



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

March 27, 2006

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,
October -- December 2005

Attached is the Facility Representative (FR) Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report covering the period from October to December 2005. 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 to improve the FR Program.

As of December 31, 2005, 78% of all FRs were fully qualified, down from 84% the previous quarter, and below the DOE goal of 80%. Site offices hired 11 new FRs in the quarter and several sites moved FRs to new facilities, thus requiring new qualifications. To help reverse the downward trend in qualification percentage, site offices are encouraged to make maximum use of qualification tools available. For new FRs completing General Technical Base (GTB) qualifications, site offices are encouraged to use the GTB course available online at <https://olc2.energy.gov/elms/learner/login.jsp>. The use of this course has shown to significantly shorten the time needed to complete GTB qualifications. There are also qualification cards and training materials available on the Facility Representative web site at <http://www.facrep.org>.

Overall FR staffing is at 85% of the levels needed, up from 81% the previous quarter. The following site offices have hiring actions planned or in progress to fill identified needs: Nevada Site Office, Sandia Site Office, Pantex Site Office, Livermore Site Office, and Idaho Operations Office.

Current FR information and past quarterly performance indicator reports are accessible at the Facility Representative web site. 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 27, 2006

Distribution:

Clay Sell, S-2	Manager, Ames Site Office
David Garman, S-3	Manager, Argonne Site Office
Chip Lagdon, S-3	Manager, Brookhaven Site Office
John Sullivan, S-3	Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
Linton Brooks, NA-1	Manager, Chicago Office
Jerry Paul, NA-2	Manager, Fermi Site Office
James McConnell, NA-2	Manager, Idaho Operations Office
Thomas D'Agostino, NA-10	Manager, Livermore Site Office
Glenn Podonsky, SP-1	Manager, Los Alamos Site Office
Mike Kilpatrick, SP-1	Manager, Nevada Site Office
Patricia Worthington, SP-44	Manager, New Brunswick Laboratory
James Rispoli, EM-1	Manager, Oak Ridge Office
Inés Triay, EM-3	Manager, Office of River Protection
Dae Chung, EM-3	Manager, Ohio Field Office
Raymond Orbach, SC-1	Manager, Pacific Northwest Site Office
Don Erbschloe, SC-3	Manager, Pantex Site Office
R. Shane Johnson, NE-2.4	Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office
	Manager, Richland Operations Office
	Manager, Rocky Flats Project Office
	Manager, Sandia Site Office
	Manager, Savannah River Operations Office
	Manager, Savannah River Site Office (NNSA)
	Manager, Y-12 Site Office

cc:

Program Sponsors:

Lloyd Piper, CBFO
Carson Nealy, CH
Robert Stallman, ID
Kirk Keilholtz, LASO
Steve Lawrence, NSO
Steve Lasell, LSO
Larry Kelly, OR
Mike Weis, RL
Chris Bosted, ORP
Roger Christensen, PNSO
Elisha Demerson, PXSO
Carl Everatt, SR
Kevin Hall, SRSO
Gary Schmidtke, SSO
Bryan Bower, WVDP
Dan Hoag, YSO

Steering Committee Members:

Jody Eggleston, NNSA Serv Ctr
Eric Turnquest, ASO
Peter Kelley, BHSO
Fred Holbrook, CBFO
George Basabilvazo, CBFO
Karl Moro, CH
Bob Everson, EM-CBC
John Scott, FSO
Dary Newbry, ID
Jody Pugh, LASO
Ed Christie, LASO
Henry Rio, LSO
Joe Drago, NBL
Bob Bangerter, NSO
Geoff Gorsuch, OH/MCP
David Cook, OH/WVDP
Michael Jordan, OH
Tyrone Harris, OR
Rick Daniels, OR

Steering Committee Members,
continued:

Tim Noe, OR
Jeff Carlson, PNSO
Leif Dietrich, PSO
Carlos Alvarado, PXSO
Earl Burkholder, PXSO
Rob Hastings, RL
John Trevino, RL
John Barnes, SRS
Phil Giles, SRS
Larry Hinson, SRS
Veronica Martinez, SSO
Steve Wellbaum, YSO

Craig Scott, EM
Doug Minnema, NA
Matthew Hutmaker, NE
Casimiro Izquierdo, FE
Barry Parks, SC

