



Fluor Fernald, Inc.

Report from the DOE Voluntary Protection Program Onsite Recertification Review, June 28 – July 2, 2004



U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
Office of Corporate Performance Assessment

Office of Quality Assurance Programs
Washington, D.C. 20585

July 2004

DOE/EH – 0687



Fluor Fernald, Inc.

Report from the DOE Voluntary Protection Program Onsite Recertification Review, June 28 – July 2, 2004



U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
Office of Corporate Performance Assessment

Office of Quality Assurance Programs
Washington, D.C. 20585

July 2004

"...Some of us will serve in government for a season; others will spend an entire career here. But all of us should dedicate ourselves to great goals: We are not here to mark time, but to make progress, to achieve results, and to leave a record of excellence."

— George W. Bush
President of the United States
October 15, 2001
Constitution Hall, Washington, DC

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | iii |
| Executive Summary..... | 1 |
| I. Introduction | 3 |
| Background..... | 3 |
| Goals for the DOE-VPP Recertification..... | 3 |
| Changes since Designation as DOE-VPP Star Site | 4 |
| II. Injury and Illness Rate Information and Trends | 5 |
| III. Summary of Performance Related to VPP Tenets and Sub-elements | 7 |
| IV. Employee Involvement..... | 9 |
| V. Hazard Prevention and Control | 11 |
| Access to Certified Professionals | 11 |
| Methods of Hazard Control | 11 |
| Work Rules, Procedures and Personal Protective Equipment | 11 |
| Positive Reinforcement..... | 11 |
| Disciplinary System..... | 12 |
| Preventive/Predictive Maintenance | 12 |
| Tracking System | 12 |
| Emergency Procedures | 12 |
| Medical Programs..... | 12 |
| VI. Worksite Analysis..... | 13 |
| Routine Hazard Assessments (Self-Inspections) | 13 |
| Preventive Maintenance..... | 13 |
| Pre-use/Pre-startup Analysis..... | 13 |
| Accident Investigations | 13 |
| Trend Analysis..... | 14 |
| Job Hazard Analysis | 14 |
| Hazard Tracking | 14 |
| Conclusion | 14 |
| VII. Safety and Health Training..... | 15 |
| VIII. Conclusions | 17 |
| Appendix: DOE-VPP Recertification Team Assignments..... | A-1 |

Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| ALARA | As low as reasonably achievable |
| CHP | Certified Health Physicists |
| CIH | Certified Industrial Hygienists |
| CSP | Certified Safety Professionals |
| D&D | Decontamination and Demolition |
| DOE | U.S. Department of Energy |
| DOE-VPP | Department of Energy Voluntary Protection Program |
| EH | Office of Environment, Safety and Health |
| ES&H | Environment, Safety and Health |
| EST | Employee Safety Team |
| FAT&LC | Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council |
| FCP | Fernald Closure Project |
| FFI | Fluor Fernald, Inc. |
| GCBCTC | Greater Cincinnati Building Construction Trade Council |
| HAZWOPER | Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response |
| ISMS | Integrated Safety Management System |
| NCR | Nonconformance Reporting |
| CTS | Commitment Tracking System |
| ORPS | Occurrence Reports |
| OSHA | Occupational Safety and Health Administration |
| PAAA | Price-Anderson Amendments Act |
| PM | Preventive Maintenance |
| PPE | Personal Protective Equipment |
| PRD | Program Requirements Document |

RDR Radiological Deficiency Report

S&H Safety and Health

Executive Summary

The DOE-VPP onsite review of Fernald Federal, Inc. (FFI) for recertification was conducted from June 28 –July 1, 2004 at the Fernald Closure Project (FCP). The Team found the STAR quality of performance resident at the FFI.

The following summarizes the review team’s other observations and analysis.

Management Leadership

The Team found high degree management commitment to safety and health (S&H). Managers are personally committed their VPP. The leadership is capable, competent and well directed. The team found leadership, fully executed at the top and in the field. The Director and other managers visibly participate in safety programs, and has successfully established an organization to implement an Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) and VPP. The management believes that all accidents are preventable and encourage a safety culture based on an “injury-free workplace.” VPP is considered as a method to measure the success of ISMS with a view that they complement each other.

