

LA-UR-16-21326

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Title: Technical Procedure Development

Author(s): Erickson, Randall Mark

Intended for: Environmental Programs

Issued: 2016-03-03 (Rev.1) (Draft)

Disclaimer:

Los Alamos National Laboratory, an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer, is operated by the Los Alamos National Security, LLC for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC52-06NA25396. By approving this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes. Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy. Los Alamos National Laboratory strongly supports academic freedom and a researcher's right to publish; as an institution, however, the Laboratory does not endorse the viewpoint of a publication or guarantee its technical correctness.

Technical Procedure Development

Effective Date:	8/13/15
Next Review Date:	8/13/18

Classification Review Unclassified

DC/RO Name	Z#	Signature	Date
Sandra Martinez	106229	/s/ Sandra Martinez	8/12/15

Approval

Name	Z#	Signature	Date
------	----	-----------	------

Technical Procedure Development

Document No.: EP-AP-10007

Revision: 0

Effective Date: 8/13/15

Page: 2 of 38

Reference

Responsible Line Manager Randy Erickson	091271	/s/ Randy Erickson	8/13/15
--	--------	--------------------	---------

REVISION HISTORY

Document Number, Rev	Issue Date	Action	Description
EP-DIR-AP-10007, R.0	10/21/11	New document	This procedure supersedes the following: SOP-4007, <i>Environmental Programs Directorate, Procedure Development</i> ; EP-DIV-AP-0113; <i>WDP Procedure Administration, Use, and Compliance</i> ; FOD9-AP-00001, <i>Procedure Preparation Revision Review, Approval, and Use</i> . This administrative procedure defines the Environmental Programs (EP) administrative system for the preparation, revision, review, approval, and use of EP procedures generated by the EP organizations.
EP-DIR-AP-10007, R.1	2/13/12	Major Revision	Added new document control SharePoint process for the Procedure Change Request System in Section 6.1; added new Training Form as Attachment 1; deleted Procedure Request Form; incorporated subcontractor and SME review criteria in Attachment 4; added definition of Periodic Review; added Lessons Learned in Section 6.1; and edited as necessary.
EP-DIR-AP-10007, R.2	6/25/13	Minor Revision	Various minor editing/grammar changes. Sec. 5.3: Added responsibilities for writer-editors. Sec. 6.2: Changed designation for major and minor revisions to include an incremental increase for minor revisions as opposed to a whole number increase. Replaced Attachment 1, "UTrain Required Reading/Training Roster Form," with new "Systematic Approach to Training (SAT) Determination Form." Changed Attachment 1, "Document Reviewer Matrix," to Appendix 1. Removed Procedure Writer's Self-Verification Checklist, Procedure Verification Checklist, Procedure Validation Checklist, IPC, and Periodic Review forms (available in P315).
EP-DIR-AP-10007, R2.1	7/22/13	Minor Revision	Changed word in Section 6.4[3] from "useless" to "unless" the procedure falls under a designated unclassified subject area (DUSA). Updated web link to DUSA Manual in Section 6.4[3].
EP-AP-10007, R0	8/13/15	Major Revision	Complete rewrite in response to DOE/IG-0922. Separated document development process with document management process (EP-AP-10001). Revised responsibilities, added requirements section, and incorporated steps within performance sections. Revision is a total rewrite.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
TITLE PAGE	1
REVISION HISTORY	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1. PURPOSE	5
2. OBJECTIVE.....	5
3. SCOPE	6
4. RESPONSIBILITIES	6
4.1 Responsible Line Manager	6
4.2 Facility Operations Director	7
4.3 Document Control	7
4.4 Preparer	7
4.5 Subject Matter Expert.....	8
4.6 Reviewers	8
4.7 Integrated Process Control Team	8
4.8 Person-In-Charge.....	9
5. REQUIREMENTS	10
5.1 Integrated Process Control Team	10
5.2 Reviewer Matrix and Approved Reviewer List.....	10
5.3 Supplemental Review Package.....	11
5.4 Review Checklists	11
5.5 Hazards Analysis.....	11
5.5.1 Identify the Hazards	11
5.5.2 Analyze the Hazards.....	12
5.5.3 Moderate Hazard Activities.....	12
5.5.4 High-Hazard Complex Activities.....	12
5.5.5 Develop and Implement Controls.....	13
5.6 Procedure Content	13
6. PERFORMANCE—PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT	15
7. RECORDS	19
8. REFERENCES.....	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Appendices</u>	
Appendix 1, WCRRF Reviewer Matrix	20
Appendix 2, TA-54 Area G Reviewer Matrix	21
Appendix 3, RANT Reviewer Matrix	22
Appendix 4, TWF Reviewer Matrix	23
Appendix 5, ER Reviewer Matrix	24
Appendix 6, ADEP Reviewer Matrix	25
 <u>Attachments</u>	
Attachment 1, Procedure Review Checklist – Shift Operations Manager/Environmental Project Manager	26
Attachment 2, Procedure Review Checklist – Field Operator	27
Attachment 3, Procedure Review Checklist – Engineering/Technical	28
Attachment 4, Procedure Review Checklist – Quality Assurance	29
Attachment 5, Procedure Review Checklist – IH&S	30
Attachment 6, Procedure Review Checklist – Radiological Protection	32
Attachment 7, Procedure Review Checklist – Criticality Safety Officer	33
Attachment 8, Procedure Review Checklist – Criticality Safety Analyst	34
Attachment 9, Procedure Review Checklist – Safety Basis	35
Attachment 10, Procedure Review Checklist – Environmental Protection/DEP	36
Attachment 11, Procedure Review Checklist – General Use	38

1. PURPOSE

This procedure defines the roles, responsibilities, and process for development of technical procedures used within the Environmental Programs Directorate (ADEP) and Environment Waste Management Operations Division (EWMO), including Subcontractor procedures.