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2005)

<u>Field or Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTEs</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>
CBFO	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	60	65
ID (ICP)	12	12	9	75	1	100	67	45	85
OH/FCP	3	3	3	100	1	100	100	45	70
OH/MCP	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	45	60
OH/WVDP	3	3	3	100	0	67	67	40	75
OR (EM)	19	19	19	100	0	74	74	46	63
ORP	14	14	13	93	1	85	85	50	74
PPPO	4	4	4	100	0	100	75	34	61
RL	18	18	17	94	1	100	94	41	67
SR	30	30	27	90	1	100	97	48	74
EM Totals	106	106	98	92	5	92	86	46	71
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 are 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 Idaho, an FR at FMDP performed two separate surveillances of the contractor's Corrective Action/Self-Assessment (CA/SA) program. The surveillances concluded that the contractor process was not capable of detecting and correcting abnormal event precursors, and that overall, the effectiveness of the CA/SA program was less than adequate.
- At Miamisburg, an FR conducted a lockout/tagout surveillance which determined that (1) a system drawing did not reflect current status of a building modification and (2) the contractor had not performed monthly verification of the LOTO status per internal requirement.
- At Oak Ridge, a new staffing analysis showed a need for 19 FRs, up from 14 in the previous analysis. This number is high due to an extremely high work activity. Five FRs were hired in the quarter to get to 19.
- At Richland, FRs participated in startup readiness reviews/assessments for SNF North Loadout Pit and oversight of Hose-in-Hose construction activities. Also, an FR identified a PISA/USQ related to the leak path factor assigned to the Plutonium Reclamation Facility during a fire and subsequent filter plugging, and a PISA/USQ related to the leak path factor assigned to 242-Z during loss of confinement accident.
- At River Protection, an FR was promoted to a Federal Project Director. Also, an FR found weaknesses in a Job Safety Analysis (JSA) for application of certain hazardous materials. The JSA respiratory protection requirements were not consistent with the materials use instructions. As a result, a painter was going to begin application of a material without the required respiratory protection. The FR brought this to the attention of management who stopped all work on application of these materials. Some corrective action was implemented immediately and some is ongoing.
- At Savannah River, an FR was promoted to Division Director. Also, FRs at the Closure Project on two separate occasions observed mechanics improperly using heavy equipment while supporting Site Deactivation and Demolition activities. Follow-up investigations identified a failure to implement controls for hazards using the Assisted Hazards Analysis Process.
- At West Valley, FRs provided additional oversight of several activities including: preparations for shipments of low-level wastes off site; preparations and removal of office space trailer units; site maintenance; and safe and compliant work practices. Monthly meetings with contractor senior management and FRs continue to result in enhanced communication for all. FRs assisted with the conduct and completion of the annual Freeze Protection surveillance.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2005)