Employee Involvement

Employees are passionate about work, their company, and their coworkers. They are mature, well seasoned, well qualified and competent. They are aware of their job hazards and how these hazards are mitigated. The team found that the workers at the FFI are cooperative and ready to follow safety and health procedures and processes. All employees understand that they have the “Stop Work” authority if unsafe conditions exist. They have no fear of reprisal and are ready to raise safety issues through a variety of communication means. The FFI continues to satisfy the VPP requirements for Employee Involvement.

Worksite Analysis

The VPP onsite review team found that the FFI satisfies the requirements of DOE-VPP criteria. The worksite analysis processes are structured and implemented to control hazards to the workers, environment and public. Hazard analysis processes incorporated a variety of tools. A comprehensive baseline hazards analysis has been completed by S&H professionals for all facilities, accident investigation and lessons learned processes are developed and implemented. The site has established trending of injury and non-injury safety & health data; results are used for continuous improvement action development; results are communicated to employees. Additionally, they conduct a vigorous and comprehensive Annual Self Assessment with a companion Annual VPP Report which in turn generates their annual Safety Performance Improvement Initiative.

Hazard Prevention and Control

The Team found that FFI satisfies the requirements of hazard prevention and control.

Safety and Health Training

The FFI continues to satisfy the safety and health training requirements. Training is comprehensive. It addresses all types of managers, workers and subcontractors.

Conclusion

The Team concludes that the FFI has satisfied the requirements for participation in DOE-VPP, and recommends recertification.

I. Introduction

This report summarizes the Department of Energy Voluntary Protection Program (DOE-VPP) recertification evaluation of Fluor Fernald, Inc. (FFI) by an Environment, Safety and Health (EH), DOE Headquarters-assigned VPP Recertification Review Team during June 28 - July 1, 2004. FFI is the management and integration contractor for the Fernald Closure Project (FCP). FFI was originally recognized as a STAR participant within the DOE-VPP in January 2001. This review was directed to the recertification of the FFI as a VPP STAR site, as required after three years of operation in the DOE-VPP.

Background

DOE-VPP onsite review of FFI was conducted during the week of June 28-July 1, 2004. FFI has been the management and integration contractor for cleanup activities at FCP since 1992. FFI is responsible for site clean up, environmental restoration and decommissioning and decontamination. The site is scheduled to be cleaned up by 2006 under DOE's accelerated clean up program. At the time of the onsite review, there were 2,313 employees at FCP.

Goals for the DOE VPP Recertification

As documented in the DOE-VPP Manuals, a formal onsite review is performed every three years for each STAR-recognized site. FFI has, each year in February, as required, submitted an annual status report for the DOE-VPP, verifying the continuance of the quality of their program. Using a series of self-assessments and routine self-examinations, FFI has maintained its STAR program. These assessments have found a pattern where workers and their supervisors and/or managers have sustained a high quality of effort to control and to mitigate safety and health (S&H) hazards. Employees remain well trained in hazard recognition, and actively utilize those skills to identify hazards and potential hazards. FFI has consistently reported major adjustments and refinements to their initial VPP baseline that have added significant value to their safety program.

The Team attended the July 2004 Safety First Meeting and reviewed the records of the past six Safety First meetings. The President, managers, safety representatives, and union representatives attend these meetings along with the DOE Site Office Manager and staff. The managers identified and presented current site accidents, incidents and significant S&H matters in the Safety First meetings, followed by healthy discussions. The Safety First Meeting is one example of the many safety initiatives that have been instituted to improve the communication of S&H issues and concerns at the site, which have added continued improvement to FFI's STAR status.

Accordingly, the primary goal of the recertification team was to verify continued and enhanced STAR performance from November 2000 to the present.

Changes since Designation as DOE-VPP Star Site

- Worker population has remained relatively same, i.e., 2,313 in 2004 compared with 2299 in 2000.
- Decontamination and Demolition (D&D) Project has completed demolition of all of the production facilities and most of the office buildings. In all, 159 of 255 structures have been dismantled across the 1050 acre site. Of the major structures, only Silos 1 and 2, and the Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility remain. The silos are scheduled for D&D, and the treatment plant to be downsized and privatized.
- 72,442 tons of waste has been shipped to the Environcare of Utah disposal site in 6,771 gondola cars.
- FCP has completed seven ecological restoration projects on site to restore natural resources that were damaged by site operations and cleanup activities. DOE plans to complete 15 ecological restoration projects through 2006.

