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### TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>administrative interface agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNI</td>
<td>Bechtel National, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPRC</td>
<td>CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIB</td>
<td>Contractor Interface Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Contractor Leadership Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESH&amp;Q</td>
<td>Environment, Safety, Health and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCAB</td>
<td>Hanford Contract Alignment Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMC</td>
<td>HPM Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSL</td>
<td>Hanford Site Structure List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWSAL</td>
<td>Hanford Waste Site Assignment List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD</td>
<td>Interface Control Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDRT</td>
<td>WTP-ICD Review Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>interface change forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMS</td>
<td>Integrated Document Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Interface Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT</td>
<td>Integrated Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAP</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 Matrix</td>
<td>Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS&amp;T</td>
<td>Laboratory Analytical Services and Testing Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Mission Support Alliance, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Mission Support Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHC</td>
<td>Other Hanford Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Occupational Medical Services (Contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORP</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNNL</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Plateau Remediation Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCC</td>
<td>River Corridor Closure Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Service Delivery Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>structured improvement initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>subject matter expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Tank Operations Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>treatment, storage, and disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAI</td>
<td>Wastren Advantage Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDS</td>
<td>Waste Information Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMA</td>
<td>waste management area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRPS</td>
<td>Washington River Protection Solutions, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 HANFORD SITE INTERFACE MANAGEMENT PLAN – A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT BETWEEN HANFORD SITE CONTRACTORS

SECTION C Reference: In cooperation with PRC, TOC, and other Hanford Site contractors, the Contractor shall develop the Hanford Site Interface Management Plan.

Hanford Site prime contractors are responsible for performing work, including delivering and receiving Hanford Site services as described in their respective prime contracts with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Richland Operations Office (RL) or Office of River Protection (ORP). This work scope includes Interface Management, as described in Section C.3 of the Mission Support Contract (MSC), Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC), and Tank Operations Contract (TOC). Specifically, the MSC DEAC0609RL14728, Section C.3.9, Interface Management states that the Mission Support Alliance, LLC (MSA) is responsible for performing the following: “In cooperation with PRC, TOC, and other Hanford Site Contractors, the Contractor [MSC] shall develop the Hanford Site Interface Management Plan.”

1.1 HANFORD SITE INTERFACE MANAGEMENT PLAN – OVERVIEW

Hanford Site prime contractors use the Hanford Site Interface Management Plan (IMP) and other controlling agreements to define prime contractors’ roles and responsibilities in accordance with the Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix (J.3) Matrix and/or other service-related documents. The Hanford Site IMP outlines the inter-relationships of interface management documents that help define the business structure whereby hundreds of work transactions take place daily between the various Hanford Site prime contractors. The Hanford Site IMP also helps to illustrate the different interface types and processes for managing these inter-contractor transactions.

This Hanford Site IMP is supported by the Interface Management webpage (http://msasp.rl.gov/interface/SitePages/Home.aspx), which serves as a central resource for all Site customers to access up-to-date interface agreement information, including Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) between individual companies and current Administrative Interface Agreements (AIA), Interface Control Documents (ICD), and Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP)-ICDs. This website also provides a list of opportunities for inter-contractor collaboration and issue resolution.

1.2 HANFORD SITE INTERFACE MANAGEMENT PLAN – APPROACH

The Hanford Site IMP is structured to follow the requirements of Section C from the MSA, CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC), and Washington River Protection Solutions, LLC (WRPS) prime contracts. The Hanford Site IMP provides an Interface Management business and operating structure for how the Site’s prime contractors will interact with each other while performing thousands of services for each other throughout the fiscal year. The objective of this structure is to allow seamless transactions between companies, efficiently
define and implement work between companies, and prevent misunderstandings. This Interface Management operating structure results in the following benefits:

- Collaborative and transparent decision making
- Clear roles, responsibilities, and processes between companies (e.g., administrative, technical, and regulatory interfaces)
- Structured issue management and resolution process.

The foundation of the operating structure is built by a hierarchy of Interface Management documents as depicted in Figure 1-1. From the J-3 Matrix of Site Services, the need for differing types of Interface Management documents and service agreements is established. These documents include:

- IMPs
- Controlling agreements (i.e., Interface Agreements)
  - MOAs – Business interfaces
  - A1As – Nonphysical service interfaces
  - ICDs – Physical service interfaces
- Service agreements
  - Inter-Contractor Work Orders – Procurement agreement between the Other Hanford Contractors (OHCs)
  - Service Delivery Documents (SDDs) – Further describe executing J.3 Matrix services items

Figure 1-1. Interface Management Documents.
2.0 ENSURING EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF TECHNICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND REGULATORY INTERFACES THROUGH COLLABORATIVE INTERFACE AND PROCESSES

SECTION C Reference: The Contractor shall obtain input from the PRC and TOC to establish interface management processes and controlling agreements that assure effective control of technical, administrative, and regulatory interfaces.

MSA, as the Site service provider/integrator seeks to obtain OHC input, concurrence/non-concurrence, or approval on all of the following plans, contracting changes, interface agreements, and Interface committees:

- Hanford Site IMP
- J.3 Matrix
- J.13 Hanford Site Structures List
- J.14 Hanford Waste Site Assignments List
- AIAs, ICDs, and WTP-ICDs
- Service Delivery Documents
- Annual Forecast of Services
- Contractor Leadership Council charter, agendas, meeting minutes
- Contractor Interface Board (CIB) charter, agendas, meeting minutes.

