this document and other efforts of the PAAA WG are to support DOE's desire to move the Price-Anderson program from an "event-driven" to an "assessment driven" process.

7. Recommendations

Based on the continued effectiveness of the PAAA WG, it is clear that its scope and mission should be continued into the foreseeable future. It is an example that typifies and exemplifies the intent and purpose of the EFCOG Charter and the overall purpose of its planned mission and goals. The PAAA WG will continue to monitor and report on its effectiveness and will adjust its approach, when necessary, to satisfy our DOE Sponsor and to meet the changing needs and expectations of our EFCOG member companies.