II. Injury and Illness Rate Information and Trends

A review of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) 200/300 logs was made. The rates below include all FFI employees.

| INJURY AND ILLNESS DATA FOR FFI (including subcontractors) | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Calendar Year | Lost Workday Cases | Total Recordable Cases | Employee Hours | Lost Workday Case Incident Rate | Total Recordable Case Incident Rate |
| 2001 | 4 | 15 | 3,988,199 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| 2002 | 15 | 46 | 4,366,576 | 0.7 | 2.1 |
| 2003 | 11 | 34 | 4,762,401 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| 3-Year (2001-2003) Average | 10 | 42 | 4,372,392 | 0.47 | 1.43 |
| Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) average 2001-2003 (SIC 495) | | | | 6.1 | 3 |

The information on the OSHA 200/300 logs supports the data provided in the FFI self-evaluations, the organization's first report of injury forms and other recordkeeping documents. A health and safety professional is responsible for classifying all injuries and illnesses for OSHA recording and is responsible for maintaining the OSHA log. Injury/illness data is submitted for inclusion in the DOE HQ Computerized Accident/Incident Reporting System (CAIRS). Routinely, the data output from CAIRS is checked against the actual data reported and submitted. This ensures that accurate information is being presented in the CAIRS database. The staff understands the recordkeeping requirements including the 29 CFR 1904 recordkeeping changes that went into effect in January 2002.

III. Summary of Performance Related to VPP Tenets And Sub-elements

Management Leadership

Interviews conducted by the Team revealed that STAR-level commitment to the safety of site employees from management has continued to be a top priority, and remains very high. During the onsite review, the Team found management commitment to be solidly demonstrated from the president, directors, and managers. This commitment has not only been demonstrated in policy statements and program and safety promotional activities, but also by addressing employee identified S&H concerns in a timely manner, and by what employees actually say and believe about their managers. The employees interviewed spoke highly of management, and felt they could approach them freely with any S&H issue, and that the appropriate personnel would address their concerns with fairness and honesty.

Management continues to work closely with employees on the Company Employee Safety Team, Employee Safety Teams, and sub-teams. The joint participation of workers and managers continues to be an effective tool used for the planning and administration of the safety process.

Management visibility continues to be demonstrated by their participation in S&H activities, maintaining a policy of accessibility, and an “open door” policy that ensures that any employee can express a S&H concern to any level of management.

The Team verified that employees felt that most concerns are likely to be solved or addressed with their first tier managers or with their supervisors. In addition, employees felt the safety committees and first line supervisors usually handle S&H issues efficiently and effectively. All managers interviewed stated that they frequently went to the field and talked with their employees. Management’s daily visits to the worksites continue to serve as a demonstration to employees that management is actively involved in showing FFI employees that their interest is in the safety of workers, not just project completion and meeting the schedule.

The President continues to hold the ultimate responsibility of the S&H program, with assistance of full-time professional, technical, and administrative Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H) team members. Adequate resources, including staff, equipment, materials and funding, training, and professional expertise have been committed to workplace S&H. This is evident by the programs reviewed, the high level of employee involvement, and competence of the FFI workforce.

IV. Employee Involvement

The formally interviewed employees were randomly selected based on jobs and locations throughout the various units. All employees interviewed were comfortable in talking with members of the DOE-VPP Onsite Evaluation Team.

The Team's assessment confirmed that FFI employees are knowledgeable about the facility's S&H program. Employees were knowledgeable about VPP participation, including their right to request and receive reports of inspections and accident investigations, and to stop work that is considered unsafe without recrimination. Employees also know of their right to lodge a formal complaint. All employees interviewed were very knowledgeable about the onsite safety committees.

Many of the employees interviewed stated that they had made suggestions during a meeting about the need to correct a safety hazard, and the situation was handled promptly. Employee involvement in the site's S&H program via committees is part of the overall S&H program effort. Employees may participate in any number of ways, one being through an onsite safety committee.

For example, several of the employees interviewed stated that they had spoken to a safety representative on the local area work group. Employees that participate on the safety workgroups or teams, routinely assess their environment with management, and interact with management for issue resolution. There are also other S&H committees in operation at the site.

