

HANFORD STRATEGIC PLAN MEETING
July 28, 1995
Draft Record of Discussion

~~95072862~~
mm
0074499

Attendees

Jim Bauer, DOE
Bob Carosino, DOE
Chuck Foreman, GSSC
Jim Goodenough, DOE
Linda Goodey, GSSC
Charlie Hansen, DOE
Bill Heilman, WHC
Gene Higgins, DOE
Nadine Highland, DOE
Ron Izatt, DOE
George Jackson, WHC
Jim Kautzky, DOE
Jackson Kinzer, DOE
Bill Kitchen, KFKH
Paul Kruger, DOE
Ron Lerch, WHC

Bill Madia, DOE
Sandy Matheson, DOE
Linda McClain, DOE
Joe Nemec, DOE
Lloyd Piper, BHI
Karen Randolph, DOE
Mike Riddell, Boeing
Bob Rosselli, DOE
R. P. Saget, DOE
Dan Sours, DOE
Mary Simpson, DOE
Bob Tiller, KH
Mark Triplett, PNL
Kristi Wagnild, DOE
John Wagoner, DOE
Tom Wintczak, BHI

RECEIVED
NOV 27 2007
EDMC

Attendees were introduced and Mr. John Wagoner indicated that this workshop session was designed to review and, if necessary, rewrite all or part of the current strategic plan, identify goals for Hanford Site activities, incorporate regulatory drivers, and identify ways to incorporate stakeholders, tribes, and the public early in DOE's planning processes. Mr. Bill Kitchen discussed the process, schedule, and ground rules for this workshop. Mr. Jim Kautzky discussed the history of the previous Hanford Strategic Plan and new drivers, including the Government Performance and Results Act and the Blush Report.

The Workshop participants discussed and drafted new Vision and Mission Statements:

VISION STATEMENT

The Hanford Nuclear Reservation has effectively dealt with legacy wastes and has transitioned to a fully utilized national environmental and technology asset.

MISSION STATEMENT

Hanford's missions are to cleanup the site by restoring the environment, protecting the river, by managing, treating, and providing long-term stewardship of wastes; to deliver science and technology in the service of the nation; and through these missions to partner in the economic diversification of the region.

GOALS

There was a discussion of goals, strategies and success indicators as currently written in the Hanford Strategic Plan.

Goal 1

Currently reads: Manage and reduce hazards. We will reduce the known hazards in our system while improving the quality of our hazard assessments to guide future decisions on risk mitigation.

Comments:

- There is no site-wide standard. We need defined parameters and endpoints.
- Projectization will be a positive approach to bring into focus short-term goals which will bring us to long-term goals.

Goal 2

Currently reads: Enhance Worker safety and health. We will enhance the safety and health of Hanford Workers.

The recommendation was to create two goals rather than one:
Enhance worker safety and health. We will protect the safety and health of hanford workers.

Under success indicators, add: Workers will have an established role in the work planning process.

Under Strategy 2.1 add:

- Identify and quantify workplace hazards
- Implement programs which will reduce workplace-related injuries and illness
- Develop and implement 'worker involvement' processes

The new goal would read:

Protect public health and the environment. We will conduct Hanford activities in a manner that protects the environment, improves the environment when feasible, and protects public health.

Success Indicators:

- Air and water emissions and off-site radiation doses meet or are below applicable federal, state, and local limits
- Management of radioactive, chemical, and mixed wastes complies with federal and state requirements
- Restrictions are removed on potential future use options for some land and structures

Strategies:

- Conduct operations under an environmental management system that ensures consideration of environmental concerns in all Hanford activities
- Control air and water emissions and off-site radiation doses to protect health and safety and maintain environmental quality
- Store, retrieve, transport, treat, and dispose of radioactive, chemical, and mixed wastes to protect the public and the environment
- Reduce the amount of, and risks from wastes and contamination on-site
- Establish waste minimization and source reduction of waste generation as criteria for a successful environmental management system
- More fully integrate RCRA and CERCLA programs to reduce studies, sampling, and decision-making processes which do not add value

It was also recommended that these goals should be integrated throughout all other goals.

Goal 3

Currently reads: Transition infrastructure. We will provide a safe infrastructure (e.g., utilities, transportation, general purpose facilities, or sitewide services) in a cost effective way that supports accomplishment of the Hanford mission and meets or exceeds appropriate standards.

