Workforce Analysis Guidance

Process to Determine Facility Representative (FR) Staffing

This staffing analysis methodology builds on the guidance in DOE-STD-1063-2011, *Facility Representatives.* It provides a technical approach to determine the appropriate amount of FR oversight necessary for a facility given its hazard level, operational activity and complexity, and programmatic importance. It also helps ensure the Department has the necessary skills and resources available to carry out its missions and effectively oversee operations at its hazardous facilities.

Methodology

The following elements should be included in each site analysis:

1. A relative ranking of facilities based on hazards or risks present to the public, worker, and/or environment.

2. A method for determining FR coverage (e.g., continual, frequent, occasional, etc.) based on facility categorization and adjusted for other factors identified in DOE-STD-1063-2011 such as facility size, operations complexity, hazards and risks, etc.

3. A determination of FR Full Time Equivalent (FTE) requirements based on coverage assigned and adjusted to address factors considered in Step 2, above.

4. A determination of actual manning based on FR FTE requirements adjusted to account for actual staff time available to support the FR function when competing activities such as collateral duties, leave, training, etc., are considered.

The Facility Representative community developed a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to automate developing the staffing analysis, as well as past examples of implementing this approach: https://powerpedia.energy.gov/w/images/b/b8/Facility_Representative_Staffing_Spreadsheet.xlsx.

Please contact Jeanette Yarrington at (301) 903-7030, jeanette.yarrington@hq.doe.gov, or Earl Hughes at (202) 586-0065, earl.hughes@hq.doe.gov.

Process to Determine Safety System Oversight (SSO) Staffing

Two methods are acceptable for determining SSO staffing for defense nuclear facilities. One is adapted from the FR staffing process in DOE-STD-1063-2011, *Facility Representatives*, modifying the FR staffing process to address the duties and responsibilities of SSOs described in DOE O 426.1 Chg.1, *Federal Technical Capability*, and taking into account safety system characteristics, including system size, condition, and complexity, and other factors deemed pertinent. The other method considers the tasks and products needed for a facility's safety system oversight program and calculates the number of people needed to accomplish the oversight program, essentially a level-of-effort calculation.

For the modified FR process, the analysis includes:

1. A relative ranking of facilities and safety systems based on the hazards or risks presented to the public, the worker, and/or the environment.

2. A method for ranking facilities and safety systems and prioritizing SSO coverage based on hazards or risks, as identified in Step 1 above, and other factors such as facility/system size, operations complexity, hazards and risks, etc.

3. A determination (i.e., an informed management judgment) of SSO FTE requirements based on the priority of coverage, the system activity level, and the identified base coverage levels adjusted to address factors considered in Step 2 above.

4. A determination of actual staffing based on SSO FTE requirements adjusted to account for actual staff time available to support the SSO function when competing activities such as other duties, leave, training, etc., are considered.

For the level-of-effort process, see the description and Microsoft Excel spreadsheets at http://www.energy.gov/ehss/workforce-analysis-and-staffing.

For more information, please contact Jeanette Yarrington at (301) 903-7030, jeanette.yarrington@hq.doe.gov, or Earl Hughes at (202) 586-0065, earl.hughes@hq.doe.gov.

Process to Determine Senior Technical Safety Manager (STSM) Staffing

The nominal STSM Full Time Equivalency (FTE) coverage estimate is derived from specific requirements of the Federal Technical Capability Order. The Field Element Manager and the Deputy Field Element Manager are normally both STSM qualified. Direct line management of the FR, SSO, Safety Management Program (SMP), Safety Basis (SB)/Nuclear Safety Specialist (NSS), and other required Technical Qualification Program (TQP) staff for defense nuclear facilities must also be STSM qualified, as well as key HQs Program Secretarial Office oversight personnel. The required STSMs can typically be determined using the organization chart and organizational roles and responsibilities. The portion of time allotted to STSM duties is generally a function of the number of FR, SSO, SMP, SB/NSS, and other TQP staff reporting through the STSM.

STSM qualification for line management of these key staff members is to ensure that all planning, guidance, direction, assistance, oversight, and evaluation that might reasonably affect safety systems or SMPs is conducted in a manner that ensures systems and the programs remain fully functional and implemented, respectively. The requirement helps ensure these key supervisors and managers are technically knowledgeable and technically competent with regard to the facilities and programs under their span of control, as well as good managers and leaders.

Normally a STSM would be a GS/GM-15, NNSA NN-4, EJ/EK/EN-IV/V, or SES.

Process to Determine Technical Qualification Program (TQP) Staffing

This staffing analysis methodology should be used to determine TQP staffing required to preserve federal safety assurance capabilities for a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) site or Office. The methodology was adapted from the Facility Representative staffing process.

Methodology

The following elements should be considered in each site analysis:

1. A relative ranking of facilities and safety systems based on the hazards or risks presented to the public, the worker, and/or the environment.

2. A method for ranking technical issues scope and prioritizing TQP Position coverage based on hazards or risks, as identified in Step 1 above, and other factors such as facility/system size, operations complexity, hazards and risks, program mission, etc.

3. A determination (i.e., an informed management judgment) of TQP FTE requirements based on the priority of coverage, the technical issue priority and the identified base coverage levels adjusted to address factors considered in Step 2 above.

4. A determination of actual staffing based on TQP FTE requirements adjusted to account for actual staff time available to support the function when competing activities such as collateral duties, leave, training, etc., are considered.

For the purposes of this report the term “critical position” has not been used. The term “federal safety assurance positions” is considered more applicable to meeting DOE’s comprehensive management obligations for safety assurance.