<u>Site Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTEs</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>
LASO	19	15	12	63	0	75	42	28	44
LSO	11	10	10	91	0	60	60	32	58
NSO	10	10	8	80	0	50	25	41	61
PXSO	10	8	7	70	1	100	86	33	72
SRSO	4	4	4	100	0	75	75	41	68
SSO	15	11	10	67	0	80	80	37	66
YSO	12	10	10	83	0	80	70	45	76
NNSA Totals	81	68	61	75	1	74	61	36	62
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 are 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, three FRs completed management self assessments (MSAs) of conduct of operations, procedures safety management program, and the FR program. These MSAs were performed in preparation for the CDNS review of LSO. Also, the triennial FR program assessment was completed in December 2005, with a number of issues identified. A corrective action plan is being developed to address these issues.
- At Los Alamos, FRs were included in the "Strategic Pause for Transition" starting in mid-November, which removed several FRs from the field to concentrate on organizational issues vital to proper contractor oversight under the provisions of the new contract.
- At Los Alamos, the number of fully qualified FRs represents those FRs fully qualified at the facilities where they are currently assigned. Recently, LASO assigned fully qualified FRs to new facilities, thus requiring additional qualifications. A total of 67% of LASO FRs have fully qualified on a facility at LASO.
- At Nevada, all but one FR were assigned to a new facilities in order to expand their knowledge and experience. In addition, two new FRs were added in the third quarter and one in the fourth quarter. As a result, the percentage of qualified FRs is well below the goal. This reassignment of the FRs will be a great benefit to NSO. However, a lesson learned from this process is that FR reassignments should be made incrementally.
- At Pantex, three FRs participated in Documented Safety Analysis Implementation Readiness Assessments for Transportation Controls on the Pantex Site. During this review, a PXSO FR discovered a significant training deficiency in the contractor training program with regards to new TSR control implementation that resulted in a pre-start finding.
- At Sandia, two FRs participated in the SSO Line Management Review of the SNL Pulsed Reactor Facility Restart Operational Readiness Review. Also, an FR led the FR Program Self-Assessment and FRs performed a causal analysis on each of the findings and observations.
- At SRSO, Tritium Extraction Facility FRs determined that actions taken to verify operations personnel knowledge were inadequate. As a result, the contractor has added additional rigor to the program. Also, an FR was the Federal Certifying Official for a recent shipment of Tritium Producing Burnable Absorber Rods from TVA's Watts Bar Nuclear Plant.
- At Y-12, an FR discovered a work package Job Hazard Analysis (JHA) did not address hydrogen fluoride (HF) controls before work began on equipment that had previously held HF. The contractor failed to use historical information that indicated a possibility of small quantities of HF being present. Controls were added to the JHA and these controls protected workers when HF was discovered in one of the containers.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE SITES

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2005)

Area/Site Office	Staffing Analysis	FTEs	Actual Staffing	% Staffing	Attrition	% Core Qualified	% Fully Qualified	% Field Time *	% Oversight Time **
AMES	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	30	85
ASO	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	23	80
BHSO	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	34	79
FSO	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	29	83
OR (SC)	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	30	50
PNSO	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	42	73
PSO	0.5	0.5	0.5	100	0	100	100	41	68
SC Totals	17.5	17.5	17.5	100	0	100	100	31	77
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 are 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, a FR was appointed for a 5-week detail as Acting DOE Deputy Site Manager for the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC). Also, FRs continue to work with the contractor to close-out OSHA non-compliances and an FR completed an investigation into Safety Evaluation Report non-compliances at the Former Hazardous Waste Management Facility.
- At Fermi, FRs were involved in numerous safety activities and initiatives this quarter. The following is a list of those activities:
 - Interactions with DOE-SC on the draft ISMS Manual
 - Response to the DNFSB 2004-1 ISMS Assessments
 - Investigation into the Low-Level Tritium Releases from Fermilab
 - Coordination of Energy Act Nuclear Energy Initiative
 - Fermilab Welding Program Assessment
- At Oak Ridge, an FR performed safety oversight for the Spallation Neutron Source and another FR performed an assessment on OR accelerator order compliance.
- At Pacific Northwest, the DOE Office of Enforcement performed an onsite review of the Battelle Price-Anderson Amendments Act (PAAA) program in September 2005. The final report issued in November 2005 noted the following contractor weakness: "OE also noted that a significant percentage of recent PNNL NTS reports (30-40 percent in recent years) involved issues identified through external sources. Further inquiry indicated that these issues were largely identified through the efforts of the DOE facility representatives. Although this percentage reflects positively on the efforts of the facility representatives, it indicates the need for PNNL improvement in the area of quality problem identification."

NUCLEAR ENERGY, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2005)

<u>Field or Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTEs</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>
ID (NE)	10	10	6	60	2	100	67	42	75
OR (NE)	5	5	5	100	0	80	80	48	55
NE Totals	15	15	11	73	2	91	73	45	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 are 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 Idaho, all FRs provided support to perform self-assessments and external assessments of the contractor to evaluate performance in the areas of work planning and control and feedback and improvement for Department-wide DNFSB 2004-1, Commitments 23 and 25 implementation.
- At Idaho, an FR at Specific Manufacturing Capability Project (SMC) identified elevated work being performed without adequate fall protection. This observation was used in persuading the contractor that additional management attention was needed in hazard identification and mitigation.
- At Oak Ridge, FR qualification progress is continuing at or above the scheduled pace. One FR participated in an assessment of ORNL accelerators. Another FR participated in an ORR for the transuranic waste treatment facility.