The site meets the DOE-VPP program sub-element that specifies that construction applicants must have a labor-management safety committee. The membership consists of representatives from DOE, Fluor Fernald management, and each of the three bargaining units; Fernald Atomic Trades & Labor Council (FAT&LC), Greater Cincinnati Building Construction Trade Council (GCBCTC), and International Guards Union of America (IGUA).

The hazard assessment activity is performed such that the entire work site is covered each month. Since the site has many and varied subcontractors and various labor organizations, the method adopted for hazard assessments is a modified one that meets the intent and scope of the program requirements.

Fluor Fernald and each subcontractor onsite perform regular worksite assessments. The subcontractors use teams consisting of a labor representative, a member of the particular contractor's management team, and a representative from Fluor Fernald. Fluor Fernald's team consists of labor, management, and professional staff members.

Employees are also allowed to observe or assist in accident investigations, have access to all relevant S&H data, and have adequate training in hazard recognition.

Employees are knowledgeable about the VPP effort at this site and feel that it is effective.

In a group interview with twelve members of FAT&LC, union members alleged that there is an unwritten message that employees are not to report injuries & illnesses. Furthermore, FAT&LC members alleged that if an employee is injured and reports the injury, they would then be required to attend an "Accountability Session" with their supervisor and the FFI President. The

inference being that those sessions are so intimidating for the employees they would never report an injury again. However, in subsequent interviews with other union officials, these allegations were not found to be factual.

Interviews with representatives of the International Chemical Workers Union, Teamsters, the Building Trades, and the International Guards unions did not substantiate FAT&LC's allegations. In fact, the allegations made by FAT&LC were in direct opposition to the statements made by other union representatives. None of the allegations of inaction on reports of safety hazards or alleged failure to report hazard occurrences or near-misses could be substantiated. The vast majority of interviews with employees, most of whom are represented by some official bargaining agent or union, found that this site has an outstanding health and safety program, and that this program has been maintained and improved over the past three years.

V. Hazard Prevention and Control

Access to Certified Professionals

FFI continues to maintain a S&H staff with certified professionals in most major areas. The current safety staff has Certified Health Physicists (CHP), Certified Industrial Hygienists (CIH), and Certified Safety Professionals (CSP) available to support the overall program. Additionally, the staff includes physicians and registered nurses, as well as emergency medical technicians for medical support. This aspect of the FFI program appears to be more than adequate, and will help ensure the ongoing level of safety at this worksite.

Methods of Hazard Control

The FFI hazard control program/process is evidently maturing. As was reported in the last annual self-evaluation by FFI, the site quickly self-identified a series of trends in the Silos project area, and called for a site-wide stand down to address the trends and take corrective actions. Similarly, there were a series of self-identified trends in the D&D Project that resulted in FFI issuing “stop work” direction to a subcontractor and taking over the subcontractors’ duties and tasks. FFI is clearly improving in their ability to take timely and effective administrative action based on their reviews of trending data and information. This level of maturation is indicative of first-rate S&H program, and FFI appears to be performing consistently at this level.

Work Rules, Procedures and Personal Protective Equipment

As was indicated in the FFI annual self-evaluation, work rules, procedures, and the personal protective equipment program is an area of the FFI program where there has been a steady-state performance with some minor issues or occurrences. The checks and balances built into this program seem to be adequate and they have identified and allowed correction of any issues or occurrences, however, there is additional room for improvement in this area, and FFI should review this part of their program. FFI should also examine links to other programmatic areas such as training, to ensure that they are sufficiently developed, and support this area of hazard prevention and control.

Positive Reinforcement

In the past year, as identified in the FFI annual self-evaluation, positive reinforcement was an issue among the workforce in that several employees felt the existing program and incentives were not applied or awarded consistently across the worksite. FFI has self-identified this as an issue, made two recommendations and assigned two managers to work these issues through to a successful conclusion. Based on observations and interviews of employees, this area is receiving the attention and increased visibility necessary to improve the program. A new system is in place for positive (monetary) awards to members of FAT&LC, as well as a separate process for members of GCBCTC. Additionally, small group recognitions and individual on-the-spot awards are being distributed through the Rewards Recognition Sub-team of the Safety First Committee.