Other established processes for interface between companies at the operations level include:

- Weekly multi-contractor operational interface meetings
- Weekly resource allocation meetings to discuss the prioritization of MSA craft for multiple contractors’ planned work
- Weekly Interface Managers meetings

Table 2-1. Managing Technical, Administrative, and Regulatory Interfaces (Examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA Obtains Input (Examples)</th>
<th>OHCs Provide Input (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hold weekly resource allocation meeting to prioritize all other OHC project needs for MSA craft resources</td>
<td>- Identify and manage interfaces related to prime contractor-provided support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify and manage interfaces related to mission support services and provide those services to OHCs, RL, ORP, and Site subcontractors</td>
<td>- Collaborate with MSA in developing the Annual Forecast of Services, Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan (ISAP), and Ten Year Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participate in existing applicable WTP-ICDs with the WTP Contractor and approving the WTP-ICDs</td>
<td>- Provide advance notice of special Environment, Safety, Health and Quality requirements and include service providers in facility/pre-job meetings to ensure work is performed safely/meets project requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assign Interface Owner for applicable WTP-ICDs to support ICD development, revision, issue resolution, and concurrence on the accuracy of the physical and administrative interfaces as identified in the WTP-ICD</td>
<td>- Work collaboratively with OHCs in resolving operational execution issues at the lowest level possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop ICDs with Hanford Site prime contractors as applicable to document work interfaces</td>
<td>- Provide qualified field work supervisors for work conducted in nuclear facilities, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1. Managing Technical, Administrative, and Regulatory Interfaces (Examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA Obtains Input (Examples)</th>
<th>OHCs Provide Input (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Lead integration with OHCs in developing/maintaining the Hanford Site IMP</td>
<td>● Collaboratively support developing the Hanford Site IMP working with OHCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● With the OHCs, develop interface agreements (e.g., MOAs, ICDs, AIAs, SDDs) documenting</td>
<td>● Work with other contractors in developing mutually agreed to interface agreements in accordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific, detailed business operating relationships for services provided/received</td>
<td>with MOAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Manage the Hanford Site Interface Management website to maintain availability and configuration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control of interface documents</td>
<td>● Work collaboratively with OHCs to process timely MOAs and other interface agreements as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Review, update, and cancel interface agreements</td>
<td>● Deliver Facilities Information Management System input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Implement interface-related procedures, as appropriate</td>
<td>● Deliver input to the Hanford Site Structures List and Hanford Waste Site Assignment List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Communicate inter-contractor interface issue resolution decisions via company newsletters,</td>
<td>● Deliver input to Condition Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>websites, meetings with DOE</td>
<td>● Sponsor and deliver input to Pension and Savings Committee (Hanford Site Pension Plan/Hanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Posting meeting agendas/information on the Hanford Site Interface Management Website</td>
<td>Site Savings Plans/Hanford Employee Welfare Trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Support external affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Support external reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Deliver input to Hanford portfolio planning, analysis, and performance assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Deliver input on critical decision data and information as directed by DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● As established in relevant J.3 Matrix items, lead integration of site-wide regulatory</td>
<td>● Work collaboratively, through interface agreements or established processes, with MSA to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information and data (e.g., environmental regulatory management, Hanford environmental</td>
<td>support regulatory information and data flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversight, and environmental surveillance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 WELL-DEFINED AND CONTROLLED SET OF INTERFACES

**SECTION C Reference:** The desired outcome of the Interface Management function is a well defined and controlled set of interfaces between MSC, PRC, and TOC that prevents misunderstandings and impacts associated with service delivery.

In addition to the interface processes as described in Section 2.0, the following interfaces improve coordination between all Site contractors:

- **Usage-based service costs** – quarterly reviews
- These quarterly meetings result in MSA providing the right level of resources to the OHCs’ changing mission needs. Comparing actual quantities and costs to OHCs’ forecast helps to identify trends and help plan for the balance of the year.
- **Structured improvement initiatives (SIA)** that use MSA’s Lean Six Sigma tools
• SIAs are performed to pull all customers together to use Lean Six Sigma tools to eliminate non-value added processes and reduce MSA costs to its customers.

Additionally, the interface groups and organizations represent interface structures that are in place today and functioning to proactively anticipate future needs of all parties and to resolve day to day issues as well as higher level contractual issues when they occur. From the Interface Management Project Liaisons to the Contractors Interface Board to the DOE Hanford Contract Alignment Board (HCAB), a well-defined interface management structure is operating today. The following sections briefly describe the roles and responsibilities of each interface group.

3.1 COMPANY INTERFACE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

MSA and their Project Liaisons and other prime contractor Interface Management staff conduct interface management discussions with the service delivery organizations and help ensure the successful delivery of MSA or other prime contractor services. Interface Management staff and Project Liaisons from each of the Site prime contractor organizations possess DOE and/or Hanford Site experience and the ability to interact at all organizational levels to ensure the delivery of services in a safe, timely, cost-effective, and quality driven manner. Interface Management staff and Project Liaisons interact with their customers daily with the intent of

• Ensuring that their company understands and uses the agreed-upon processes for acquiring services
• Working with customers to ensure the service request process is working effectively
• Eliminating hurdles, complications, or disputes that may arise between contractors
• Facilitating dispute resolution at the lowest possible level
• Supporting long-term planning/scheduling so that service delivery meets customers’ needs.

3.1.1 Integrated Project Teams

Integrated Project Teams (IPT) will be established as the primary inter-contractor working level team for responding to and resolving specific issues on an as-needed, case-by-case basis. These teams will be formed, staffed, and disbanded once the project’s objectives have been achieved. The IPTs may include

• Project Managers
• Senior Functional Managers
• Interface Managers/Project Liaisons
• Contractor customer representatives
• Affected prime contractors as necessary
• Support staff
• Subject matter experts (SME)
• Third-party advisors.

Examples of IPTs include

• Electrical load forecast for WRPS waste feed delivery
• Fire systems maintenance field work supervisor
• Warehouse consolidation business case analysis.
3.1.2 Contractor Interface Board

Led by the OHC Interface Managers, the Contractor Interface Board (CIB) provides a mechanism for the OHCs to meet on a set, recurring (i.e., monthly) basis and discuss matters of importance to the prime contractor companies. While the Interface Managers and staff meet regularly with their OHC counterparts, the CIB provides a forum to present and discuss emerging issues as well as ongoing business and make, including vote on, decisions. While some topics are discussed at each meeting (e.g., budget performance), SMEs will be invited to brief the CIB on key topics of importance to the Site (e.g., dosimetry rates).

The monthly CIB meetings are scheduled at the beginning of each calendar year, and hosted by MSA, who is responsible for developing the agenda with input from the other contractors and preparing the final meeting minutes with input from the other two member companies. Along with the CIB Charter, the CIB agendas, minutes, and briefings are posted on the Hanford Site Interface Management webpage.

The intent of the CIB is to bring the three prime contractor companies together on a set, recurring basis to discuss key topics, make decisions, resolve issues, and reach consensus on these subjects prior to presenting these topics to DOE.