The recommendation was to restate the goal:

We will provide a safe infrastructure (e.g. utilities, transportation, information management, waste management, analytical laboratories, facilities, fire and emergency services, and other sitewide services) in a cost competitive way that supports accomplishment of the Hanford Mission and meets commercial standards.

Strategy 3.1 should be replaced with:

Integrate strategy approach and plan to define Hanford Mission needs on a planning horizon relative to the useful life of the infrastructure asset and the mission need for services.

Strategy 3.2 should be modified to read:

In a fair and open process, periodically determine the best alternative (competitive with the best commercial services) for continuing to provide the required infrastructure.

Strategy 3.3 should be replaced with:

Plan and utilize site infrastructure and services to provide the lowest total cost to the government.

Strategy 3.4 should be replaced with:

Involve the community and affected employees in a timely manner in any transition process.

The current success indicators were generally felt to be inadequate.

Success Indicator 3.1 should be replaced with:

Percent (based on dollar value) of services competed on an evaluated price basis.

3.2 leave as is

3.4. replace with:

Health and safety statistics that are better than commercial averages for similar work.

3.5 Delete

General Comments:

- The current strategies in Goal 3 seem to be very process oriented and need to be more endpoint oriented.
- There needs to be focus on the bigger picture rather than on individual budget items.
- The time span for the strategic planning horizon needs to be identified, the recommendation is 25 years to be consistent with other infrastructure planning documentation.

Goal 4

Currently reads: Manage cleanup as a project. We will manage the Hanford cleanup as a project by consistently applying project management principles to reach the desired endstate as quickly and cost effectively as possible while considering risks and benefits to the public and workers and the environment.

Recommended change:
Manage Hanford as a project.

Comments:

- There must be validated programs, validate costs, assumptions, and scope. This means to ask the following questions:
 - Does what I'm doing make sense, does it fit into the Hanford Mission, is it necessary, do we really need all these people to do this job, are there established tools that will make this project more efficient and cost effective?
- There needs to be an integrated data management system to provide for consistent data collection and information gathering.

Goal 5

Currently reads: Enhance work force effectiveness. We will have the right number of diverse people doing the right jobs in the right way, culminating in the successful execution of the mission.

The recommendation was to delete this goal and make it a success indicator, and together with total quality management infuse it into a central philosophy and description of how we will achieve change in our culture and commitment to the vision and values for the Site.

Goal 6

Currently reads: Improve decision making process. We will have effective decision making across the Hanford Site that balances decision quality, acceptance of the decision by the public, and timeliness of the decision.

The Site Management Board is assisting in improved decision making. This goal could be deleted and the Board could become more efficient if it were expanded to include regulators and other contractors.

7. Science and Technology. We will be leaders in providing science and technology that enhances Hanford's cleanup mission, improves U.S. competitiveness, and supports the regional, national, and international need to balance economic growth and environmental responsibility.

General Comment:

Rather than having 9 goals, there should be 2 missions that provide drivers for activities, (1) cleanup and (2) science and technology. The Mission Plan would address cleanup while the Institutional Plan would address science and technology.

Goal 8

Currently reads: Build partnerships. We will establish positive working relationships that will build confidence and enhance trust in Hanford.

General Comments:

- Building partnerships is an attitude that needs to be built in throughout the Strategic Plan.
- If the "customer" was defined, actions for creating partnerships could be more integrated.

Goal 9

Currently reads: Economic Transition. We will use the cleanup and science and technology mission elements to help the community establish a diversified and stable economic base over the long term. This will be accomplished through private sector participation in cleanup, creation of local technology

and service companies, and effective use of assets no longer required by the federal government.

- There needs to be more honesty in communicating DOE's roles and proposed activities, in commitments made by DOE to the community and region in order to not foster unrealistic expectations, and in promoting an understanding of DOE's role in diversification.

