



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

June 17, 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: John D. Evans 
Facility Representative Program Manager
Office of the Departmental Representative to the
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DR-1)

SUBJECT: Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report

Attached is the Facility Representative (FR) Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report covering the period from January to March 2004. 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 FR Program.

As of March 31, 2004, 91% of all FRs were fully qualified, exceeding the DOE goal of 80%. Currently, 23 of 28 sites meet the goal for FR qualifications.

Sites are staffed to 83% of the levels needed per the staffing analysis methodology in DOE-STD-1063-2000. Sites continued to post announcements to fill vacancies that resulted from higher than average program attrition in 2003, as reported in last quarter's report. Oak Ridge and Nevada Site Office recently posted announcements, which are advertised on the Facility Representative web site (<http://www.facrep.org>).

Nine site offices currently meet all the DOE goals for the performance indicators (i.e., staffing 100%, qualification 80%, FR Time in Field 40%, FR Total Oversight Time 60%). These site offices are: Carlsbad, Princeton, Fernald, Miamisburg, Pacific Northwest, River Protection, Richland, Rocky Flats, and Y-12.

Current FR information and past quarterly performance indicator reports are accessible 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
June 17, 2004

Distribution:

Kyle McSlarrow, S-2	Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
Bruce Carnes, S-2	Manager, Chicago Operations Office
Leslie Novitsky, S-2	Manager, Idaho Operations Office
David Garman, S-3	Manager, Livermore Site Office
Linton Brooks, NA-1	Manager, Los Alamos Site Office
Tyler Przybylek, NA-1	Manager, Nevada Site Office
Everet Beckner, NA-10	Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office
James Mangeno, NA-3.6	Manager, Office of River Protection
Glenn Podonsky, SP-1	Manager, Ohio Field Office
Mike Kilpatrick, OA-1	Manager, Pacific Northwest Site Office
Patricia Worthington, OA-50	Manager, Pantex Site Office
Jessie Roberson, EM-1	Manager, Portsmouth Paducah Project Office
Inés Triay, EM-3	Manager, Richland Operations Office
Patty Bubar, EM-3	Manager, Rocky Flats Project Office
Raymond Orbach, SC-1	Manager, Sandia Site Office
Milt Johnson, SC-3	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
Robert Stallman, ID
Steve Lawrence, NSO
Phil Hill, LSO
Bob Poe, OR
Shirley Olinger, RL
Chris Bosted, ORP
Karl Waltzer, PXSO
Ed Westbrook, RFPO
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, RFPO
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
Barry Parks, SC

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2004)

Field or Ops Office	<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	47	67
OH/Fernald	5	5	5	100	1	100	100	46	80
OH/Miamisburg	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	46	69
OH/West Valley	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	35	78
Portsmouth/Paducah	4	4	4	100	0	50	50	***	***
Richland	18	18	18	100	0	100	95	45	67
River Protection	11	11	11	100	0	82	82	50	75
Rocky Flats	4	4	6	150	4	100	100	65	75
Savannah River	35	29	29	83	0	100	100	57	87
EM Totals	103	91	93	90	5	95	94	49	73
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

*** Data not measured in 1Q CY2004.

EM Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Oak Ridge (EM), FRs completed a series of walkthroughs focused on criticality safety. No significant issues were identified. Also, FRs associated with Isotope Circle and K-25 D&D performed walkthroughs to observe foaming activities in light of lessons learned from the Rocky Flats fire.
- At OH/Fernald, additional focus placed on safety in the field has resulted in a reduction of the number of recordable injuries this quarter.
- At OH/Miamisburg, FR staffing per the analysis was reduced from 4 to 3 due to reduced site activity. FRs identified several potentially hazardous situations during excavation work. One FR directed a worker to exit a trench that had a wall over 5 feet high until the wall was reduced. In another case, an FR observed a worker exit a trench by walking through a part of the 10 foot deep trench that was not protected by a trench box.
- At OH/West Valley, both FRs completed supplemental qualifications for the Remote Handled Waste Facility (RHWF). One FR was a member on the Line Management Assessment and both FRs were involved in a review of the site SAR, the new RHWF SAR, and the site TSR documents.
- At Richland, FRs participated in 4 assessments and performed 24 surveillances, including surveillances of the contractor's Corrective Action Management (CAM) program. FRs identified a number of findings with the CAM program, including the lack of screening of potential deficiencies for opportunities for improvement and inadequate causal analyses.
- At River Protection, FRs identified several alarming systems and directed the attention of contractor management to get the equipment fixed and to highlight a need for heightened sensitivity to alarming conditions. The contractor took actions to remove unneeded alarms and performed a wide review of alarm response with the workers.
- At Rocky Flats, there are now four designated FRs with two others performing FR functions. Due to facility D&D efforts and the reduction in overall number of facilities at the site, the number of FRs decreased from 10 to 6.
- At Savannah River, three FRs passed requalification tests. An FR at H-Canyon noted evidence of liquid being present in an out-of-service sodium hydroxide storage tank. The presence of liquid was suspected based on indication of a slow leak where steam lines enter the tank. Further review determined that an inadvertent transfer occurred due to inadequate execution of a procedure during sodium hydroxide unloading operations.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2004)