This procedure implements technical procedure development requirements in accordance with SD330, *Los Alamos National Laboratory Quality Assurance Program*; P1020-2, *LANL Document Control Program*; P315, *Conduct of Operation Manual*; and EP-DIR-QAP-0001, *Los Alamos National Laboratory Environmental Programs Directorate Quality Assurance Program Implementation Plan, Attachment B1.6, Requirement 5-Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings*.

2. OBJECTIVE

This procedure is designed to ensure the production of consistent, accurate, complete, and usable procedures that promote safe, compliant, and efficient operations in ADEP organizations, which include the Environmental Remediation Division (ER), LANL Waste Disposition Division (WD), the TRU Waste Facility (TWF), and EWMO.

Core conventions integrated within this procedure include:

- Inclusion of an Integrated Process Control Team (IPCT) to establish and document the technical and regulatory functions for waste remediation and treatment processing procedures,
- Assignment of document responsibility to a Responsible Line Manager (RLM) at an appropriate management level,
- Use of a mandatory Reviewer Matrix to ensure a documented, comprehensive review by appropriate SMEs,
- Engagement of workers and working groups during the development process,
- Distribution of Supplemental Review Packages containing relevant documents, process flow diagrams, and white papers for use during procedure development and review,
- Hazard Analysis and Control development to ensure work can be performed safely,
- Direction for managing communication between personnel involved in the process, and
- Guidance for writing concise, usable procedures.

3. SCOPE

This procedure is applicable to all persons involved in developing, writing, revising, and reviewing technical procedures used within ADEP facilities and in support of operations.

This procedure is not applicable to non-technical procedures.

Specific procedure types included in the broad category of Technical Procedure are Technical Procedures (TP), Detailed Operating Procedures (DOP), Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), Emergency Response Procedures (ER), and Alarm Response Procedures (AR).

4. RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 Responsible Line Manager

NOTE *The RLM has the responsibility, authority, and accountability for issuing procedures within their scope of work. The RLM will be designated as a Level 4 Manager or higher; assignment of a lower level manager requires written delegation by the Associate Director/Deputy for Environmental Programs.*

- Ensures work activities are planned, validated, coordinated, approved, executed, and closed out in accordance with Integrated Work Management (IWM) and applicable policies; for example,
 - Provides preparers and reviewers with supporting technical information and data.
 - Ensures procedures have the necessary level of detail to ensure safe, consistent, and compliant performance of work, including process steps, materials, and material substitutions.
- Ensures that IWM is applied effectively to all activities for which he or she is responsible; for example,
 - Completes or updates a Hazard Analysis (HA) when procedures are developed or revised.
- Ensures that activities are conducted within the safety envelope of the facility and do not place the public, co-located workers, or the environment at risk, with accountability to the Facility Operations Director (FOD) and Responsible Associate Director (RAD).
- Ensures programmatic work is performed in accordance with P300.

4.2 Facility Operations Director

NOTE *Responsibilities and authorities assigned to the FOD may be assigned to a representative. Where designated representatives are authorized to perform tasks on behalf of the FOD, the FOD will determine the method used to make that designation. In all cases, the FOD remains accountable for the designee's action.*

- Establishes and maintains the facility safety and security envelopes.
- Assigns the RLM for facility-related work in accordance with P300.
- Reviews procedures for other work within the facility to ensure the activity/facility interface is appropriately addressed.
- Designates RLM for facility-related procedures.
- Releases all work.

4.3 Document Control

- Manages the process for performing a document action, including initiation, revision, review, approval, control, and distribution in accordance with EP-AP-10001.
- Assigns document numbers.
- Initiates and coordinates the procedure review cycle.
- Ensures reviewers receive Supplemental Review Packages to assist in technical review.
- Ensures reviewers receive description of procedures changes and technical basis for changes within the review notification.
- Develops and maintains document history files.
- Maintains and updates the Approved Reviewer List.

4.4 Preparer

- Utilizes procedures templates from the Electronic Document Management System (EDMS).
- Collaborates with the RLM to generate the Document Action Request (DAR).
- Assists the RLM, Subject Matter Expert (SME), or Person-in-Charge (PIC) in the development of technical procedures in accordance with P315.
- Reviews Lessons Learned databases for relevant applications.
- Collaborates with SMEs to perform validations and gather technical content necessary to produce accurate, complete, and useable procedures.
- Collaborates with IPCT and reviewers to collect comments, implement dispositioned comments, clarify inconsistencies, perform round-tables, and ensure the production of accurate, complete, and useable procedures.
- Proofs procedures to ensure readability, usability, and the correctness of style, format, grammar, terminology, acronyms, and references.