Note: The WTP Contractor does not participate in CIB meetings. The TOC Contractor will represent WTP issues at the CIB, as necessary.

3.1.3 Contractor Leadership Council

MSA has established a senior level, Sitewide Contractor Leadership Council (CLC). The CLC assesses strategic emerging issues and takes unified action as appropriate to serve the DOE Hanford Site missions. The CLC meets quarterly with the following objectives:

- Assess strategic emerging issues affecting the DOE Hanford Site missions
- Share strategic mission objectives in the context of the DOE Hanford Site missions
- Identify and agree upon unified actions to successfully accomplish the DOE Hanford Site missions.

Copies of CLC meeting agendas can be found on the Hanford Site Interface Management website at http://msasp.rl.gov/interface/SitePages/Home.aspx.

3.1.4 Hanford Contract Alignment Board

To facilitate Site interfacing, the Hanford HCAB began operating in May 2012. The HCAB is intended to provide DOE with a collaborative change control process for contracts, baselines, and funds. The HCAB has the following objectives:

- Improve Sitewide alignment of contracts, allocation of funds, and overall project management
- Improve communication between DOE leadership (including Assistant Managers) relative to contract changes and the impacts of those changes
- Resolve issues related to contract execution that could have impacts to other contracts
- Support contractor level integration of work activities
- Improve change management discipline across the Hanford Site.
The HCAB and a supporting HCAB Integration Support Team is made up of the RL Assistant Managers, RL chief counsel, RL contract managers, and RLSMEs. ORP is not a participating member in the HCAB. MSA Portfolio Management provides support to the HCAB, the Integration Support Team, and the HCAB Administrator in compiling and analyzing data used in determining impacts of changes and ensuring complete decision packages. Other than the support role provided by MSA Portfolio Management to the HCAB, MSA and the OHCs are not involved in this process. The HCAB change control process requires that detailed HCAB Decision Criteria be used to identify all issues that require HCAB review and, in some cases, DOE-Headquarters approval. In the HCAB process, the DOE leadership who are voting members must review and sign off electronically on all HCAB decisions.

4.0 INTERFACES

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall provide the content for and processes to: Identify the various interfaces, define the scope of each interface, provide a brief description of the required deliverables (products, documents, procedures, services, etc.), define interface requirements, and cite applicable source documents for each interface.

The key Interface Management-related interfaces (i.e., technical, administrative, and regulatory), their scope, deliverables, requirements, and applicable reference/source documents are described in the following sections.

4.1 TECHNICAL INTERFACES

Technical interfaces, as described in Table 4-1, revolve around the planning, performance, and completion of Hanford Site work that is technical in nature. Examples of technical interfaces include holding weekly resource allocation meetings, preparing work packages, holding pre-job briefings, and preparing new or updating existing ICDs. Technical interfaces focus on delivery or receipt of Site technical services (e.g., water distribution, electrical services, road work).

| Deliverables: New or updated interface control documents (ICD), Waste Treatment Plant ICDs, new memorandums of agreement for technical interfaces, resource allocation meetings, work packages, pre-job briefings, Interface Management inter-contractor meetings |
| Review: Reviewed and updated as required |

4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE INTERFACES

Administrative interfaces, as described in Table 4-2, involve a service interface but no physical interface (e.g., MSA will maintain a database of Site training records that other Site contractors need to access). These administrative interfaces generally are described and controlled by developing administrative interface agreements (AIA). AIAs are used by any Site prime contractor to document roles and responsibilities between contractors for a specific service or set of related services to establish the bounds, service expectations, service limitations, and anything required from the service receiving company. Typically, AIAs are for base services only because there is no exchange of funds between companies.
Table 4-2. Administrative Interfaces.

| Deliverables: | New or updated memorandums of agreement, administrative interface agreements, service delivery documents (SDD), Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix, Annual Forecast of Services, service-level agreements, Contractor Leadership Council |
| Review: | As requested by signatory contractors |

4.3 REGULATORY INTERFACES

Regulatory interfaces, as a function of Interface Management, are established by data and information interface requirements in the J.3 Matrix relating to environmental regulations. In general, regulatory interfaces are managed through the respective contractor’s Integrated Environment, Safety, and Health Management System Description, Quality Assurance Program Description, and subordinate plans and procedures. Although specific, data and information exchange can be arranged through interface agreements or other established communication processes. Table 4-3 identifies these regulatory deliverables and the interface methods used to achieve collaboration between the OHCs.

Table 4-3. Regulatory Interfaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Type of Regulatory Interface/Deliverables:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Regulatory Management: Site-wide Environmental Management System Program Plan, Hanford Site-wide permitting and compliance framework, Hanford Site-wide environmental reports and metrics, legally and regulatory required air and liquid effluent and near facility environmental monitoring, Hanford Site Environmental Report, unit specific permit modification, near-field monitor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hanford Environmental Oversight: Hanford Site NEPA Characterization Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Surveillance: Hanford Site Environmental Report, Hanford Site Environmental Surveillance Master Sampling Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ecological Monitoring and Compliance: CERCLA/RCRA risk assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural and Historic Resource Program: CLUP Cultural &amp; Historic Resource Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-Term Stewardship: Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan, Long-Term Stewardship Surveillance and Maintenance Plans, Annual NEPA Mitigation Action Plan Accomplishments, Hanford Site Institutional Controls Plan, CERCLA 5 Year Reviews, Site Transition Plans, annual site-wide institutional controls assessment, CERCLA RODs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hanford Environmental Data Integration: Hanford Environmental Information System, Sample Data Tracking System, Hanford Well Information System, Waste Information Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interface Methods: AIAs, data calls, information requests, certifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When interfacing on regulatory issues, Site contractors work collaboratively to ensure that all environmental regulatory requirements are met. While each Site cleanup contractor is responsible for managing their respective projects/scope for environmental compliance management of operations, MSA’s Environmental Integration and Services organization provides Sitewide environmental regulatory support on behalf of DOE and in interfacing with the cleanup contractors/regulatory agencies, including providing

- Sitewide permits management, renewals, and configuration control
- Sitewide environmental report preparation/consolidation/submittal to agencies, with data from Hanford Site contractors
- Sitewide inspection coordination and tracking of potential non-compliances, violations, and/or penalties for the Hanford Site
- *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order* (Tri-Party Agreement [TPA] (Ecology et al 1986) integration, TPA milestone tracking, management of the Hanford Administrative Record, milestone dispute/technical support, and configuration control with database tracking of TPA change requests of potential non-compliances, violations, and/or penalties for the Hanford Site
- Hanford Site Environmental Management System integration of contractors on behalf of DOE.
5.0 IMPLEMENTING CHANGES TO CONTROLLING AGREEMENTS

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall provide the content for and processes to: Implement changes to controlling agreements through the appropriate change control process and, if necessary, to initiate changes to the Contract.

