



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

March 16, 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: John Evans, Facility Representative Program Manager

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Evans".

SUBJECT: Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report

Attached is the Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report covering the period from October to December 2003. Data for these indicators are gathered by Field elements quarterly per DOE-STD-1063-2000, *Facility Representatives*, and reported to Headquarters program offices for evaluation and feedback in order to improve the Facility Representative Program.

As of December 31, 2003, 93% of all Facility Representatives were fully qualified, exceeding the DOE goal of 80%. Currently, 23 of 27 sites meet the goal for Facility Representative qualifications.

The overall attrition rate from the program in 2003 was 20%, which is significantly higher than the average of 13% from previous years. Of the 40 Facility Representatives who make up the 20% attrition rate, 34 stayed within the Department. Of these, 26 made lateral transfers to other Department organizations, 5 transferred to a Facility Representative position at a different site, and 3 were promoted to a higher grade. At the end of 2003, overall Facility Representative staffing was at 186, representing 83% of total staffing levels using the methodology in DOE-STD-1063-2000. Progress is being made to improve overall staffing. Several sites, such as Sandia, Los Alamos, and Nevada, recently posted announcements to fill vacant Facility Representative positions.

Current Facility Representative information and past quarterly performance indicator reports are accessible via the Internet at <http://www.facrep.org>. Should you have any questions or comments on this report, please contact me at 202-586-3887.

Attachment



Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report
March 16, 2004

Distribution:

Kyle McSlarrow, S-2	Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
Bruce Carnes, S-2	Manager, Chicago Operations Office
Kevin Kolevar, S-2	Manager, Idaho Operations Office
Leslie Novitsky, S-2	Manager, Livermore Site Office
Robert Card, S-3	Manager, Los Alamos Site Office
Linton Brooks, NA-1	Manager, Nevada Site Office
Tyler Przybylek, NA-1	Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office
Everet Beckner, NA-10	Manager, Office of River Protection
James Mangeno, NA-3.6	Manager, Ohio Field Office
Glenn Podonsky, SP-1	Manager, Pacific Northwest Site Office
Mike Kilpatrick, OA-1	Manager, Pantex Site Office
Patricia Worthington, OA-50	Manager, Portsmouth Paducah Project Office
Jessie Roberson, EM-1	Manager, Richland Operations Office
Paul Golan, EM-2	Manager, Rocky Flats Field Office
Ines Triay, EM-3	Manager, Sandia Site Office
Raymond Orbach, SC-1	Manager, Savannah River Operations Office
William Magwood, NE-1	Manager, Savannah River Site Office (NNSA)
	Manager, Y-12 Site Office

cc:

Program Sponsors:

Carson Nealy, CH
Roger Wilbur, ID
Steve Lawrence, NSO
Phil Hill, LSO
Bob Poe, OR
Shirley Olinger, RL
Chris Bosted, ORP
Karl Waltzer, PXSO
Ed Westbrook, RF
Charles Hansen, SR
Ken Zamora, SSO
Dan Hoag, YSO

Steering Committee Members:

Jody Eggleston, NNSA Serv Ctr
Gary Schmidtke, SSO
Heather Holman, SSO
Earl Burkholder, PXSO
Carlos Alvarado, PXSO
Joe Vozella, LASO
Fred Bell, LASO
Don Galbraith, CBFO
Karl Moro, CH

Steering Committee Members,
continued:

Leif Dietrich, PAO
Peter Kelley, BAO
Eric Turnquest, AAO-E
Mark Holzmer, AAO-W
Mike Haben, AAO-W
Bob Seal, ID
Tim Henderson, NSO
Richard Scott, LSO
Michael Jordan, OH
Jennifer Dundas, WVDP
T.J. Jackson, WVDP
Bob Everson, FCP
Christopher White, MCP
Tyrone Harris, OR
Rick Daniels, OR
Tim Noe, OR
Jeff Carlson, PNSO
Jeff Parkin, RF
Rob Hastings, RL
John Trevino, RL
Steve Goff, SRS

Steering Committee Members,
continued:

Larry Hinson, SRS
Robert Edwards, SRS
Teresa Tomac, SRS
Steve Wellbaum, YSO
Emil Morrow, NA
Ed Tourigny, NE
Craig West, ME
Casimiro Izquierdo, FE

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2003)