4.4 Preparer (continued)

- Maintains the working draft of a document during the drafting process, and submits a copy of the formal review draft and the final draft to Document Control for processing.
- Submits all relevant documentation used in the development of the procedure to Document Control for inclusion in the DHF.

4.5 Subject Matter Expert

- Provides input to ensure work is compliant with applicable codes and standards, if appropriate to their area of expertise.
- Provides input on technical content to the preparer to ensure the procedure is accurate, complete, and ready for field use.
- Supports procedure validations in accordance with P315.

4.6 Reviewers

NOTE *Required reviewers are determined by the RLM; minimum reviewers are identified on the Reviewer Matrix (Appendices 1-6) and include personnel from within EWMO or the responsible FOD, such as Industrial Hygiene, Engineering, and Radiation Protection, as well as external organizations, such as Environmental Protection and Central Characterization Project.*

- Provides review and comment during the procedure development process to ensure accuracy, completeness, and usability, and may include comments outside of specific discipline.
- Reviews procedures with a systems approach/big picture view.
- Utilizes discipline-specific checklists ensuring that applicable review criteria for each functional area are met. Minimum required review criteria are included as Attachments 1-11 to this procedure; review scope is not limited to these checklists.
- Ensures potential hazards have been identified and required controls are identified.
- Interacts with RLM and preparer to address review comments.
- Participates in round-table discussions, procedure validations, and comment-resolution meetings, as requested.

4.7 Integrated Process Control Team

NOTE *Use of an IPCT is mandatory in the development of waste remediation and treatment processing procedures. An IPCT may also be established for other procedures as determined by the RLM.*

4.7 **Integrated Process Control Team (continued)**

- Defines, establishes, and documents the technical and regulatory functions and requirements for those unique or specific processes that require change control.
- Develops baseline process flowchart and approves changes to baseline flowchart.
- Identifies procedures required to support activities identified in the process flowchart.
- Provides discipline-specific review and comment during the development of waste remediation and treatment processing procedures in accordance with the IPCT Charter.
- Interacts with RLM and preparer to address review comments.
- Participates in round-table discussions and comment-resolution meetings, as requested.
- Ensures that technical and safety aspects of procedures are accurate, complete, and useable in the field.
- Completes review of procedure by the assigned due date.
- Notifies RLM if assigned due date is insufficient for adequate review.

4.8 **Person-In-Charge**

- Supervises the performance of work.
- Performs work in accordance with approved documents.
- Controls and performs activities and work based on organizational assignments.
- Accountable to an RLM.
- Determines, with the RLM, SME engagement and independent worker participation.
- Remains knowledgeable of applicable facility safety basis documentation, such as the DSA, and ensures that the planned activities are within the bounds of these documents.

5. REQUIREMENTS

5.1 Integrated Process Control Team

The IPCT is an entity that brings together the various organizations, disciplines, and levels of management necessary to establish the technical and regulatory compliance functions required to determine the appropriate waste remediation and treatment processing methods for each LANL waste stream.

An IPCT will be established to develop and approve the process baseline for each waste stream. The IPCT will manage changes to the process baseline and associated documents, including process flow sheets, waste processing plans, and technical procedures. The process baseline will include the definition of the process, material specifications, and controls.

The RLM will determine IPCT membership by identifying key disciplines necessary for detailed review of the procedure and will develop a charter to detail specific requirements, expectations, and deliverables, which will include, at a minimum, a process baseline for the waste stream. The charter will be approved by the Associate Director/Deputy for EP.

An IPCT may be established for processes not associated with waste remediation and treatment processing as a good business practice; utilization of an IPCT as a good business practice may be implemented on a graded approach.

5.2 Reviewer Matrix and Approved Reviewer List

The Reviewer Matrix (Appendices 1-6) identifies the minimum required reviewers and/or approvers for ADEP and EWMO procedures.

The functional organizations and SME disciplines identified on the matrix represent the minimum level of review required for development of new procedures and subsequent changes and/or revisions to technical procedures. The RLM is responsible and accountable for augmenting the list of reviewers as necessary to ensure a comprehensive review cycle. The Reviewer Matrix is used in conjunction with the Approved Reviewer List to identify reviewers by name on the DAR. The Reviewer Matrix also identifies when an IPCT is required, as well as other management level review and approval.

The Approved Reviewer List identifies those individuals designated by the functional organization's RLM as SMEs to perform technical procedure reviews. The RLM will designate qualified SMEs based on their training, experience, and technical knowledge. The list will be maintained as a revision-controlled document by ADEP Document Control.

