Idaho Cleanup Project

CH2M•WG IDAHO, LLC

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: December 14, 2005

To: Project File 24914 MS

From: Max R Christensen MS 5224 6-6080

Subject: INTEC NMD FACILITIES SEGREGATION FENCE LESSONS LEARNED

This project was executed very smoothly. A total of 302 post holes were vacuum excavated. Underground piping and cathodic protection lines were encountered, but were expected and prior planning in place as to what to do in each instance. The subcontractor's plan was well thought out and was followed with little deviation. Communication between the subcontractor, Sloan Fencing and Construction, Inc.; the CH2M-WG Idaho, LLC subcontractor technical representative; and other project personnel was timely, clear, and informative. The following lessons learned are submitted for use in other projects.

1. The decision to bid this work as non-Rad work was a cost saving move. All work was performed using the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) clean work permit. It was planned that if the project were to encounter contaminated soil, the subcontractor would stop work on that particular post hole and move to the next post hole and keep working while a dedicated radiation work permit was generated. A contaminated object was encountered in one hole. The object was removed by the Radiation Control Technician; the surrounding soil surveyed and found to be clean, and work moved on.
2. Sloan Fencing and Construction, Inc. was a new subcontractor to the site. Understanding INTEC's vendor data system and how to access the subcontractor's requirements information from the Idaho National Laboratory's (INL) web page was a little confusing at first. One on One communication between the Subcontractor Technical Representative, INTEC's vendor data administrator and the corresponding Subcontractor's personnel proved to save time and paper by eliminating unnecessary submittals and correspondence between the two companies. Scheduling a couple of hours of time up front for these individuals to review the procedures is time well spent.
3. The selection of a sub-tier subcontractor, experienced in soil excavation at the INL, by Sloan Fencing and Construction, Inc. to perform the soil excavation work saved training time and money.
4. Blanket communication to all INTEC personnel announcing the start of construction and where individuals could find maps showing the fence route saved a number of questions and telephone calls. Construction moved smoothly with a minimal amount of interferences between INTEC operations personnel and construction personnel.
5. The early communications with the soils disturbance permitting department worked to our advantage. Together we were able to get approval to perform the soil disturbance with a minimum amount of sampling and reporting requirements.
6. The planning and daily communication between the subcontractor, the Subcontract Technical Representative, and the operations personnel was well executed. There were no delays in the shipments of spent nuclear fuel or shipment of contaminated debris from the dismantlement work being performed around INTEC. The subcontractor planned his work such that there were

no road closures required. When it was necessary to temporarily block a section of road, the blockage time was kept to a very minimum. At no time was a road blocked for more than 30 minutes.

7. The decision to survey every post hole up front and provide the subcontractor with the survey coordinates proved to be a time savor. At those post holes where the project did encounter interferences from underground piping or cables, resolving where to move the post hole was a simple task.
8. Having a new subcontractor who was not privy to the nuances of performing work at the INL proved to be a blessing in disguise. The Architect-Engineering (A-E) standards requirements for fencing had not been reviewed and updated for a while and some areas were shown to be outdated. A separate list of A-E standards requirements to review has been generated and is not repeated here.

Good communication between all parties and dedication to following company policies made for a smooth running construction project.

mrc

cc: R. G. Akins, MS 5220
R. B. Clark, MS 5224
T. A. Langenwalter, MS 3650
M. R Christensen Letter File (MRC-06-05)

Uniform File Code: 8201
Disposition Authority: A17-31-a-1
Retention Schedule: Until dismantlement or disposal of facility, equipment system, or process, or when superseded or obsolete, whichever is earlier.

NOTE: Original disposition authority, retention schedule, and Uniform Filing Code applied by the sender may not be appropriate for all recipients. Make adjustments as needed.