Disciplinary System

This part of the FFI hazard prevention and control program appears to be functioning in an acceptable manner. The system appears to be applied in a fair and consistent manner, and no significant issues related to this sub-element were identified during the interview process. Interviews did confirm that the employees are trained initially regarding the disciplinary system and kept informed of any changes to the system or procedures.

Preventive/Predictive Maintenance

The FFI preventive maintenance program appears to be functional, and well maintained. Existing equipment has been cataloged and assigned a tracking number, and scheduled maintenance is performed according to the manufacturer's recommendations, or more frequently as may be warranted, based on actual field experience. New equipment is inspected and assigned a tracking number, and maintained accordingly. The site has recently migrated the preventive maintenance system from one computerized system to another. The new system appears to be more technically effective and incidentally includes language and artificial program boundaries matching the Integrated Safety System (ISM) verbiage.

Tracking System

Tracking and trending of personnel injury and illness data, including OSHA Recordable and First Aid cases, is presently being performed by FFI as a means to aid in the identification and control of hazards and potential hazards. This data is reviewed and used by the S&H staff, including the medical staff. Tracking and trending is performed using the Radiological Deficiency Reports (RDR's) and Occurrence Reports (ORPS). The company's internal assessment procedures and processes interface with the mandatory Nonconformance Reporting (NCR), and the Commitment Tracking System (CTS). The Price-Anderson Amendments Act (PAAA) organization onsite also utilizes tracking and trending of noncompliances with nuclear requirements via the PAAA database, as well as the DOE Noncompliance Tracking System (NTS).

Emergency Procedures

Fire response and emergency medical services are now provided via an operational agreement with the local townships. As the facilities have undergone D&D, and the onsite staff has been reduced, a separate fire station, including fire and emergency medical personnel, can no longer be justified. The site has carefully examined the services required, and arranged for support services that are more than adequate.

Medical Programs

The medical program is excellent. There are two physicians, including the Medical Director. These two doctors maintain coverage during day hours when the majority of the workforce is on duty. The medical department is also staffed with Certified Occupational Health Nurses. The site's emergency response program has been downsized as the facilities have undergone D&D, and the number of workers has been greatly decreased.

VI. Worksite Analysis

Routine Hazard Assessments (Self-Inspections)

The number of documented self-inspections has increased since the first of the calendar year. All supervisors and managers now have required self-inspection performance objectives. Many inspections had been taking place in the past, but were not documented or tracked. A *Safety Progress Evaluation* was performed by Dupont Safety Resources in November 2003, identifying the lack of documented inspections as a major concern. New site-wide requirements were implemented, and now documented inspections are at record numbers. Each project uses its own process to track self-inspections and actions taken to correct concerns identified.

Preventative Maintenance

An aggressive, well established preventative maintenance program exists at the site. All essential equipment is identified at the time of purchase, and entered into the site's computerized database [controlled by Tabware, Version 4.1.01, Oracle based software]. All pertinent information (owner, location, equipment ID, maintenance requirements, maintenance cycle, etc.) is entered into the database. An equipment maintenance schedule is then created, and may be printed for the craftsmen from which the required work is performed. The printed package provides a step-by-step instruction for the maintenance to be performed, and identifies required personal protective equipment (PPE) and safety precautions to be taken. Maintenance backlogs are tracked, and the responsible owners of the equipment are notified when backlogs become two weeks old.

Pre-use/Pre-startup Analysis

All work activities and new equipment receive a Job Hazard Safety Analysis (JHSA) to identify the hazards associated with the work or equipment. For new equipment, this analysis becomes a part of the preventative maintenance work package. For larger activities and projects, the hazards are identified in more formal Hazard Analysis documents, specific to the project, as part of the work planning process. All efforts are made to engineer out the hazards, or control them through administrative procedures. Where these methods do not eliminate the hazards, PPE is identified to protect the workers.

Accident Investigations

Investigations are done for every first aid and recordable incident. Investigations are generally performed by the safety point-of-contact (POC) for each project, along with the site injury/illness investigator, who is responsible to investigate all injury/illness events. Project safety is always part of the investigation process. The individual responsible uses a systematic process to complete the investigation and identify corrective actions. Corrective actions are agreed to by the

injured party, their supervisor, and the safety POC. The corrective action is tracked to completion by the safety POC.

