

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

November 24, 2000

TO: J. Kent Fortenberry, Technical Director

FROM: Paul F. Gubanc and David T. Moyle, Oak Ridge Site Representatives

SUBJ: Activity Report for Week Ending November 24, 2000

Mr. Moyle was on leave Wednesday and Friday. Mr. Coones visited Y-12 this week to review the status of fire protection compensatory measures and corrective actions. Thursday and Friday are contractor holiday days at Y-12.

A. Recommendation 2000-2: This week, the Y-12 Area Office (YAO) advised that they've reconsidered their interpretation of the 2000-2 Implementation Plan lists of facilities (Appendix E). Contrary to our last weekly report, YAO now intends to address each of the listed facilities in their entirety as opposed to only certain portions of those buildings. (1-C)

B. Y-12 Fee Plan: This week, we reviewed the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) for BWXT Y-12 covering the period November 1, 2000 through September 30, 2001.

1. The \$20M fee pool is divided 65% for Performance Based Incentives (PBIs) and 35% for Award Fee. Significantly, the "Safety" PBI, which includes ISM implementation and fire protection, is assigned 20%, while the production PBI is assigned only 10%. Restart and Modernization PBIs are each assigned 15%. YAO cites this as a demonstration of its increased focus on safety.
2. Few of the PEMP performance measures are stand-alone; most depend heavily on Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) which have yet to be finalized and agreed to. For example, "successful implementation of ISM for balance-of-plant" is not fully defined in the PEMP. YAO desires to finalize these MOAs by year's end but acknowledges current progress is slow.
3. Other items of Board interest in the PEMP include authorization basis documents, Building 9206 material disposition, emergency management, automated job hazard analysis, operational readiness guidance, implementing Design Authority, and senior management retention. (1-C, 2-A)

C. Y-12 Fire Protection: The draft fire protection corrective action plan being prepared to respond to ISM issues as well as the concerns expressed by the Board in its August 18, 2000 letter, does not currently address the multitude of hardware deficiencies that are present at Y-12, while appearing to contain a "wish list" of items that add little value to the fire protection program (e.g., hydraulic modeling of the water system). Status of the fire protection program

from earlier this year is largely unchanged; fire protection systems such as deluge, preaction, and smoke detection systems are still not being tested. Some minor improvement in the testing of dry pipe sprinkler systems was observed.

In early November, BWXT personnel determined that fire system 7W in 9201-5 had approximately one third of the required heat detectors impaired by paint or improper mounting. This review identified that fire protection management was aware of these deficiencies but considered no compensatory or mitigative actions necessary. We do not agree. The staff also visited the fire department alarm room and determined that the new fire alarm system continues to experience large numbers of spurious faults and alarms (we observed ~10 alarms in 10 minutes). In one recent instance, three buildings lost communications entirely with the system for several hours. Some of these problems have existed on the system since initial startup over two years ago. Efforts to increase the reliability of the new fire alarm system and eliminate the fault conditions have been largely ineffective. Mr. Coones shared these observations with BWXT and YAO senior management. (1-C)

cc: Board Members