Hanford Site Interface Management organizations follow established processes for incorporating changes to controlling agreements, as shown in Figure 5-1. Should changes to the MSC, PRC, and TOC be necessary, MSA and the OHCs follow the process described in Section 10.0 (J.3 Matrix Change Process).

Figure 5-1. Interface Management Change Process for Controlling Agreements.
6.0 INTER-CONTRACTOR ISSUE RESOLUTION

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall provide the content for and processes to: Identify, track, and elevate issues for management review on a regular basis.

Prime contractors will manage interfaces so that potential issues are resolved at the lowest level possible, as described in the MOAs, or as described in the WTP IMP. The Hanford Site Interface Management system is structured to seek issue resolution at the lowest level in our contractor organizations, but with clear processes for quick escalation of issues to the appropriate level of management in the respective organizations, as shown in Figure 6-1. While line managers within the respective companies largely focus on day-to-day operations level interface issues, those organizations have immediate access to their Interface Management organizations who can step in quickly to resolve potential issues related to contract scope, cost allocation, or roles/responsibilities. Though worded differently, the WTP IMP issue resolution process is consistent and compatible with the Hanford Site IMP process.

For those inter-company business issues that may impact contracts or funding for each company, the CIB has been established to focus on such business issues.

For more global Sitewide policies, goals, and challenges, the CLC meets quarterly to discuss such issues as Sitewide safety standards, Site progress on beryllium management, federal budget challenges and Site priorities, inter-contractor occurrence reporting, and other key subjects that provide high-level guidance and collaboration that is in the best interest of the Site as a whole.

Figure 6-1. Interface Management Issue Resolution Process.
7.0 INTERFACE MANAGEMENT POINTS OF CONTACT

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall include: Organizational points of contact for participants and their responsibilities.

Sitewide prime contractor Interface Management points of contact and their responsibilities are included in Table 7-1. This information will be reviewed annually and updated annually if necessary. This information is current as of issuance, for an updated listing see the Hanford Site Interface Management webpage (http://msasp.rl.gov/interface/SitePages/Home.aspx).

Table 7-1. Hanford Site Interface Management Contact List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Contractor</th>
<th>Prime Contract</th>
<th>Name / Address</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support Alliance, LLC (MSA)</td>
<td>Mission Support Contract (MSC)</td>
<td>Dan Sours, MSA (509) 372-1324, 2490 Garlick Blvd. (MS H1-27) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington River Protection Solutions LLC (WRPS)</td>
<td>Tank Operations Contract (TOC)</td>
<td>Jeff Van Meighem, WRPS (509) 373-7333, 2425 Stevens Drive (MS H6-02) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for WRPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)</td>
<td>Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC)</td>
<td>Kevin Kjarmo, CHPRC (509) 376-4901, 825 Jadwin Ave. (MS A7-02) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for CHPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battelle Memorial Institute</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Contract (PNNL)</td>
<td>Jim Bixler, PNNL (509) 371-7755, 3350 George Washington Way (MS J2-33) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for PNNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI)</td>
<td>Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Contract (WTP)</td>
<td>Brian Bowers, BNI (509) 371-8147, 2435 Stevens Center Place (MS 14-2B) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for BNI/WTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPM Corporation (HPMC)</td>
<td>HPMC Occupational Medical Services (OMS) Contract</td>
<td>Erica Ramos, HPMC (509) 376-6022, 1979 Snyder Street (MS G3-70) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for HPMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastren Advantage Inc. Hanford Laboratory (WAI)</td>
<td>Hanford 222-S Laboratory Analysis and Testing Services Contract (LA&amp;ST)</td>
<td>Jessica Linton, WAI (509) 713-7503, 1955 Jadwin Ave. (MS B6-01) Richland, WA 99354</td>
<td>Manage interfaces for WAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 ASSOCIATED CONTROLLING AND SERVICE AGREEMENTS

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall include: Associated controlling agreements (e.g., an MOA).

Interface Management controlling agreements document the exchange of services and funds between MSA and the OHCs. The various controlling agreements that are considered the Interface Management controlling agreements or interface agreements are continually being changed to meet mission needs. Interface Management service agreements further describe J.3 Matrix services that are provided to the OHCs and, for some services, establish performance expectations for the service. The specific types of controlling agreements and service agreements are discussed further in the following sections. For up-to-date information, please see the Hanford Site Interface Management webpage (http://msasp.rl.gov/interface/SitePages/Home.aspx).

8.1 MEMORANDUMS OF AGREEMENT

The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) documents the business interfaces between the Hanford Site contractors. The MOA documents overall roles and responsibilities for service, delivery, and payment. MOAs will be approved and signed by the appropriate responsible persons from each organization. Hanford Site prime contractors have developed a specific MOA for the service and payment between each other and other Hanford Site contractors. MOAs are reviewed annually, updated as needed, and placed into the Integrated Document Management System (IDMS) for configuration management. MOAs may be accessed on the Hanford Site Interface Management website, which integrates all MOAs in one location. While MSA maintains the Hanford Site Interface Management website, CHPRC and WRPS also have Interface Management websites, which are linked to the Hanford Site Interface Management webpage.

8.2 ADMINISTRATIVE INTERFACE AGREEMENTS

AIAs are used by any prime contractor to document roles and responsibilities between contractors for a specific service or set of related services when there is a service interface but no physical interface (e.g., MSA will maintain a database of Site training records that other contractors need to access). AIAs may be linked to other relevant documents, reviewed annually, and concurred upon by the relevant senior manager with responsibility for that functional service area. AIAs configuration management is maintained through use of IDMS. Each prime contractor has internal procedures for developing and maintaining AIAs.

