

Report of the FTCP Face-to-Face Meeting of May 14, 2003 Palace Station Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada

I. Agenda for the Meeting

<u>Time</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Agent</u>
0800 - 0815	Opening Remarks and Introductions	Mr. Schepens
0815 - 0825	Roll Call	Mr. West
0825 - 0950	Interactive Computer-based OLC Delivery System for the General Technical Base Qualification (Epsilon Systems)	Ms. Manning
0945 - 1000	Break	
1000 - 1030	DNFSB Recommendation 2002-1 Implementation Plan FTCP Commitment to Establish Technical Qualification Requirements for Software QA - Finalize Approach	Mr. West
1030 - 1115	NNSA Strategy for Facility Representatives and Technical Personnel post-reorganization	Mr. Emil Morrow
1115 - 1230	Lunch	
1230 -2:15	Status on FY2003 Annual Plan Goals and Action Items	Mr. Poe
	1.1 The Panel will continue to promote and monitor the status of technical participants in the DOE intern programs (Completion Goal: Semi-annually)	Mr. West
	2.1 The Panel will identify positions with critical technical capabilities at closure sites (Rocky Flats and Ohio) where personnel may become available to the rest of DOE (Completion Goal: Quarterly)	Ohio (Lead)
	3.1 FTCP Agents will analyze the Workforce Analysis developed for their organizations, and will recommend actions to address the shortfalls of technical positions (Completion Goal: January 2003)	Mr. Poe
	4.1 Review and update the functional area qualification standards and incorporate them into the Technical Standards Program. As part of this effort, review, update, or add competency requirements, if needed to cover safety system oversight roles for each functional area (Completion Goal: December 31, 2003)	Mr. West
	4.2 Review the Project Management Career Development Program (PMCDP) to assess its alignment to the Technical Qualification Program's (TQP) Project Management (PM) Functional Area Qualification Standard (FAQS) (Completion Goal: March 31, 2003)	Mr. Mellington

<u>Time</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Agent</u>
	5.1 Consistent with the Department's directives system review process, the FTCP Manual 426.1-1 (dated 6-5-00) will be updated as appropriate (Completion Goal: December 31, 2002; in the DOE Directives System for Review and Comment)	Mr. West
	5.2 The FTCP will continue to monitor and report performance indicators to monitor the progress of qualifications and reducing the critical technical skill gaps for those Offices that are in need of additional safety system expertise. They will be refined as needed (Completion Goal: Quarterly)	Mr. Schepens
	5.3 The Federal Technical Capabilities Panel Agents will continue to track the staff level personnel identified in FY 2002 responsible for oversight of contractor safety systems in priority facilities (Completion Goal: January 2003, and periodically thereafter)	Mr. Schepens and All Agents
	5.4 Evaluate the need for a Subject Matter Expert (SME) qualification program (Completion Goal: September 2003)	Mr. Schepens
1415 - 1430	Break	
1430 - 1500	Address Comments and Finalize DOE Manual 426.1 Revision	Mr. West
1500 - 1505	Approval of April 30, 2003, Conference Call Report	Mr. West
1505 - 1630	Call for New Business, Additional Concerns, and Issues (including selection of date for next Conference Call)	Mr. Schepens
1630 - 1700	Final Comments and Closure of the Meeting	Mr. Schepens Mr. Poe

II. Results and Report of the Call

1. Opening Remarks: Mr. Schepens, FTCP Chairman opened the meeting at 8:00 a.m. (PDT) by welcoming the Agents and announcing schedule changes: 8:30-9:00 a.m. the Agents will attend Mr. Swailes presentation to the Facility Representatives Workshop on the Safety System Oversight (SSO) Program; 9:00-9:15 a.m. Mr. Charlie Brooks, INPO will brief the Agents on the event at the Davis Bessie Nuclear Power Plant; 9:15-10:00, Ms. Manning and Epsilon Systems will provide the GTB presentation.
2. Roll Call: Mr. West, FTCP Executive Secretary conducted a roll call and requested that the Agents introduce themselves. Attendees included:

Eric T. Adams	DOE Savannah River Operations Office
Charles Anderson	DOE Savannah River Operations Office
Joe Arango	DOE HQ-EM
Nat Brown	DOE-Ohio Field Office
Pat Casey	DOE Office of River Protection
Susan Coleman	DOE Office of River Protection
Jay DeLoach	DNFSB
Fay Furstenau	DOE Idaho Operations office
Don Galbraith	DOE Carlsbad Field Office
Ken Ivey	NNSA Y-12 Site Office
Ralph Kopenhaver	NNSA Livermore Site Office
Deborah Manning	NNSA Service Center
Steve Mellington	NNSA Nevada Site Office
Billye Neilson	NNSA Service Center
Lloyd Piper	DOE Richland Operations Office
Robert Poe	DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office
Roy Schepens	DOE Office of River Protection
Jim Szenasi	NNSA Service Center
Ed Tourigny	DOE HQ-NE-40
Wayne Walker	NNSA Service Center
Craig D. West	DOE HQ-ME-51