<u>Field or Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Carlsbad	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	60	65
Oak Ridge (EM)	20	14	14	70	0	93	93	60	73
OH/Fernald	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	46	80
OH/Miamisburg	4	4	3	75	0	100	100	37	58
OH/West Valley	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	33	64
Richland	17	17	17	100	0	94	94	41	66
River Protection	11	11	11	100	0	82	82	49	77
Rocky Flats	11	11	10	91	0	100	100	65	75
Savannah River	35	29	29	83	0	100	100	52	85
EM Totals	107	95	93	87	0	96	96	51	76
DOE GOALS	-	-	-	100	-	-	>80	>40	>60

* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

** % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

EM Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Oak Ridge (EM), the numbers in the above table reflect the new coverage matrix. The Portsmouth Paducah Office was officially started in January 2004, so future quarterly reports will list this office separately. Also, FRs began quarterly joint walkthroughs of facilities with subject matter experts.
- At OH/Miamisburg, FRs identified several potentially hazardous situations during surveillances of work areas, including unsafe staging of excavation equipment and rigging equipment staged in close proximity to a fire protection emergency control panel. In both these cases, the contractor relocated the equipment after FR notification. Also, an FR discussed several recent inadvertent cuttings of energized electrical lines with the contractor, resulting in improved supervisory oversight, additional training, and redesigned labeling requirements.
- At OH/West Valley, FRs have been attending additional training on facility systems for the Remote Handled Waste Facility, which is due to startup in 2004. Also, an FR observed volumetric flow rates, boroscopic exams, and the cleaning and leak testing of sample rakes of the Vitrification, Supernatant Treatment System/Permanent Ventilation System Building, Main Plant stacks.
- At Richland, a FR identified significant issues related to the identification of hazards associated with operation of the sealer bar units at the Plutonium Finishing Plant. The hazards – arc flashing and radio frequency exposure – were not well understood and equipment was not operating properly to control the hazards. Arc flash suppressions mechanisms were installed and the vendor began monitoring radio frequencies. Also, an FR supported the DOE readiness review and oversaw the contractor readiness assessment for startup of TRU Retrieval. RL subsequently authorized operations to commence in December 2004.
- At River Protection, an FR requested shutdown of an ongoing transfer from tank S-112. The FR observed that operators believed the pumping of waste was in a recirculation mode, but was actually transferring waste to another tank, and alarm response procedures were not used even though two were locked-in. DOE-ORP issued a letter to the contractor requiring corrective actions prior to restart of the system.
- At Savannah River, four FRs participated on a readiness assessment team for the Actinide Removal Process at DWPF. Also, an FR for the Waste Disposition Project identified that the method of performing material balances for waste transfers did not comply with TSR requirements. The activity was halted until an acceptable method was established. All F-Area Closure Project FRs are trained and qualified as asbestos supervisors. They used the training to identify several asbestos work violations and ensure corrective actions taken.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2003)

Site Office	Staffing Analysis	FTE Level	Actual Staffing	% Staffing	Attrition	% Core Qualified	% Fully Qualified	% Field Time *	% Oversight Time **
Kansas City	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Livermore	10	10	8	80	2	88	75	38	61
Los Alamos	16	16	11	69	3	91	82	32	54
Nevada	9	9	7	78	1	100	100	40	67
Oak Ridge (NNSA facility)	1	1	1	100	1	100	100	50	50
Pantex	15	7	7	47	0	100	100	45	71
Sandia	12	8	8	75	0	63	63	41	64
Savannah River	3	3	2	67	0	100	100	46	80
Y-12	9	9	9	100	0	100	100	49	80
NNSA Totals	75	63	53	71	8	91	87	41	66
DOE GOALS	-	-	-	100	-	-	>80	>40	>60

* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

** % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

NNSA Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Kansas City, the FR program is being discontinued. The remaining FR transferred to another position in January 2004.
- At Livermore, FRs worked closely with LLNL on a NNSA approved Readiness Assessment of the Heavy Element Facility. The operations to reduce the radioactive material cut the inventory quantities by 80% in that facility. Also, FRs were an integral part of site reviews in electrical safety, especially underground excavations and building and wall penetrations.
- At Los Alamos, several FRs participated on a LANL-led initiative to upgrade and improve work control program and implementation. This extensive effort involved FRs performing assessments of work control practices and program implementation at numerous LANL work sites. FRs also assisted in developing and overseeing implementation of an interim integrated work management document.
- At Nevada, an FR identified that the contractor Material Control & Accountability (MC&A) process did not communicate the receipt and storage of reportable quantities of special nuclear materials (SNM) to the Facility Manager & NNSA program manager. Consequently, facility risk control and emergency plan documentation did not address MC&A requirements such as ensuring detection of access to or removal of SNM.
- At Pantex, an FR identified a TSR violation when unallowed activities were performed during fire suppression system impairment. Also, FR assessments of Safety System surveillance and maintenance activities identified procedural weaknesses with facility crane brake inspections, Lightning Location Protection System troubleshooting, and fire systems surveillances.
- At Sandia, FRs participated in overseeing the characterization of about 95,000 pounds of excess lead stored at TA-V Hot Cell Facility. The SSO Tech-Area V FR reviewed/commented on procedures, participated in procedure walkdowns and process dry runs, obtained NE-40 permission to use the facility for this project, and provided oversight of this project during actual lead characterization.
- At Y-12, an FR participated in the Los Alamos Type B accident investigation and identified several issues involving inadequacies in the work control processes and general safety culture. The FR provided lessons learned presentations to NNSA and BWXT senior management at Y-12.
- At Savannah River, an FR was the lead for the NNSA-SRSO Validation Team of the Tritium Consolidation and Modernization (TCOM) Project. FRs conducted training of TCOM systems for the NNSA staff. Also, FRs performed the three year comprehensive training review as required in DOE O 5480.20A.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2003)

<u>Area/Site Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Ames	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	33	85
Argonne-East	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	20	73
Argonne-West	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	31	61
Brookhaven	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	37	90
Fermi	2	2	2	100	0	100	50	38	83
Oak Ridge (SC facilities)	3	2	2	67	0	100	100	66	79
Pacific Northwest	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	41	75
Princeton	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	51	71
SC Site Totals	23	22	22	96	0	100	95	36	78
DOE GOALS	-	-	-	100	-	-	>80	>40	>60

* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

** % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

SC Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Argonne-East, the lab has shipped all of its legacy contact-handled debris TRU waste to WIPP. Overall, the lab has shipped 87% of its contact-handled homogeneous solid waste to WIPP. The balance of this waste will be shipped pending approval by the state of New Mexico. FRs participated extensively in overseeing these operations.
- At Brookhaven, FRs participated in a joint DOE/BNL task force evaluating the causes of a series of safety-related occurrences. The task force identified weaknesses in work planning at BNL partly stemming from worker overconfidence and complacency. Also, two FRs participated in reviews of a 9/9/03 laser incident at BNL in which a graduate student's eyes were injured. Weaknesses in work planning were identified in both reviews.
- At Pacific Northwest, an FR surveillance on fume hood work practices at the Radiochemical Processing Laboratory identified significant radiological survey procedural noncompliances. A contractor extent-of-condition review found similar noncompliance issues at other Pacific Northwest National Laboratory radiological facilities. Contractor completion of the corrective action plan requested by PNSO will reinforce procedure use expectations and revise radiological procedures to remain 10 CFR 835 compliant while better reflecting research personnel needs and establishing controls better tailored to the actual levels of risk involved in fume hood work.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2003)

<u>Area/Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Argonne-West	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	31	61
Idaho	18	16	15.5	86	0	100	100	42	79
Oak Ridge (NE facilities)	5	5	3	60	0	100	66	62	72
NE Totals	26	24	21.5	83	0	100	95	43	67
DOE GOALS	-	-	-	100	-	-	>80	>40	>60

* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

** % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

NE Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Argonne-West, FRs provided assistance to ANL-W with the development and issuance of a site-wide procedure "AWP 2.13, Radiological-Material Inventory Control and Facility Hazard Categorization." This procedure is intended to ensure that non-nuclear and radiological facilities do not contain radionuclide inventories that exceed the authorization bases. Also, the ANL-W management of satellite accumulation areas (SAA) has improved as a result of an FR observation that there is insufficient guidance in ANL-W SAA management procedures.
- At Idaho, all FRs are now fully qualified. FRs provided augmented oversight at the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility while the contractor transitioned from single shift to round-the-clock operations. This oversight facilitated a safe and effective transition.
- At Oak Ridge, an FR assigned to HFIR completed interim qualifications at the facility.