8.3 INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENTS

There are two separate processes used for managing Hanford ICDs and WTP-ICDs. Physical interfaces between Hanford Site contractors (except WTP) all follow the process described in Section 8.3.1. Physical interfaces between the WTP and the Hanford Site contractors follow the process described in Section 8.4 subsections.
8.3.1 Hanford Interface Control Documents

ICDs are established by any prime contractor to document the following:
- Physical interface/relationship between two or more company managed infrastructures or systems (e.g., MSA will provide electrical distribution services to the TOC)
- Roles and responsibilities of each party responsible for maintaining that service
- Identify capacities of those systems (optional)
- Location of interface
- Drawings or figures (engineering or non-engineering).

ICDs may be linked to SDDs, are reviewed as required, and concurred upon by the relevant senior manager with responsibility for that functional service area. ICD configuration management is maintained using the engineering change document process.

8.4 WTP INTERFACE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The following sections address the interface management approach between Hanford Site contractors under the Hanford Site IMP and the WTP IMP. The Hanford Site IMP does not apply to the WTP Contractor, but reflects the interface relationship between DOE, the WTP Contractor, and the Hanford Site contractors.

8.4.1 Hanford Site Interface Partners

The Hanford Site organizations listed below may have a role in the development and management of the WTP interfaces. Each organization has different prime contract scope and responsibilities. If an interface need exists with the WTP, it must be administratively aligned to achieve success in making the WTP interfaces correctly function. These WTP-specific roles and responsibilities are described in detail in Section 8.4 subsections.
- ORP
- RL
- TOC
- PRC
- MSC

The parties listed above are referred to as “Interface Organizations” in the WTP IMP while the term “WTP Interface Partners” as used in the WTP IMP, refers specifically to ORP, the WTP Contractor, and TOC. This is primarily due to the unique nature of the TOC – specifically J.3 Matrix Number 88, WTP Support – its relationship to the WTP Contractor, and the existence of multiple Hanford Site contractor service providers. For the remainder of Section 8.4, the term “Interface Partners” is used to describe collective interfaces between DOE and Hanford Site contractors in relation to the WTP.

8.4.2 Hanford Site Interface Management Program Relationship to Contracts

The WTP-ICDs provide a mechanism to define specific details required to implement inter-contractor interfaces, which are consistent with each prime contractor’s statement of work, J.3
Matrix, and funding constraints. The business agreement for direct interface work between other Hanford Site contractors and the WTP Contractor is via MOA. The mechanism for interface work between the WTP and other Hanford Site contractors is via the Hanford Site IMP.

8.4.3 U.S. Department of Energy Office of River Protection and Richland Operations Office

DOE ensures that the prime contractors under their management control are committed to supporting the WTP startup and operations through their oversight of the prime contracts. DOE also will ensure that their prime contractors fully support the WTP interface process in accordance with the Hanford Site IMP. Through contract oversight and approval of the Hanford Site IMP, DOE ensures that its prime contractors meet all commitments to fully support WTP operations.

In their role as client for Hanford Site contractors, ORP and RL have the following joint responsibilities:

- Monitor interfaces between the Hanford Site Contractors and the WTP Contractor to ensure interfaces remain functional, optimized, and aligned with Hanford Site funding priorities. These interfaces are executed in accordance with contract terms and managed via MOA(s).
- Provide interface team members to participate in the production and maintenance of the WTP-ICDs.
- Sign applicable WTP-ICDs to signify concurrence of the applicable DOE Interface Owners’ (IOs’) technical scope and capability to meet WTP technical requirements.
- Maintain a continuing awareness of the state of each interface.
- Support the resolution of disagreements regarding WTP-ICD scope or responsibilities when elevated by the Hanford Site contractors.

8.4.4 Tank Operations Contractor

- Participate in the definition, development, management, issue resolution, approval, and documentation of the interfaces as documented in their contract scope of work interface management responsibilities, J.3 Matrix, and the current Hanford Site IMP.
- Provide resources to perform to the technical specifications of the approved ICDs and WTP-ICDs.
- Concur with applicable WTP-ICDs affecting the cognizant work scope and ensure that the ICDs accurately reflect the following work scope elements, as applicable:
  - Baseline scope
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Forecasted services and infrastructure interfaces
  - Milestones
  - Technical requirements related to external interfaces
- Physical and administrative interfaces
- Acceptance criteria
- Funding availability

- Collaborate with the WTP-ICD Review Teams (ICDRTs) to ensure all issues associated with a WTP-ICD have been identified as ICD issues in that WTP-ICD.

Section J.3 of the Tank Operations Contract discusses TOC’s contractual relationship to WTP’s interfaces with Hanford Site contractors as follows:

TOC shall be responsible for coordinating, planning and paying for the WTP Contractor’s requirements for infrastructure, utility, and service support from the MSC and PRC as identified in the J.3 Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix.

The TOC is also responsible for coordination of the WTP IMP with the Hanford Site IMP. Long-range integration of WTP Site services and infrastructure requirements with the Hanford Site is accomplished through the Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan (ISAP).

8.4.5 Mission Support Contractor and Plateau Remediation Contractor Responsibilities

MSC and PRC will provide the following services to support the WTP-ICD process in accordance with their prime contracts. Those service activities include:

- Participate in the definition, development, management, issue resolution, approval, and documentation of the interfaces as documented in their contract scope of work interface management responsibilities, J.3 Matrix, and the current Hanford Site IMP.
- Provide resources to perform to the technical specifications of the approved WTP-ICDs.
- Concur with applicable WTP-ICDs affecting the cognizant work scope and ensure that the WTP-ICDs accurately reflect the following work scope elements, as applicable:
  - Baseline scope
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Forecasted services and infrastructure interfaces
  - Milestones
  - Technical requirements related to external interfaces
  - Physical and administrative interfaces
  - Acceptance criteria
  - Funding availability
- Collaborate with the ICDRT to ensure all issues associated with a WTP-ICD have been identified as WTP-ICD issues in that WTP-ICD.
8.4.6 Role of WTP Interface Control Document Review Teams

The IOs will participate in applicable ICDRT or interface coordination meetings. The requirement for a quorum at an ICDRT meeting is considered to be satisfied if each involved organization is represented by its IO or at least one individual that is authorized by the IO to speak for their organization. The TOC will be copied on all communications between the WTP Contractor and PRC or MSC.