3. Due to available time before Mr. Swailes presentation, Mr. West led a discussion on the status of the DNFSB Recommendation 2002-1 QA Software commitment. Mr. Arango described the groups and the plan. Mr. Casey followed up with an overall status on the 2 groups, and Mr. Arango then introduced the options that the group had prepared and were continuing to refine. There was to be a conference call on Thursday or Friday to attempt to finalize a recommendation to the Agents. Mr. Schepens asked Mr. Arango to clearly identify the scope encompassed by the recommendation and wanted to know whether the working group had the skill to identify which of the sites will need the software QA person. (Action)
4. The Agents attended the “Applying Facility Representative Lessons Learned to the Federal Technical Staff” presentation to the Facility Representatives Workshop by John Swailes. Mr. Swailes provided a briefing on the Office of River Protection, and Facility Representatives and Safety System Oversight (SSO) personnel relationship.
5. Mr. Charlie Brooks, INPO discussed the event at Davis Bessie, stating that it was the “most significant recent event since TMI” and was the result of lack of balance between production and safety. The event caused INPO members to openly focus on the safety culture within the organization. The working definition of the INPO safety culture is now “That set of attributes that results in nuclear safety being the overriding priority at the station.”
6. Ms. Manning introduced the discussion with a brief history of the General Technical Base Qualification and the need for it to be computer-based. She then introduced Mr. Grady Petty, Director, Energy & Environmental Division and Vice President of Epsilon Systems Solutions, Inc. who provided a presentation on the computer-based training that Epsilon Systems has provided for other organizations/agencies, and how it could be tailored to meet DOE’s needs.

After the presentation, the Agents discussed the viability and Mr. Schepens asked Mr. Mellington to establish a sub-group to develop the scope/needs (action) so that Mr. Schepens could formally request a proposal (action). The sub-group would be led by Mr. Mellington and include Mr. Adams, Mr. West, Mr. Kopenhaver, and Mr. Walker. Mr. West was also assigned an action to set up a meeting between Mr. Petty and the DOE-ME organization person responsible for the OLC to further discuss opportunities/hardware relationships.

7. Mr. Emil Morrow briefed the Agents on the current path that NNSA is pursuing regarding use of Facility Representatives and technical personnel. He stated that the guidance is consistent with paragraph 1.4 of the Manual. He also attempted to clarify certain statements/concerns, the first the myth being perpetrated that Facility Representative requalification is not necessary -- this is not true, however the focus will be on time in the field; another myth is that the Facility Representative reduction will occur immediately -- also not true, however, the responsibility is on the site manager to determine his/her needs in this area and assure that are met. Facility Representatives will still be expected to participate on Readiness Assessments and Operational Readiness Reviews.

An example of how the needs may be determined based on Activity Level and Hazard categorization, is as follows:

Hazard Classification	Activity Level		
	High	Medium	Low
2	<u>Daily</u> - Weekly	<u>Weekly</u> - Monthly	<u>Monthly</u> - Quarterly
3	Daily - <u>Weekly</u>	Weekly - <u>Monthly</u>	Monthly - <u>Quarterly</u>
Unique	Daily - Weekly	Weekly - Monthly	Monthly - Quarterly
Note: FRs will not be used in OSHA only sites			

A draft charter has been developed and reviewed by the committee. Each site is represented on the committee and DNFSB (Mr. Morrow is the HQ representative on the committee). The next step is to present the charter to management and the Site Managers to get their approval. A more detailed presentation was to be made at the Facility Representatives Workshop by Mr. Fred Bell, Los Alamos Site Office Facility Representative Team Leader later that day.

Mr. Schepens mentioned a report/chart (staffing analysis) that he had Mr. Bill Bell develop at the Savannah River Site to evaluate the needs for Facility Representatives like Mr. Morrows. Mr. Schepens took an action to send it out to the Agents and Mr. Morrow for their information.

Mr. DeLoach stated that the Board is still looking at the policy, specifically the Facility Representative re-qualification aspect. One of the Board's key issues is that there is one group of competent people in the field and any potential change is of concern. Mr. DeLoach stated that he is in the process of planning a public meeting for the Board on the NNSA/EM oversight policy. The meeting will be held in September 2003.