5.3 Supplemental Review Package

During procedure development and procedure review, the preparer, SME reviewers, and IPCT members have access to any information that may be pertinent to the development or review process, such as white papers, waste processing plans, technical references, and process flow diagrams. Prior to procedure revision or development, the RLM identifies those documents to be included as part of the Supplemental Review Package. Additionally, SMEs can identify further documents that need to be added to the Supplemental Review Package and provide them to Document Control. Document Control ensures those documents are provided to the preparers and other personnel involved in the procedure development process. Supplemental Review Package documents should be listed as references in the procedure.

5.4 Review Checklists

Functional organizations involved in technical procedure development or review utilize discipline-specific review checklists that provide guidance for items of consideration during the review. Formal reviews will be completed using these discipline-specific checklists, ensuring that applicable review criteria for each functional area are met. The checklists are the minimum criterion for SMEs to use as review guidance; SMEs are expected to think critically about all aspects of the procedure during their review.

Checklists for typical reviewers are provided as Attachments 1-11 to this procedure.

5.5 Hazards Analysis

New procedures or major revisions to procedures must either develop a new HA or update an existing HA. When answering the hazard grading questions, both activity and work-area hazards must be considered. The PIC/Preparer/IPCT have the responsibility for applying professional and expert judgment to determine if the information is sufficient to identify the hazard level and if not, seek additional assistance and expert resources.

5.5.1 Identify the Hazards

The PIC/Preparer/IPCT must utilize the Work Management System (WMS) to identify hazards. The WMS Tool offers an interface that helps workers identify all the hazards (including security) and has “mouse-over” links showing the requirement and in many cases, links to the actual language of the requirement to be met. Changes to policies will be highlighted within the tool so that each year, the preparer can identify policy changes that might impact how the work is conducted. Future versions will incorporate “Quality” questions, and other policy questions that require compliance for executing work (i.e., a one-stop shop).

5.5.1 Identify the Hazards (continued)

The PIC, IPCT, and workers who will participate in the work (or who could potentially be assigned to do the work) will utilize the hazard output from the WMS Tool to discuss the severity of the hazards associated with the activity and ensure that all hazards associated with the activity are captured and requirements identified.

5.5.2 Analyze the Hazards

Moderate or high hazard activities must be analyzed to determine how harm might be caused and how the hazards will be mitigated. The PIC, workers involved in the activity, and appropriate SMEs (e.g. Industrial Hygiene and Safety, Radiological Control Technicians, etc.) must meet to discuss the hazards and critically review proposed hazard mitigation measures. They should ask the question, “What if the control fails?” to ensure the analysis is complete and effective.

The results of these analyses will be incorporated into the procedure.

5.5.3 Moderate Hazard Activities

For moderate hazard activities, a systematic HA must be conducted. The analysis may be graded based upon the complexity of the activity, ranging from a relatively quick “brainstorming” for simple activities to a formal “what if” or Hazard and Operability Analysis (HAZOP) for more complicated ones. The HA *shall* be documented and included in the Document History File.

To facilitate consistent implementation, the controls identified in these HAs are to be incorporated into the procedure, as applicable.

5.5.4 High-Hazard Complex Activities

For High-Hazard/Complex activities, a documented “what if,” HAZOP, or other effective analysis technique must be used. This analysis must be performed by a documented Job Hazard Analysis (JHA) team with appropriate depth and breadth of expertise to identify and analyze the hazards thoroughly and to determine how effective hazard mitigation will be achieved. The preparer leads the team and must include workers or a representative set of workers, dependent upon activity scope. Appropriate SME involvement is required to ensure that the analysis is complete and effective. The names of the JHA team participants must be documented.

5.5.5 Develop and Implement Controls

Based on the outcome of the HA, controls are developed to reduce the probability and/or consequence of adverse events. When establishing controls, the following hierarchy is used:

1. Hazard elimination by process modification or substitution of a less hazardous substance,
2. Application of engineering controls,
3. Application of administrative controls (e.g., training, lock-out/tag-out, and procedures),
4. Use of appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).

If worker training is required to mitigate the hazards presented by the activity, the required training must be developed and documented in accordance with P781-1, *Conduct of Training*. PPE controls must be specific to the hazard to enable the worker to maintain personal safety. “Gloves” is an inadequate PPE descriptor. More complete descriptors for this instance include, “leather gloves, nitrile gloves, welding gloves, etc.”; this finer detail will allow the worker to understand the PPE requirements specific to the task at hand.

5.6 Procedure Content

Technical procedures must be as concise and simple to use as possible. In addition to the requirements established in P300 and P315, the following bullets offer guidance for writing, organizing, and consolidating content during the procedure development process.

Major revisions are characterized as changes in the intent, scope, purpose, steps, responsibilities, safety, or technical content described in a document. Inconsequential editorial changes are considered **minor revisions**.

NOTE *The RLM identifies whether proposed changes constitute a major or minor change to the procedure.*

1. Developing or revising a procedure is a significant activity that should only be done for appropriate cause, such as when a procedure cannot be executed as written. Minor changes that do not affect performance should be tabled until a revision is performed, at which time they can be incorporated.
2. Ensure appropriate detail to adequately describe the work, but avoid extraneous content that is not necessary to direct action by the procedure user.
3. Performance sections within a procedure are divided into subsections to describe an activity in manageable segments. Each subsection should not exceed four or five pages in length.