8.4.7 Interface Owners

The IOs are designated project representatives responsible for the primary area affected by the interface. The IO is the primary organizational point of contact. Each interface organization for a WTP-ICD will designate an IO who is accountable to the organization’s Interface Manager for the performance of WTP-ICD-related responsibilities. In their role, IOs assume the following responsibilities:

- Ensure a Technical Lead, Regulatory Lead, and Nuclear Safety Lead are appointed for each WTP-ICD affecting their organization’s scope, as applicable.
- Ensure the WTP-ICDs accurately reflect their organization’s contract baseline and that exceptions falling outside their organization’s contract baseline are captured as WTP-ICD issues.
- Ensure all WTP-ICDs, WTP interface change forms (ICF), and all revisions to WTP-ICDs affecting their organization, are evaluated by the applicable Regulatory Lead, Nuclear Safety Lead, Technical Lead, respective SMEs, and Contracts; and ensure any identified regulatory, nuclear safety, technical, and contract issues are tracked as WTP-ICD issues.
- Ensure reviews of ICDs are completed within the designated review cycle and are focused on the scope of the changes. Ensures review comments are consolidated.
- Ensure the resolution of all comments is completed to the satisfaction of the applicable Technical Lead, Regulatory Lead, Nuclear Safety Lead, respective SMEs, and Contracts before signing WTP-ICDs and ICFs. Determine if the IO WTP-ICD Revision Checklist is appropriate to document concurrence of Leads.
- Manage the WTP-ICD issues, including the approach to resolve WTP-ICD issues based on the recommendations from the Technical Lead, Regulatory Lead, Nuclear Safety Lead, and respective SMEs as applicable.
- Identify and evaluate WTP-ICD issues and initiate any necessary contract or baseline changes needed to drive the issue to resolution.
- Sign completed WTP-ICDs and ICFs to signify concurrence.
- Understand each interface and monitor its compatibility. This may be accomplished through reports from team representatives or direct participation in the interface process. The IOs are responsible for ensuring that a compatible and viable interface exists. Either the interface is within the contract baseline, permits, and authorization basis of the contractor; or the incompatibility issue is accurately identified as a WTP-ICD issue, and the process used to follow each issue to resolution is documented.
• Inform their respective IM of all pertinent details of an ICD issue that cannot be resolved by the ICDRT so that the ICD issue may be brought before the IMs and IOs for resolution.

• Participate in IM/IO meetings as applicable to address WTP-ICD issues that have not been resolved in the course of routine ICD Review Team meetings (more detail on IO WTP-ICD issue resolution is described in Section 8.4.14).

• Assess the impact of ICD changes to functions and requirements applicable to their organization.

8.4.8 Technical Lead

PRC, MSC, and TOC will provide named Technical Leads for WTP-ICDs where they are interface partners and have technical interface responsibilities.

8.4.9 Nuclear Safety Lead

PRC, MSC, and TOC may appoint Nuclear Safety Leads at their discretion.

8.4.10 Regulatory Lead

PRC, MSC, and TOC may appoint Regulatory Leads at their discretion.

8.4.11 WTP Interface Definition Development

The WTP-ICDs identify WTP interface partner contract baseline requirements for shared responsibilities associated with WTP interfaces. Specific WTP-ICDs are identified by the WTP Contract and are reflected in the Contract J.3 Matrix shared by the TOC, PRC, and MSC. If any of the interface partners identify the need for a new interface affecting the WTP, the affected IO will recommend the new WTP interface to TOC prior to proposing its potential incorporation into the WTP Contract to ORP as a new WTP-ICD. The TOC may communicate the new interface need to the CIB if the new interface impacts the OHC’s contracts.

8.4.12 WTP Interface Control Document Content

All WTP-ICDs shall accurately reflect physical interfaces, service requirements, organization roles and responsibilities, milestones, issues, and references necessary to ensure compatibility between the interface partners throughout the construction, performance testing, commissioning, and operation of the WTP.

8.4.13 WTP Interface Control Document Approvals and Concurrences

The approval of WTP-ICDs will be based on the concurrence of the interface partners. Concurrence signatures on a WTP-ICD signify that the WTP-ICD accurately reflects the current contract technical, regulatory, and nuclear safety baseline for each applicable interface partner. The entire WTP-ICD revision and approval process is subject to DOE monitoring, audit, and review at any time. DOE will work with interface partners to resolve whatever question there may be regarding conduct of the process.
8.4.14 WTP Interface Control Document Issue Resolution Process

WTP-ICD issues are defined as an incompatibility between the technical, regulatory, or nuclear safety baselines of interface partner’s contracts across a WTP interface or an incomplete WTP interface.

When issues are identified the WTP-ICD Review Team attempts to resolve the matter. If agreement cannot be reached between the affected IOs present at a WTP-ICD Review Team meeting and further actions are not considered viable, the resolution will be recorded in the meeting minutes and elevated to the appropriate IM/IO in parallel with Step 3 of the Hanford Site IMP Interface Management Issue Resolution Process (Figure 6-1). If the issue cannot be resolved, then the applicable IM manager (or delegate) will schedule a CIB meeting. The affected IO is responsible for ensuring the issue or risk and associated actions are entered into the assigned/affected interface partner’s action tracking system and/or project schedule, as applicable.

If the CIB is successful in reaching a consensus resolution among all interface partners, the applicable IM Manager (or delegate) will record the resolution in the meeting minutes for distribution to the entire ICDRT.

Although WTP-ICD issues may be declared resolved, they will not be considered closed until DOE has made that determination. Following needed changes to project baseline documentation and/or the contract, the appropriate IO shall recommend WTP-ICD issue closure and provide the closure strategy to ORP for approval, at which time the issue may be closed. Approval and concurrence signatures on WTP-ICDs do not independently constitute the closure of WTP-ICD issue without prior ORP approval.

8.4.15 Procedures

The interface partner organizations will maintain implementing procedures that flow down the requirements in this plan and ensure the processes prescribed are compatible with the Hanford Site IMP.

8.5 SERVICE DELIVERY DOCUMENTS

SDDs are used in describing J.3 Matrix services that are provided to or by the OHCs. The SDD reflects a contractor’s J.3 Matrix scope and helps bound a service offered to customers. The SDD provides a single document that service users may access regarding a particular J.3 Matrix service that they want to acquire. MSA is the central point-of-contact for requesting and incorporating non-substantive changes or updates to the SDDs – requests for and resulting updates to the SDDs are communicated via e-mail amongst prime contractors.