8. Lunch
9. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 1.1 -- Mr. West handed out the latest Quarterly Performance Indicator Report and reviewed Attachment 4, "Status of DOE Technical Interns," which identified that the current class consists of 11 technical and 3 accounting Interns. He stated that he is working with NNSI to over the next couple of years add a security and information technology tracks (depending on funding). The 2002 and 2001 classes will both be graduating this September 2003. Mr. DeLoach asked about the Intern Program under Office of Science but Mr. West had no details to provide.

The DOE FY 2003/4 class will kickoff during the August/September 2004 timeframe. Personnel are currently being identified/hired. The Intern Program costs the field/HQ program offices only travel costs (\$4-5K) since the balance is covered by DOE-HQ ME.

10. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 2.1 -- Mr. Brown reviewed Attachment 3, "Availability of Technical Positions at Closure Site Offices," of the Quarterly Report and noted that the numbers are down 67 from the 1st quarter of FY03, and that the term critical position at Ohio has been redefined to mean find a new job as soon as possible. He stated that the positions/personnel are available now despite the dates listed. There was a question whether the FTE position would travel to the new site with the person. Mr. Brown also stated that there is discussion occurring towards consolidating 90% of the staff at Mound and 80% of the Fernald Federal staff in a combined organization and the physical moves are estimated to start in the next couple of weeks, which will further make personnel available for transfer.

Mr. Schepens asked whether he could send John Swailes to Ohio to be available to answer questions from personnel potentially interested in transferring to the Office of River Protection. Mr. Brown stated that he would need to check with Mr. Warther the Ohio Field Office Manager but he thought that there would not be a problem since staff from Wright Patterson Air Force Base had already visited the Field Office.

Mr. Schepens informed the Agents that at the recent Field Managers Meeting, Jessie Roberson, EM-1 stated that the site managers should be actively trying to recruit from the closure sites. There was concern from the NNSA sites since they have direction that they must first recruit from within NNSA and after all avenues have been pursued they may look to EM closure sites.

11. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 3.1 -- Mr. Poe discussed the workforce analysis and that the template was sent out on May 6, 2003, for the Agents to identify the critical positions at their site. Input is to be to Mr. Poe by June 30, 2003. Mr. Piper briefed on how the template was developed. Mr. DeLoach provided two concerns, 1) are the sites being too restrictive by focusing only on critical positions, and 2) each office seems to prepare staffing analysis differently with different levels of rigor. Mr. Schepens encourage the Agents to include text identifying activities performed to improve the technical competence, that the sites should be taking credit for the accomplishments not just providing numbers.

12. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 4.1 -- Mr. West stated that of the functional area qualification standards approximately 1/3 were approved, 1/3 were in-progress of being revised; and 1/3 appeared to need to be initiated. He reviewed those that were underway and those that appeared to need to be initiated to confirm the status and point-of-contact. Mr. Schepens asked Mr. West for an up-to-date copy of the Functional Area Qualification Standards list (**action**). Mr. West also stated that he is working with Mr. Norm Schwartz, EH to put together a flow diagram of the process.

There was discussion regarding the General Technical Base and whether it needs to be updated. There was also discussion about the Senior Technical Safety Manager standard and that it needed to be more rigorous.

13. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 4.2 -- Mr. Mellington provided a briefing and the recommendations from the subgroup regarding the Project Management Career Development Program vs. Project Management Functional Area Qualification Standard. The Panel accepted the recommendation and Mr. Mellington took an **action** to review the FTCP Manual and provide recommended changes, if needed. The Recommendations are attached to this report for the record.
14. Status of FY2003 Annual Plan Action 5.1 -- Mr. West handed out a document showing the DOE RevCom process for issuance of a DOE directive/manual. (Attached to this report for the record.) Mr. West reminded the Agents that the Manual was transmitted during the previous week and high-level comments should be provided as soon as possible. There was discussion regarding the comment resolutions and accepted by the Agents. There was also discussion regarding the location of the FAQ Template and that evidently, sometime during the revision process text describing duties and responsibilities was removed from the FAQ section. It was agreed to add the words back into the Manual. Ms. Coleman took the **action** to work with Mr. Arango to ensure that the correct words were reincorporated.
15. Report of the Status of other Concerns, Issues, or Items from April:
 - Mr. West reminded the Agent to work with their Field/Site/HQ manager to receive formal letters of designation as Agent for the respective organization. To date, letters had been received on Mr. Swailes (ORP), Mr. Mellington (NNSA/NSO), Mr. Anderson (SR), Mr. Richardson (NNSA/SR), Mr. Kopenhaver (LSO), Mr. Tillman (NNSA Service Center). Mr. Piper informed the Agents that he will be replaced effective June 2, 2003, by Ms. Shirley Olinger as RL Agent.
 - Mr. Schepens reiterated the need to keep working on the QA software activity.
16. The April Conference Call Report was passed out and approved without comments.