All recordable and first aid cases are reviewed through a management accountability session. The injured party along with their representative, if desired, attends meeting with their supervisor and a member of upper management to review the details of what happened, how it happened and how it may be prevented in the future. The purpose is to determine the specific cause(s) and allow management to take additional action if necessary, to prevent similar events from occurring on a site-wide basis. These sessions are not for disciplinary purposes.

Trend Analysis

Trend analysis is conducted at both the project level and site-wide level. Trending is used by the projects and site to identify common hazards, as well as the traditional injury types, rates, and causes. Responsibility for site-wide trending lies within the Safety, Health and Quality Division. Data used for trend analysis includes first aid cases, accident investigation results, OSHA recordable cases, injury and illness rates, and management walk-throughs. Subcontractor information is also included in the trend analysis program. In most cases, the subcontractors also maintain their own trend analysis programs; analyzed data is accessible to all facility personnel through the plant website.

Trend analysis is generally presented on a monthly basis to general management, distributed to project managers, and posted on the website. Much of this data is reviewed and presented at the Safety First Meeting held on the last Thursday of the month, with all interested parties attending the meeting. All first aid events, recordable incidents, and occurrence reports are individually reviewed for cause, and corrective actions taken and presented as lessons learned to the attendees.

Job Hazard Analysis

Job hazard analysis has been performed for all regularly occurring tasks on the site. In the area of preventative maintenance, work packages contain step-by-step instructions to perform the work, and identify all PPE required to mitigate the hazards associated with the work.

Hazard Tracking

Hazard characterization and tracking has long been well established through procedures at the site. The hazards are characterized and addressed through many different work documents. Hazards that are identified through the management walk-throughs are tracked through the corrective action process to completion and elimination.

Conclusion

The Team concludes that “Worksite Analysis” remains strong at this site and meets the expectations of DOE-VPP.

VII. Safety and Health Training

The re-evaluation team verified that the Fluor Fernald Inc. training program continues to be comprehensive and well administered. The site fully implements a comprehensive training tracking system (the training matrices) that identifies for each individual onsite, the training required to perform his/her task, and the frequency of that training. The training matrix is developed by the training department, and is distributed on a monthly basis to each of the supervisors. These color-coded matrices clearly identify each individual's status as to which training is current, and identifies which training needs to be redone to maintain training qualifications. In one of the projects examined (Silos project), there is an extensive matrix developed specifically for job safety analysis.

Fluor Fernald Inc. managers and supervisors are aware of their S&H responsibilities to themselves, and this awareness extends to their employees. During the interviews, both managers and supervisors were able to explain the training process and demonstrate that there is a match between the job requirements and the training requirements. The training process extends to the subcontractors to ensure they have the correct training and qualifications for the work they perform. Most site personnel interviewed, including the subcontractors, responded that the level of S&H training they received was sufficient to conduct their work in a safe and productive manner. In reviewing some of the Training Qualification Programs (TQPs), some of the TQPs should be reexamined to determine whether the frequency of training (e.g., one time only) is sufficient for the frequency of the use of the equipment.

With the impending closure of the Fernald site, it is important to be able to carry these training qualifications to future employment. The training program at Fernald is comprehensive, and teaches employees to operate equipment and do their work in a safe and healthy manner. Certification of the training should be provided to all the employees. For Fernald employees, having worked at a VPP site should be identified as an asset for their future employment.

The team concludes that the facility exceeds the expectations of a quality S&H training program routinely observed at other VPP sites.

VIII. Conclusions

The Team concluded that FFI is operating and sustaining an effective STAR level VPP program. The Team also concluded that FFI meets the applicable technical requirement for continued participation in the DOE-VPP. During the period of the onsite review, the Team did not identify any specific, technical or other weaknesses in the FFI S&H program.

Appendix A: DOE-VPP Recertification Team Assignments

| NAME/E-MAIL | ORGANIZATION | AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| Steve Singal steve.Singal@eh.doe.gov | DOE, EH-31 Team Leader | Management Leadership Employee Involvement |
| David Smith david.Smith@eh.doe.gov | DOE, EH-31 | Hazard Prevention and Control |
| Ed Skintik ed.skintik@fernald.gov | DOE Fernald Area Office | Safety and Health Training |
| Bud Schmidt bud.schmidt@ohio.doe.gov | DOE Ohio Field Office | Worksite Analysis |