8.6 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures are used to establish performance expectations for a specific J.3 Matrix service. These expectations may include performance indicators such as turnaround times, response times, availability, and quality.
9.0 HANFORD SITE IMP REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

SECTION C Reference: The Plan shall be signed by MSC, PRC, and TOC. MSC shall submit the document to DOE for review and approval. The Plan shall be reviewed at least annually, and if updated, submitted to DOE for approval. The Contractor shall involve appropriate organizations and Hanford contractors in the integration, review and approval of interface requirements and changes.

The Hanford Site IMP shall be reviewed at least annually, and if updated, submitted to DOE for approval. The Hanford Site IMP is reviewed, approved, signed by personnel from MSA, CHPRC, and WRPS, as shown on Page ii of this document. In accordance with MSC Section C.3.9, this Hanford Site IMP is submitted to DOE for review, comments, and approval. RL will collaborate with ORP to gain concurrence. As described earlier in Section 5.0 and Figure 5-1, MSA involves the appropriate internal organizations as well as the OHCs in integrating, reviewing, and approving interface related requirements and changes.

10.0 J.3 MATRIX RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

SECTION C Reference: The Contractor shall establish, appropriately document, and manage interfaces in accordance with Section J Attachment entitled, Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix, and their subsequent revisions.

The J.3 Matrix is contained in the MSC, PRC, TOC, and WAI LA&ST contracts. The J.3 Matrix is a listing and definition of Hanford Site services and accompanying designations that define whether DOE funds the performing contractor directly to perform the service or whether the service is usage-based and funded by the contractor receiving the service, or a combination of these two cost methods, as described in Table 10-1. The J.3 Matrix defines which services are mandatory or optional for the recipients of the J.3 Matrix defined service. These determinations are made by DOE. On behalf of DOE, the MSC coordinates with other Hanford Site prime contractors and facilitates evaluation and submittal to DOE for changes to the J.3 Matrix. The J.3 Matrix is updated as needed as a deliverable to RL and ORP. OHCs, as impacted, shall review and provide input for all J.3 Matrix change requests prior to the MSA submittal of J.3 change requests to RL. CHPRC and WRPS will concur/non-concur on all change requests. As part of the J.3 change process, MSA, CHPRC, and WRPS will submit impact analysis for all J.3 changes as part of the submittal to RL/ORP. MSA and the OHCs’ J.3 Matrix change process, as shown in Figure 10-1, follows a collaborative review and concurrence process.

Table 10-1. J.3 Matrix Service Types and Definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.3 Matrix Service</th>
<th>Definition of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>Service is provided at no cost to eligible Hanford Site contractors (users).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage-Based Service</td>
<td>Service whereby all, or a portion of, the service cost is passed back to the user via usage rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Service</td>
<td>Service where cost responsibility is shared between the service provider and service user. Service costs that are the responsibility of the user are passed back to the user via usage rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J-3 Matrix = Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix
10.1 REQUESTS FOR RELIEF FROM A MANDATORY J.3 MATRIX SERVICE

DOE contract language allows mandatory service users to obtain services from another source by obtaining Contracting Officer approval. To ensure a holistic, consistent approach to potential Sitewide impacts, a process for obtaining this relief has been agreed upon by the OHCs. When a contractor requests relief from a mandatory service, an analysis of the impacts to service provider and user will be required, and a review of that analysis case by effected prime contractors and the CIB will be facilitated by MSA (multiple prime contractor focus), RL, and ORP to determine if such a change is in the best interest of DOE and the Hanford Site. The requestor of a change to the J.3 Matrix may, at their discretion, express a dissenting opinion on an MSA-facilitated J.3 Matrix recommendation to DOE. Each prime contractor maintains its contractual rights to work directly with their respective Contracting Officer.

If any Hanford Site contractor believes it is in DOE’s best interest to change a “Mandatory” service to “Optional” so that it may be self-performed by the requestor or procured from a different source, the contractor shall propose this change through the annual ISAP revision or J.3 Matrix update process. A written justification shall be provided describing how the change is in the best interest of the government and include the impacts to users and the provider. If, at the discretion of the responsible DOE Contracting Officer, the decision is made to implement the proposed change, the change will not take effect until the Contractor receives the Contracting Officer’s direction to implement the change. DOE shall be the exclusive authority for resolving disputes associated with any interface issues that cannot be resolved between the Prime Contractors in a timely manner.

10.2 J.3 MATRIX CHANGE CONTROL PROCESS

DOE’s approved changes to the J.3 Matrix will be provided to CHPRC, MSA, and WRPS as formal contract direction, as well as to WAI for incorporation into their J.3 Matrix. When requested by DOE, the MSA will prepare a proposed revision to the J.3 Matrix to incorporate DOE directed changes and transmit the revision to RL/ORP for approval. This process will be conducted using approved contractor records management and document control procedures. Changes to the MSC, PRC, or TOC Section C Scope of Work or other sections of the contract (e.g., Requirement Sources and Implementing Documents or Contract Deliverables) also may drive a J.3 Matrix change. When a Company becomes aware of a potential contract change that will impact the J.3 Matrix, the Interface Management staff shall provide the substance of the proposed change to Interface Management of the OHCs so that they may assess the potential impact. Results of those assessments should be returned to the Interface Manager so that information can be included as part of the Company’s assessment of impact to the appropriate DOE Contracting Officer.
Figure 10-1. J.3 Matrix Change Process.
10.3 CONTRACTORS THAT PARTICIPATE IN J.3 MATRIX SERVICES

SECTION C Reference: Contractor interfaces: Include all Hanford Site contractors providing or receiving a service in accordance with the Section J Attachment entitled, Hanford Site Services and Interface Requirements Matrix.

All Hanford Site contractors that provide or receive a Hanford Site service, according to the J.3 Matrix, are included in Table 10-2.