5.6 Procedure Content (continued)

4. Waste remediation and treatment processing procedures should explicitly identify critical steps/elements of the process and documentation requirements.
5. Action steps should be written using simple language that includes all relevant information. Action steps should not exceed two lines across the page.
6. Action steps that take the user beyond the activities described within the procedure should be minimized. In most cases, the following will suffice: “**NOTIFY** supervision of the issue, and **DOCUMENT** guidance on Attachment.”
7. **IF/THEN** steps are necessary, but should be used sparingly.
8. Sub-steps within an action (e.g., [A] through [Z]) should be limited to the extent possible.
9. Sub-sub-steps within an action (e.g., [a] through [z]) should be avoided.
10. Symbols denoting requirements (e.g., \$, Circle CS, &) should only be used for action steps, and should not appear in the Purpose, Scope, Precautions & Limitations, or Warnings/Cautions/Notes.
11. Approved symbols denoting requirements are:
 - \$ - Technical Safety Requirement or Safety Basis requirement
 - **CS** - Criticality Safety requirement
 - & - Environmental regulatory requirements, i.e., RCRA, LANL Hazardous Waste Facility Permit requirement, Consent Order, Individual Permit, etc.
 - **PR** - Processing requirement that is defined in the approved process baseline.

Changes to steps identified with the approved symbols will be reviewed by the ADEP Change Control Board.
12. Warnings, Cautions, and Notes should not contain directive language. Directives should only be provided in action steps.
13. Prerequisite Actions and Post-Performance Activities should be specific to performance of the procedure.
14. Personnel identified within a procedure should use titles consistent with training qualifications and operations-specific Roles, Responsibilities, Authorities, and Accountability.
15. Consumables, equipment, and materials identified within the procedure should be specific.
16. Attachments and space for recording information within a procedure should be formatted to allow adequate room for record taking, quality reviews, and signatures.
17. Procedures are identified as Use Every Time (UET), Reference, or Mixed. If procedures are Mixed usage the UET portions of the procedure must be attachments; they cannot be embedded in the body of the procedure.
18. Revision History is limited to one page.

6. PERFORMANCE—PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT

The fundamental elements for developing, maintaining, and revising procedures are described in LANL policy document P315, which includes a working procedure template and explanation of required content. P300 establishes the expectations for defining work, grading hazards, and developing controls within an IWD-equivalent procedure. These documents are used in conjunction with this procedure to produce accurate, complete, and useable procedures that promote safe and efficient operations and formal work authorization by the Responsible Manager.

Procedure development occurs with direct input from the workers that will execute the procedure. Workers are an essential source of information when developing procedures and must be involved throughout the process.

RLM

- [1] **INITIATE** a document action in accordance with EP-AP-10001, including completion of the DAR, designation of reviewers using the Reviewer Matrix (Appendices 1-6), and an IPCT requirement determination, and **RECORD** additional reviewers as necessary to ensure a thorough review of the procedure.
- [2] **MAKE** usage determination for whether procedure is Reference or UET.

NOTE 1 *A Reference designation is appropriate for activities that can rely on training and expertise for successful performance. The procedure must be readily available, but does not need to be in the user’s hand.*

NOTE 2 *UET procedures must be in the user’s possession and performance must be verbatim. Usage may be designated for the entire document or for individual sections. For example, the procedure body may be Reference while a checklist attachment is designated UET.*

The UET designation must be considered for a document or document section that

- *has potential for high consequence of error*
- *is complex*
- *is infrequently performed*
- *involves data collection*
- *requires sign-offs*
- *has stringent quality or regulatory documentation requirement*

6. **PERFORMANCE—PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT (continued)**

[3] **IF** the procedure is a waste remediation and treatment processing procedure and/or if the RLM determines that and IPCT is appropriate for the procedure,
THEN INVOKE the IPCT.

[4] **IF** a charter for the IPCT has not been established,
THEN DEVELOP the charter to establish the IPCT.

NOTE *The IPCT charter must include, at a minimum:*

- *IPCT membership, by name, organization, and discipline and identification of the Chairperson*
- *Requirements of the IPCT*
- *Expectations of the IPCT*
- *Deliverables from the IPCT, which must include, at a minimum, a process baseline and list of implementing processing procedures.*

[5] **IF** the technical baseline of associated procedures is affected by the change,
THEN INITIATE an appropriate response, such as an additional procedure revision.

[6] **PERFORM** hazard grading and HA in accordance with P300, *Integrated Work Management*, Attachment B, *Hazard Grading Table*.
THEN DOCUMENT results on the DAR.

PIC/Preparer

[7] With input from the IPCT, **ESTABLISH** the scope and content of the work.

[8] **DETERMINE** the activities needed to complete the task, and **ENTER** this information into the [Work Management System Tool](#) (WMS).

[9] **DETERMINE** Hazard Category in WMS.

RLM

[10] **DETERMINE** validation requirements and **DOCUMENT** on the DAR; validation is required for all new technical procedures and recommended for major revisions to technical procedures.