17. Call for any other New Business, Concerns, Issues for Items

- The April Conference Call Report was passed out and approved without comments.
- Ms. Coleman reminded the Agents that it will be soon be time to develop the FY2004 Annual Action Plan and that they should be evaluating/identifying potential actions for the next fiscal year.
- Mr. Schepens reminded the Agents that his term as Chairman expires on December 30, 2003, and that if anyone is interested to please contact him.
- Next conference call will be June 25, 2003, 10-11:30 EDT, call in number is (202) 287-1088 (reservation number 82849).

18. Action Items Resulting From the Meeting

- a. Mr. Schepens asked Mr. Arango to clearly identify the scope encompassed by the recommendation and wanted to know whether the working group had the skill to identify which of the sites will need the software QA person.
- b. As a result of the discussion regarding the GTB, Mr. Schepens asked Mr. Mellington to establish a sub-group to develop the scope/needs
- c. Upon receipt of the scope/needs list, Mr. Schepens would formally request a proposal from Epsilon Systems, Inc.
- d. Mr. West was assigned an action to set up a meeting between Mr. Petty and the DOE-ME organization person responsible for the OLC to further discuss opportunities/hardware relationships.
- e. Mr. Schepens will send to the Agents the staffing analysis that he at the Savannah River Site to evaluate the needs for Facility Representatives like Mr. Morrows for their information
- f. Mr. West will provide to the Agents an up-to-date status list of the Functional Area Qualification Standards.
- g. Mr. Mellington will review the FTCP Manual related to the Project Management Career Development Program vs. Project Management Functional Area Qualification Standard and provide recommended changes, if needed.
- h. Ms. Coleman will work with Mr. Arango to ensure that the words requiring identification of duties and responsibilities in FAQs were reincorporated into the FTCP Manual.

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
VS
PROJECT MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL AREA QUALIFICATION STANDARD**

ANALYSIS:

- The Project Management Functional Area Qualification Standard (PM FACS) requires familiarity with mechanical, electrical and civil engineering theories, principles and techniques, which the Project Management Course Development Program (PMCDP) does not.
- The PMCDP has little reference to nuclear safety where as the PM FAQS has significant requirements for familiarity with DSAs, TSRs and USQs.
- The PM FAQS requires a better understanding of 29 CFR 1910 & 1926.
- Neither one of them adequately addresses ISM.
- The administrative project management skills are covered adequately in both of them with the PMCDP being more up to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Require participants in the PMCDP who are selected for the Technical Qualification Program (TQP) to complete the General Technical Base (GTB) Qualification Standard.
- The GTB Qualification adequately addresses ISM and industrial safety requirements (29 CFR 1910).
- Upgrade and update GTB Qualification Standard to include competencies addressing 10 CFR 830. Include separate competencies for Documented Safety Analyses, Technical Safety Requirements and Unreviewed Safety Questions (see Attachment 1 for suggested wording).
- Upgrade the GTB Qualification Standard to include competencies for mechanical, electrical and civil engineering principles.
- Add wording to the FTC Manual to address project management qualification requirements for the TQP (PMCDP & GTB)
- Cancel the Project Managers FAQS.

Attachment 1

1. A Technical Program Manager shall demonstrate a familiarity level knowledge of 10 CFR 830.204, Documented Safety Analysis, with respect to its impact on Department Nuclear Safety, to include:

Supporting Knowledge and/or Skills:

- a. Discuss the four basic purposes and objectives of Documented Safety Analysis.
- b. Describe the responsibilities of contractors authorized to operate defense nuclear facilities for the development and maintenance of a Documented Safety Analysis.
- c. Define the following terms and discuss the purpose of each:
 - Design Basis
 - Engineered Safety Features
 - Safety Analysis
 - Safety Class
 - Safety Significant
 - Defense in Depth
- d. Describe the requirements for the scope and content of a Documented Safety Analysis and discuss the general content of each of the required sections of the Analysis.
- e. Discuss the approval requirements for the Documented Safety Analysis for new facilities and subsequent changes to the Analysis.
- f. Define who approves facility operations prior to achieving Documented Safety Analysis upgrade approval.
- g. Discuss the provisions for temporary and permanent exemptions from the requirements of DOE-STD-3009-094, Change Notice 2, Preparation Guide for U.S. Department of Energy Nonreactor Nuclear Facility Safety Analysis Reports, and 10 CFR 830.204, Document Safety Analysis.
- h. Discuss the requirements for the contractor to maintain the Documented Safety Analysis current.