GENERAL STRATEGIC PLAN GENERAL COMMENTS

- We need to work on building goals that appropriately support the Mission Statement.
- We need to create and implement a site-wide plan in order to provide consistency of standards, expectations, and behaviors while allowing each organization the flexibility they need to accomplish their tasks in the most efficient, cost effective manner. A part of this plan would involve a site-wide change control process which would include all participants/contractors in a defined, streamlined process in order to assist in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
- Through projectization, there will be definitive ownership of each project and identified baselines, endpoints, and strategies for each project.
- Communication is of primary importance:
 - The Hanford Vision, Mission, and Strategic Plan will be communicated to all Hanford personnel, and implementation will be done on an individual basis upward and outward.
 - We will communicate honestly and openly with local communities, business, industry, governments, stakeholders, and the public regarding the long-term nature of waste management and cleanup at the Hanford Site.
 - We will communicate with other DOE sites in order to share the lessons we have learned in our extensive work at Hanford, and we will strive to learn lessons from other sites, thus providing another avenue to magnify results and cut costs to all taxpayers.
 - We will develop strategies to work with local governments in order to encourage diversification and independence.
 - We will support the labs and encourage better communication about what the lab is and its accomplishments and activities, in order to provide the region with information and encourage more comprehensive understanding, appreciation, and utilization of the labs.

The group divided into three teams: Cleanup and Environmental, Science and Technology, and Critical Success Factors. Their assignment was to make recommendations to the group regarding strategies and goals.

The Cleanup and Environmental Team identified goals in four areas: manage urgent risk, stabilize and contain waste, restore the environment, and mortgage reduction. The strategies would be defined for the whole program for as long as the program is needed. Part of public acceptance of this approach would be to educate the public on cleanup versus cost versus safety. The level of cleanup could be identified, and it would not be cleanup to residential scenario. Cleanup would be to an industrial scenario, with designated industrial corridors onsite. Also, as much as possible, the land would be restored to allow for traditional uses by Native Americans.

This is the first time we have said we will maintain Hanford Site under perpetual care. It doesn't open the Site up to the public, but Native Americans will have access. There will be no agricultural use. The river will be protected. Environmentally sensitive areas such as ALE will be maintained and protected. Cleanup will not be to a green field state.

Cleanup would be consistent with identified regulations and requirements. Waste management would be dictated by the TPA, and milestones would be the success indicators.

ACTION: Ron Izatt will follow up with a meeting of the Cleanup Team, contractors, and others to put together a draft plan to be presented to the group at the next HSP meeting. Possible meeting date: Monday, July 31.

The Science and Technology Team identified the S&T mission: To (develop, apply, and) deliver science and technology in the service of Hanford, the nation, and human-kind.

They identified five goals with corresponding strategies, success indicators, and included methods to partner in economic diversification. (Mary Simpson developed the S&T chart below).

S&T Goals, Strategies, Success Indicators:

Goal	Strategy	Success Indicator	Partner in Economic Diversification
Contribute to fundamental sciences	Bring National talent to PNL	Deliver EMSL	Scientific breakthroughs in support of Hanford cleanup goals
Deliver technologies to ER & WM	Deliver knowledge for consistent risk-based decision making	Number of technologies deployed	Technologies deployed in support of Hanford cleanup goals - Partner for economic diversification
Apply capabilities to Nat'l Security, Energy, Health, Economy	Develop supportive technologies	Number of technologies developed	Technologies developed in support of Hanford cleanup goals - Partner for economic diversification
Develop arms control, nonproliferation, and intelligence technologies	Develop supportive technologies	Number of technologies developed	Partner for economic diversification
Be benchmark for Nat'l labs for value-added work and environment	ACE	Lab system benchmarking cost, process, OH, ...	

ACTION: Bill Madia will follow up with a meeting of the of the S&T Team, contractors, and others to put together a draft plan to be presented to the group at the next HSP meeting. Meeting date will be within the next two weeks.

Critical Success Factors Team identified seven critical success factors:

1. Protect the safety and health of Hanford workers
2. Protect public health and the environment
3. Engineer business processes to effectively manage assets and resources
4. Build/strengthen partnerships to help us make decisions and implement actions
5. Manage Hanford as an integrated system (projectize Hanford, including lab, infrastructure, information resources, etc.)
6. Economic transition
7. Communicate progress

ACTION: The Critical Success Factors Team assigned Items 1 and 2 to Paul Kruger, Items 4 and 7 to Bob Carosino, Item 3 to Lloyd Piper, Item 5 to Gene Higgins, and Item 6 to Jim Goodenough. The Critical Success Factors Team will meet and prepare a strawman to be presented to the HSP group at the next meeting.

ACTION: All teams will status their activities with a draft paper or outline of proposed actions at the August 14 Senior Management Board meeting.

ACTION: Bill Kitchen will distribute draft meeting minutes to all attendees.