NOTE *If the RLM elects to waive validation for a technical procedure, the justification is documented on the DAR.*

6. **PERFORMANCE—PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT (continued)**

- [11] **IDENTIFY** documents to be included in the Supplemental Review Package for use in developing/revising the procedure.

IPCT Chairperson

- [12] **IF** the procedure is identified as requiring an IPCT,
THEN COORDINATE IPCT resources to develop or revise baseline process flow diagrams, review new or revised procedures, and collaborate with the RLM and preparer in accordance with the IPCT Charter.

Preparer

- [13] **OBTAIN** the approved procedure template for a new procedure or a controlled copy of the most recent revision of an existing procedure from Document Control or EDMS.
- [14] **DEVELOP** the procedure or make updates in accordance with P315 and the criteria provided in Section 5.6 of this procedure.
- [15] **COORDINATE** informal reviews as needed of the draft procedure with the RLM, IPCT, or workers who perform roles within the procedure to address discipline-specific concerns throughout the development process.
- [16] **PERFORM** a verification of the draft procedure with a worker and/or SME.

NOTE *Verification is a review of the document for technical accuracy and editorial/formatting compliance prior to formal review of the procedure. Verification is documented in accordance with P315; verification form can be obtained in EDMS.*

- [17] **PREPARE** review-ready procedure and send the draft to the RLM.

RLM

- [18] **REVIEW** the draft for technical accuracy, usability, and compliance with requirements.
- [19] **WHEN** document is ready to be sent for formal review,
THEN SUBMIT the review draft to Document Control electronically.

6. PERFORMANCE—PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Document Control

- [20] **PROCESS** the procedure for formal review, comment resolution, and approval in accordance with EP-AP-10001.

Reviewers

- [21] **REVIEW** the procedure within area of expertise for accuracy, clarity, and compliance with established requirements.
- [22] **COMPLETE** discipline-specific review checklists (included as Attachments 1-11 to this procedure) and comment resolution forms as directed by the review notification.
- [23] **IDENTIFY** any comments outside of assigned area of expertise to appropriate SME or RLM.

RLM

- [24] **DISPOSITION** comments in conjunction with the preparer, and **DOCUMENT** the comment resolution in accordance with direction provided by Document Control.
- [25] **COORDINATE** the procedure validation and **UPDATE** procedure as indicated by the validation, if required.
- [26] **IF** revisions resulting from comment resolution or validation substantially change the technical content,
THEN COORDINATE with Document Control to perform another review cycle.

7. RECORDS

Records generated in the course of performing this procedure must be maintained and managed in accordance with EP-AP-10003, *Records Management*.

Record	QA Record	Non-QA Record
Document Action Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Immediate Procedure Change form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Periodic Review Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved, revised procedure – signed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Revised procedure – redlined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplemental Review Package	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment spreadsheets, forms, or other documentation with reviewers name, credentials/signature, date, and comment category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Document review markups without reviewers name, credentials/signature, date, and comment category	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discipline-Specific Checklists	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verification Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Validation Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazards Analysis documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process Flow Diagram	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Systematic Approach to Training (SAT) form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional email	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. REFERENCES

EP-AP-10001, *Document Control*

EP-AP-10003, *Records Management*

EP-DIR-QAP-0001, *Los Alamos National Laboratory Environmental Programs Directorate Quality Assurance Program Implementation Plan*.

P300, *Integrated Work Management*

P315, *Conduct of Operations Manual*

P781-1, *Conduct of Training Manual*

P1020-2, *LANL Document Control Program*

SD330, *Los Alamos National Laboratory Quality Assurance Program*

Technical Procedure Development

Document No.: EP-AP-10007
 Revision: 0
 Effective Date:
 Page: 20 of 38

Reference

Appendix 1
 WCRRF Reviewer Matrix

WCRRF Procedure Classification		IPCT	CCP & Difficult Waste Team	Carlsbad Field Office	EWMO Operations	WD Operations	Operator SME	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	IH&S	Radiation Protection	Criticality Safety	Environmental Protection/DEP	Fire Protection	Maintenance	Waste Management	Chemistry
Waste Processing & Handling (WO)																		
1A	DOP/AP for sampling or processing waste	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√
1B	DOP/AP for transporting or receiving waste containers	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	√
1C	DOP/AP for preparing glovebox and waste processing equipment	√	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	-	√	-	-
Facility Operations (FO)																		
1D	DOP/AP that implements facility TSRs, including SRs, ISIs, and SACs	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-
1E	DOP/AP for using and maintaining the ventilation system	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-
1F	DOP/AP for using and maintaining the fire suppression system	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	√	√	-	-
General Use																		
1G	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-
1H	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-
1I	Administrative procedures that are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-