2. A Technical Program Manager shall demonstrate a familiarity level knowledge to determine the existence of an Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) in accordance with 10 CFR 830.203, Unreviewed Safety Question Process.

Supporting Knowledge and/or Skills:

- a. Discuss the reasons for performing an USQ determination.
- b. Define the following terms:
 - Accident Analyses
 - Safety Evaluation
 - Technical Safety Requirement
- c. Describe the situations in which a safety evaluation is required.
- d. Define the conditions for a USQ.
- e. Describe the responsibilities of contractors authorized to operate DOE nuclear facilities for safety evaluations.
- f. Describe the actions to be taken by a contractor upon identifying information that indicates a potential inadequacy of a previous safety analyses or a possible reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the Technical Safety Requirements.
- g. Discuss the actions to be taken if it is determined that a USQ is involved.
- h. Discuss the qualification and training requirements for personnel who perform safety evaluations.

Writers

The following is general information about how to process a directive in the Departmental Directives System. *This process reflects the December 3, 2002, memorandum from Bruce Carnes, Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation. The Office of Management Communications is in the process of revising its directives.*

1. Before submitting your draft directive to the Office of Management Communications (ME-43), it is recommended that you pre-coordinate it with your stakeholder/user community and with any other relevant points of contact. This should eliminate some of the comments during the formal review and comment period in the Departmental Directives System.
2. Once the draft directive is ready for coordination, please submit to ME-43, both an electronic and hard copy of the cover memo and the draft directive. The hard copy cover memo must be signed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) or equivalent, and addressed to Stephen M. Smith, Director, Office of Management Communications, ME-43.
3. The memo needs to include the purpose, and background information on why the directive is needed or being revised; and if the draft directive was developed or revised by a team, or by other people outside your organization, who those people were and what organizations they represented.
4. ME-43 will provide an editorial review of your directive. After the edit, the directive will be returned to you for concurrence. Once ME-43 receives clearance from you, the following process occurs:

Days	Process Component	Details
30	Review and Comment	Begins when the draft directive is posted to RevCom to be reviewed by Directives Points of Contact (DPCs) and their designated Subject Matter Experts throughout the Department. (If you need to be trained on RevCom, please let the ME-43 analyst know.) After 30 days have elapsed, RevCom will not accept further comments. Extensions to the commenting period are discouraged, and will only be granted with the directive writer's permission. Any extensions granted will apply only to the requesting organization and will not be "blanket" extensions. Comments received should mirror the views of the Assistant Secretary commenting organization.

Days	Process Component	Details
60	Comment Resolution	Begins at the close of the 30-day comment period. You must resolve all the major issues surfaced by the review. It is strongly suggested that you establish a line of communication with the commentors. As you resolve the issues, you should incorporate the changes to produce a redline/strikeout of the directive. Prior to the end of this period, you must submit to ME-43 a redline/strikeout of the directive. At the end of this 60-day period, <i>regardless of whether all major issues have been resolved, you</i> must enter your proposed resolutions in RevCom, then submit your comment resolution package. Your resolutions should mirror the views of the Assistant Secretary of your organization.
10	Concurrence	<p>The redline/strikeout of the directive will be posted to RevCom to allow interested parties to see the cumulative effect of changes produced during the review. DPCs should concur, if they have not already, in RevCom if they agree on the proposed resolution(s) and the redline/strikeout.</p> <p>If at the end of the 10 days concurrences have been obtained on all major issues in RevCom, please forward the final package (cover memo stating that all comments have been resolved, clean draft directive, the concurrence matrix generated by RevCom, and emails of concurrences received outside of Rev Com) to ME-43 for approval by the Deputy Secretary.</p>
15	Non-concurrences	If at the end of the 10 days concurrence has not been received on all major issues, you will draft and forward electronically to ME-43, a Decision Paper that: (1) has been coordinated with the contending parties, and (2) that fairly states their positions on the issues. ME-43 will utilize the Decision Paper to elevate the unresolved issues quickly for action, then approval.
5	Administrative processing time	Occurs by directives analyst at various times throughout the process.
120	Processing Time	