Table 10-2. Hanford Site Contractors that Provide or Receive a J.3 Matrix Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor (Company)</th>
<th>Contract Title</th>
<th>Contract Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastren Advantage Inc.</td>
<td>Hanford 222-S Laboratory Analysis and Testing Services Contractor (LA&amp;TS)</td>
<td>DE-EM0003722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battelle Memorial Institute</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)</td>
<td>DE-AC05-76RL01830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bechtel National, Inc.</td>
<td>Hanford Tank Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) Contract</td>
<td>DE-AC27-01RV14136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company</td>
<td>Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC)</td>
<td>DE-AC06-08RL14788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPM Corporation</td>
<td>HPMC Occupational Medical Services (OMS) Contract</td>
<td>DE-EM0002043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Controls, Inc.</td>
<td>Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC)</td>
<td>DE-AC06-97RL13184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UniTech Services Group</td>
<td>Laundry Services Contract</td>
<td>DE-AC06-04RL14540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Support Alliance, LLC</td>
<td>Mission Support Contract (MSC)</td>
<td>DE-AC06-09RL14728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastren Advantage Inc.</td>
<td>Hanford 222-S Laboratory Analysis and Testing Services Contract (LA&amp;ST)</td>
<td>DE-EM0003722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington River Protection Solutions LLC</td>
<td>Tank Operations Contract (TOC)</td>
<td>DE-AC27-08RV14800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.0 J.13 TABLE CHANGE PROCESS

The MSC, PRC, and TOC J.13 Table, Hanford Site Structure List, contains a list of structures the government owns or has responsibility for dispositioning. The main focus of this table is to document the contractors having current responsibility for managing and maintaining the structures. The structures contained in the J.13 Table are obtained from the Hanford Site Structure List (HSSL) database maintained by MSA. A previous modification to the J.13 Table removed all mobile offices. Responsibility for a mobile office is maintained in the HSSL and the Sunflower Asset Management System.

The J.13 Table contains the following headings for each structure listed:

- Structure ID
- Title
- Geographic area
- Assigned contractor
A spreadsheet maintained by MSA is used to track proposed changes to the J.13 Table and provide DOE contractor accepted changes with a final conformed copy for use in a contract modification. The Site contractors’ Interface Management teams manage the process of proposing, reviewing, and accepting changes input to the worksheet. Proposed changes may come from the following sources:

- HSSL quarterly updates (structure additions, deletions, title changes, area changes)
- DOE-requested change in responsibility
- Hanford contractor proposed change in responsibility (transfer)
- DOE or Hanford contractor proposed responsibility assignment for unassigned structures

A high-level diagram illustrating the process of assigning or transferring responsibility for Hanford structures is shown in Figure 11-1. The diagram focuses mainly on Site contractors’ activities in the process of making contract changes to the J.13 Table. Each contractor will have their own internal procedures for accepting changes in structure assignments. For reference, a list of current contractor procedures is provided:

- MSA – Facility Transfers to MSA (MSC-PRO-54133)
- CHPRC – Property Management (PRC-PRO-PMT-52772)
Figure 11-1. J.13 Hanford Site Structure Ownership Assignment (3/20/14, Rev. 6)
12.0 J.14 TABLE CHANGE PROCESS

The J.14 Table, Hanford Waste Site Assignment Structure List, which is in the MSC, PRC, and TOC prime contracts, contains a list of sites on the Hanford Site that have been or are going through the established process as outlined in the TPA-MP-14 procedure (RL-TPA-90-0001). Even though not all the sites are classified as waste sites the generic title of waste site is used to define the list. The main focus of the J.14 Table is to document the contractors having current responsibility for managing and maintaining the sites. The waste sites contained in the J.14 Table are obtained from the Hanford Waste Site Assignment List (HWSAL) database maintained by MSA. The base HWSAL information is extracted from the Waste Information Data System (WIDS) database maintained by CHPRC.

The J.14 Table contains the following headings for each waste site listed:

- Site code
- Site names
- Designated area
- Assigned contractor

A spreadsheet maintained by MSA is used to track proposed changes to the J.14 Table and provide DOE contractor accepted changes with a final conformed copy for use in a contract modification. The Site contractors Interface Management teams manage the process of proposing, reviewing, and accepting changes input to the worksheet. Proposed changes may come from the following sources:

- HWSAL quarterly updates (site additions or name changes)
- DOE-requested change in responsibility
- Hanford contractor proposed change in responsibility (transfer)
- DOE or Hanford contractor proposed responsibility assignment for unassigned sites

The established criteria for proposing waste site responsibility assignments to a contractor is described in Table 12-1. DOE is responsible for making the final decision in assigning a waste site. A high-level diagram illustrating the process of assigning or transferring responsibility for Hanford waste sites is shown in Figure 12-1. The diagram focuses mainly on Site Contractors activities in the process of making contract changes to the J.14 Table. Changes to the established process for transferring waste sites will be documented in the IMP. Each contractor will have their own internal procedures for accepting changes in waste site assignments.
The criteria below will be used to recommend a responsible contractor for a waste site assignment, but the final decision is made by DOE. Criteria 1 and 2 will be applied first and the remainder will be considered as necessary to make a recommendation. The Central Plateau Remediation Implementation Area strategy is not considered in these criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites that are part of a treatment, storage, and disposal unit (TSD) will be assigned to the contractor listed as an operator on the RCRA permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pipelines and other TSD ancillary equipment will remain to be determined (TBD) until a Unit Category for these sites is agreed upon by the Tri-Parties (TSD or past-practice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active waste sites will be assigned to the operating contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sites located in an area being remediated will be assigned to the remediation contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sites considered a part of a structure, process, or waste site that is already assigned to a contractor will be assigned to the same contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sites adjacent to or within the operational boundary of a facility or waste management area (WMA) are assigned to the contractor operating the facility or WMA. (Sites within areas with restricted access due to fencing, posting, or other access controls will be assigned the contractor managing that controlled area.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pipeline recommendations will be based, whenever possible, on existing operational information. If a contractor has been assigned the facility and disposal site connected by a pipeline, that contractor will also be assigned the pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waste sites managed under RL’s Long-Term Stewardship program will be assigned to MSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Contamination migration sites from a specific source will be assigned to the owner of the source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
In cases where none of the criteria applies to a waste site, the recommendation has been left as TBD.
Some assumptions were made based on overall contractor scope.
Figure 12-1. J.14 Waste Site Ownership Assignment (3/31/14, Rev. 8).
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