* – as determined by CCP Site Project Manager

Technical Procedure Development

Reference

Document No.: EP-AP-10007
 Revision: 0
 Effective Date: 8/13/15
 Page: 21 of 38

**Appendix 2
 TA-54 Area G Reviewer Matrix**

TA-54 Area G Procedure Classification		IPCT	CCP & Difficult Waste Team	Carlsbad Field Office	EWMO Operations	WD Operations	Operator SME	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	IH&S	Radiation Protection	Criticality Safety	Environmental Protection/DEP	Fire Protection	Maintenance	Waste Management	Chemistry
Waste Processing & Handling (WO)																		
2A	DOP/AP for sampling or processing waste, including SSSR and DVS activities	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√
2B	DOP/AP for transporting or receiving waste containers	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
2C	DOP/AP for waste container operations, including OVERPACK or drum prep	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
Facility Operations (FO)																		
2D	DOP/AP that implements facility TSRs, including SRs, ISIs, and SACs	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
2E	DOP/AP for completing non-TSR rounds, inspections, and work release	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
2F	DOP/AP for inspecting facility structures and equipment	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	-	√	-	-	√	√	√	-	-
General Use																		
2G	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-
2H	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-
2I	Administrative procedures that are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-

* – as determined by CCP Site Project Manager

Technical Procedure Development

Document No.: EP-AP-10007
 Revision: 0
 Effective Date: 8/13/15
 Page: 22 of 38

Reference

**Appendix 3
 RANT Reviewer Matrix**

RANT Procedure Classification		IPCT	CCP & Difficult Waste Team	Carlsbad Field Office	EWMO Operations	WD Operations	Operator SME	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	IH&S	Radiation Protection	Criticality Safety	Environmental Protection/DEP	Fire Protection	Maintenance	Waste Management	Chemistry
Waste Handling (WO)																		
3A	DOP/AP for transporting or receiving waste containers	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√
3B	DOP/AP for preparing payload for shipment	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
3C	DOP/AP for sampling waste containers	-	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
Facility Operations (FO)																		
3D	DOP/AP that implements facility TSRs, including SRs, ISIs, and SACs	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
3E	DOP/AP for using and maintaining site equipment (vehicles, cranes, doors, etc.)	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
3F	DOP/AP for using and maintaining the fire suppression system	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	√	√	-	-
General Use																		
3G	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-
3H	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-
3I	Administrative procedures that are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-

* – as determined by CCP Site Project Manager

Technical Procedure Development

Document No.: EP-AP-10007
 Revision: 0
 Effective Date: 8/13/15
 Page: 23 of 38

Reference

**Appendix 4
 TWF Reviewer Matrix**

TWF Procedure Classification		IPCT	CCP & Difficult Waste Team	Carlsbad Field Office	EWMO Operations	WD Operations	Operator SME	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	IH&S	Radiation Protection	Criticality Safety	Environmental Protection/DEP	Fire Protection	Maintenance	Waste Management	Chemistry
Waste Handling (WO)																		
4A	DOP/AP for transporting or receiving waste containers	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√
4B	DOP/AP for preparing payload for shipment	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
4C	DOP/AP for sampling waste containers	√	√	*	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
Facility Operations (FO)																		
4D	DOP/AP that implements facility TSRs, including SRs, ISIs, and SACs	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
4E	DOP/AP for using and maintaining site equipment (vehicles, cranes, doors, etc.)	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
4F	DOP/AP for using and maintaining facility systems	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	√	√	-	-
General Use																		
4G	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	-
4H	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard AND are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-
4I	Administrative procedures that are <u>not</u> included in Groups A through F.	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-

* – as determined by CCP Site Project Manager

Technical Procedure Development

Document No.: EP-AP-10007
 Revision: 0
 Effective Date: 8/13/15
 Page: 24 of 38

Reference

**Appendix 5
 ER Reviewer Matrix**

ER Procedure Classification		Technical Procedure Owner	Technical Leads	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	Environmental Protection	Subcontract Technical Representative	Waste Management	Radiation Protection/DEP	Safety IH	Security	EWMO FOD	Electrical Safety Officer	Pressure Safety Officer	Criticality Safety
General Use																
5A	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	AR	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
5B	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	AR	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
5C	Administrative procedures (APs, Plans, Guides, QAPP, etc.)	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
Groundwater																
5D	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
5E	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
Storm Water																
5F	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard.	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
5G	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard.	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
Drilling																
5H	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard.	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
5I	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard	√	√	AR	√	AR	√	√	√	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR

AR – As Required

**Appendix 6
 ADEP Reviewer Matrix**

ADEP Procedure Classification		IPCT	CCP & Difficult Waste Team	Carlsbad Office	EWMO Operations	WD Operations	Operator SME	Engineering	Quality Assurance	Safety Basis	IH&S	Radiation Protection/DEP	Criticality Safety	Environmental Protection	Fire Protection	Maintenance	Waste Management	Chemistry
Directorate Level																		
6A	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard	-	-	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	-
6B	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard	-	-	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	-	-	-	-
6C	Administrative procedures	-	-	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-
EWMO/WD Division Level																		
6D	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Moderate or High/Complex Hazard	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	-
6E	Procedures that direct work categorized as a Low Hazard	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	-	-	-	-
6F	Administrative procedures	-	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-