Site Office	Staffing Analysis	FTE Level	Actual Staffing	% Staffing	Attrition	% Core Qualified	% Fully Qualified	% Field Time *	% Oversight Time **
Livermore	10	10	8	80	1	88	88	46	74
Los Alamos	16	16	13	81	0	83	83	40	63
Nevada	10	7	6	60	1	100	67	38	64
Oak Ridge (NNSA facility)	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	50	50
Pantex	15	8	7	47	0	100	100	31	65
Sandia	12	8	8	75	0	63	63	35	66
Savannah River	3	3	2	67	0	100	100	47	80
Y-12	9	9	9	100	0	100	100	50	80
NNSA Totals	76	62	54	71	2	89	85	41	69
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 Livermore, four FRs worked on a DOE Operational Readiness Review (ORR) of the TRUWASTE Mobile Vendor packaging facility. The ORR was successfully concluded with DNFSB staff attendance and the facility startup approved by the authorizing official. Operations are proceeding smoothly with approximately 90 drums completed and preparations for shipment to WIPP underway.
- At Los Alamos, an FR investigated contractor response to a radiological contamination of an employee's face. The investigation revealed site-wide issues involving training and decon procedures that are currently being pursued by the FR and LASO management. Also the FR at DARHT has continuously pressed LANL to adequately manage their waste and material. The contractor has responded by hiring a Waste Coordinator that has been working closely with DARHT Operations personnel to characterize, package, and transport their waste/material. A schedule has been established to remove the waste and resources have been assigned.
- At Nevada, NSO submitted a request to NNSA HQ for three additional FR positions. Two FRs were reassigned to new facilities due to attrition and are being re-qualified at the new facilities.
- At Pantex, two FRs participated on the W78 Step II NNSA Readiness Assessment. Also, an FR performed assessments of Tooling, Training, and Hazardous Material Movements. Many concerns were identified, including failure to flow down authorization basis controls and failure to follow procedures. The concerns identified were transmitted to the M&O Contractor for correction.
- At Sandia, an FR participated on a project oversight team which evaluated safety practices at the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Applications (MESA) project and implementation of the Safety Plan at the Microsystems Fabrication Facility construction site over a month long period. Also, an FR participated on the Root Cause Analysis Team for the Z-Machine Beryllium Investigation.
- At Y-12, an FR intervened in Enriched Uranium Operations on a new handling fixture used for an engineering control for criticality safety resulted in the discovery that an error was made in the design dimensions that resulted in the fabrication of an inadequate engineered control. The fixture was in operations area and ready to be placed in service when the FR questioned the design and stated that it was unsatisfactory. Following this questioning, operations had the fixture modified to correct function prior to being placed in service.
- At Savannah River, FRs conducted oversight of the WSRC Tiger Team and Startup and Operational Readiness Assessment for the start-up of 234-7H Tritium Facility Modernization and Consolidation (TFM&C) Project. Also, Facility Reps conducted an oversight of the WSRC Operational Evaluation for Tritium introduction into the HT-TCAP columns portion of the 233H TFM&C Project. This assessment was completed in April 2004 and granted WSRC approval to introduce Tritium into the HT-TCAP glovebox. This provided the final approval required to complete the project.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2004)

<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	29	80
Argonne-East	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	26	71
Brookhaven	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	33	90
Fermi	2	2	2	100	0	100	50	45	80
Oak Ridge (SC facilities)	3	2	2	67	0	100	100	66	79
Pacific Northwest	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	44	76
Princeton	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	51	77
SC Site Totals	20	19	19	95	0	100	95	38	80
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 Brookhaven, FRs continue to participate in developing and implementing the BNL Safety Improvement Initiative and BHSO Comprehensive Safety Strategy. The initiative and strategy stem from recent increased in injuries and near misses. Parts of the initiative and strategy include improvements to the BNL Standards Based Management System., Corrective Action Management, BNL Self Assessment, ISM, and Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series 18001. A major emphasis is improving BNL work planning and defining and bounding skill of the craft.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2004)

<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	27	66
Idaho	18	16	15.5	86	0	100	100	40	78
Oak Ridge (NE facilities)	5	5	3	60	0	100	66	62	72
NE Totals	26	24	21.5	83	0	100	95	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

NE Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Argonne-West, an FR observed that operators had failed to verify that the load tests on an eyebolt and the 300 lb hoist were current at the time of their use. Also, an FR noted that radiation survey instrumentation had not undergone daily source checks as required.
- At Idaho, an FR observing the lift of an ATR Canal component noted that the shouldered eyebolts in use were not correctly installed and loaded for the lift. Subsequent investigation revealed that the guidance in the DOE Hoisting and Rigging Standard was misleading regarding the proper use of shouldered eyebolts for angular lifts. As a result of this, the site-wide training provided to INEEL hoisting and rigging engineers and craftsmen was in error. This error allowed the loading of eyebolts far in excess of their design ratings with consequent increase in risk to worker and equipment safety.
- At Idaho, an FR observing the replacement of HEPA filters in the TRA Hot Cells facility noted that the replacement filters had exceeded their shelf lives. Further investigation by the FR revealed that contrary to company requirements, the site wide warehousing organization had failed to properly segregate HEPA filters that had exceeded their shelf life from other HEPA filters.
- At Oak Ridge, an FR assigned to HFIR completed interim qualifications at the facility.