ATTACHMENT 4

Page 1 of 1

Procedure Review Checklist – Quality Assurance

Discipline-Specific Review Checklist – <i>Quality Assurance</i>				
Document Number:	Document Title:	Revision:	Draft:	
Review Criteria		Yes	No	N/A
1.	Does the procedure invoke the requirements of SD330?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Does the procedure clearly identify lines of authority and responsibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Does the procedure identify personnel, operators, and supervisors invoked by an approved training implementation matrix (TIM) and/or R2A2?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	Does the procedure identify consumables, equipment, and materials by specific name?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	Does the procedure clearly identify design requirements of systems or components?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	Does the procedure clearly identify performance, inspection, and acceptance criteria?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	Are work process steps clearly identified and able to be followed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Are hold points and the release process for hold points identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Are TSR, criticality safety, RCRA, and other regulatory compliance steps clearly identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	Are relevant references incorporated within the procedure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Are forms well designed and adequate for collection of quality assurance data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Does the procedure correctly speak to other existing procedures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	Are Document Control, development, and records associated with this procedure clearly identified and disposition guidance provided?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Does the procedure identify quality improvement processes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	Does the procedure review team include all necessary personnel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments and/or Technical Review Guidance Used:				
<p><i>Quality Assurance</i> review of the procedure has been completed in accordance with the above criteria.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I have no comments. Concurrence with the associated draft is given.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Additional comments are documented and provided through formal means.</p> <p>_____ / _____ / _____ / _____</p>				
<i>Reviewer Name</i>		<i>Signature</i>		<i>Z Number</i>
			<i>Date</i>	

ATTACHMENT 5

Procedure Review Checklist – Industrial Hygiene & Safety

Document Number:	Document Title:	Revision:		Draft:
IH&S Review Criteria		Yes	No	N/A
1.	Does the procedure meet the LANL-specific health and safety requirements provided in PD100, <i>Occupational Safety and Health</i> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Have hazards been identified and controls been incorporated in accordance with P300, <i>Integrated Work Management</i> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	If activity involves asbestos or other fibers, have requirements for protecting workers from exposure been incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	If activity involves working with beryllium, have controls been incorporated in accordance with the Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (CBDPP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	If activity involves hazardous chemicals, including waste and reagents, are requirements included for safe and responsible chemical management? Compatibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	If activity involves potential exposure to lead or lead compounds, have controls been included to limit exposure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	If activity involves entering confined spaces, having posting and access requirements been incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	If activity involves cranes, hoists, lifting devices, or rigging equipment, have applicable requirements, controls, and safety techniques been incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	If activity involves cryogen operations, have hazards been identified and controlled?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Does the procedure meet the requirements of LANL’s Electrical Safety Program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	If procedure involves excavation-related tasks, have soil disturbance requirements and controls been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	If procedure involves work being performed with the possibility of a greater than 4 ft fall, have fall protection requirements been incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	If activity involves forklifts and powered industrial trucks, have requirements been incorporated for their safe use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	If activity involves interaction with hazardous energy, have Lockout/Tagout requirements been incorporated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	If procedure involves the use of machine shop equipment, then have safe work practices and machine safeguarding been defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	If activity has the potential to exceed LANL Hearing Conservation/Noise Program limits, have requirements for protecting workers been identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ATTACHMENT 10

Page 1 of 2

Procedure Review Checklist – Environmental Protection/Deployed

Document Number:	Document Title:	Revision:	Draft:	
Environmental Protection/DEP Review Criteria		Yes	No	N/A
1. If the procedure change requires laboratory ENV SME review and interpretation of regulatory requirements, has review/interpretation been completed and incorporated within the procedure?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. If the procedure change requires modification to existing permits, submittal of new permits, or notifications to external regulatory agencies, have the modification/ submittal/notifications been completed and referenced within the procedure?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Has the external regulatory agency approved the permit/notification submittal?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. If the process described in the procedure involves any discharge (solid/liquid/gas) to the environment, have required environmental monitoring or waste sampling been completed?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. If the procedure involves waste generation, then is the method by which the waste is generated consistent with the current method <i>or</i> has the new method been evaluated in terms of RCRA, CAA, or CWA (NPDES storm water) requirements?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. If waste will be generated, does the procedure explain how it should be managed?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are applicable RCRA and permit requirements referenced and integrated within the procedure?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Are necessary storm water limits incorporated within the procedure?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. If additional modifications are required to other procedures to remain compliant with NMED permits/notifications, have these modifications been completed?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. If procedure involves treatment, storage, or disposal of RCRA-related waste, is it Permit compliant have specific criteria been provided?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Have required modifications to WCATS or other related procedures been implemented prior to or at same time as the FMO will begin operations?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments and/or Technical Review Guidance Used:				

ATTACHMENT 10

Page 2 of 2

Environmental Protection review of the procedure has been completed in accordance with the above criteria.

I have no comments. Concurrence with the associated draft is given.

Additional comments are documented and provided through formal means.

_____ / _____ / _____ / _____

Reviewer Name

Signature

Z Number

Date

Deployed Environmental review of the procedure has been completed in accordance with the above criteria.

I have no comments. Concurrence with the associated draft is given.

Additional comments are documented and provided through formal means.

_____ / _____ / _____ / _____

Reviewer Name

Signature

Z Number

Date

