



## Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

June 30, 2005

### 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 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 in order to improve the FR Program.

As of March 31, 2005, 88% of all FRs were fully qualified, up from 86% the previous quarter, and exceeding the DOE goal of 80%. Several of the new FRs hired recently completed qualifications. Eighteen of 27 reporting sites meet the goal for FR qualifications.

Overall FR staffing is at 84% of the levels needed. Sites have been updating their staffing analyses in accordance with guidance promulgated in two recent memoranda: a September 16, 2004, memorandum from Roy Schepens, Chairman, Federal Technical Capability Panel, and an October 13, 2004, memorandum from Jerald S. Paul, Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration. The guidance provides an updated methodology for FR staffing that accounts for FR coverage at hazardous non-nuclear facilities and provides an improved workload analysis. The guidance will be included in an upcoming revision to DOE-STD-1063-2000.

Future FR Program Performance Indicator Quarterly Reports will include a new office, the New Brunswick Laboratory, which is developing a FR program and adding a part-time FR to its staff. Current FR information and past quarterly performance indicator reports are accessible at the FR 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  
June 30, 2005

**Distribution:**

Clay Sell, S-2	Manager, Ames Site Office
Les Novitsky, S-2	Manager, Argonne Site Office
Linton Brooks, NA-1	Manager, Brookhaven Site Office
Jerry Paul, NA-2	Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
James McConnell, NA-2	Manager, Fermi Site Office
Thomas D'Agostino, NA-10	Manager, Idaho Operations Office
Emil Morrow, NA-3.6	Manager, Livermore Site Office
Glenn Podonsky, SP-1	Manager, Los Alamos Site Office
Mike Kilpatrick, OA-1	Manager, Nevada Site Office
Patricia Worthington, OA-40	Manager, New Brunswick Laboratory
Charlie Anderson, EM-2	Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office
Patty Bubar, EM-3.2	Manager, Office of River Protection
Raymond Orbach, SC-1	Manager, Ohio Field Office
Milt Johnson, SC-3	Manager, Pacific Northwest Site Office
William Magwood, NE-1	Manager, Pantex Site Office
	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  
Doug Shoop, RL  
Chris Bosted, ORP  
Roger Christensen, PNSO  
Karl Waltzer, PXSO  
Ed Westbrook, RFPO  
Charles Hansen, SR  
Connie Soden, SSO  
T.J. Jackson, WVDP  
Dan Hoag, YSO

Steering Committee Members:

Jody Eggleston, NNSA Serv Ctr  
Veronica Martinez, SSO  
Earl Burkholder, PXSO  
Carlos Alvarado, PXSO  
John Scott, FSO

Steering Committee Members,  
continued:

Fred Bell, LASO  
Jody Pugh, LASO  
Joanne Lorence, LASO  
Don Galbraith, CBFO  
George Basabilvazo, CBFO  
Karl Moro, CH  
Leif Dietrich, PSO  
Peter Kelley, BHSO  
Eric Turnquest, ASO  
Joe Drago, NBL  
Mike Haben, NE-ID  
Bob Seal, NE-ID  
Tim Henderson, NSO  
Henry Rio, LSO  
Michael Jordan, OH  
David Cook, WVDP  
Bob Everson, FCP  
Christopher White, MCP  
Tyrone Harris, OR  
Rick Daniels, OR

Steering Committee Members,  
continued:

Tim Noe, OR  
Jeff Carlson, PNSO  
Jeff Parkin, RFPO  
Rob Hastings, RL  
John Trevino, RL  
Larry Hinson, SRS  
John Barnes, SRS  
Phil Giles, SRS  
Steve Wellbaum, YSO  
  
Craig Scott, EM  
Emil Morrow, NA  
Ed Tourigny, NE  
Craig West, ME  
Casimiro Izquierdo, FE  
Barry Parks, SC

## ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2005)

Field or Ops Office	Staffing Analysis	FTE Level	Actual Staffing	% Staffing	Attrition	% Core Qualified	% Fully Qualified	% Field Time *	% Oversight Time **
Carlsbad	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	60	65
Idaho (EM)	12.5	9	9	72	0	100	100	35	72
Oak Ridge (EM)	20	14	14	70	0	93	93	43	63
OH/Fernald	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	47	80
OH/Miamisburg	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	46	72
OH/West Valley	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	20	75
Portsmouth/Paducah	4	4	4	100	0	100	100	34	61
Richland	19	19	19	100	0	89	89	44	75
River Protection	14	14	14	100	0	86	86	58	80
Rocky Flats	4	4	8	200	0	100	100	65	75
Savannah River	30	28	28	93	0	100	100	49	78
<b>EM Totals</b>	<b>114.5</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % 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 Idaho (EM), FRs conducted focused training on Hoisting & Rigging, Industrial Safety, and Construction Safety. The time in the field dropped slightly as a result, but is expected to increase next quarter. Also, RWMC FRs served as members of the Central Characterization Project Line Management Assessment to verify the contractor's readiness to safely commence waste characterization activities. RWMC FRs also performed intensive safety oversight (including backshift coverage) of the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project resumption of WIPP shipments and acceleration of all aspects of facility operation to meet an Idaho Settlement Agreement milestone date.
- At Oak Ridge (EM), FRs focused on Hoisting & Lifting programs at Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC and identified some issues with crane operator qualifications.
- At OH/Miamisburg, an FR verified that corrective actions were completed in response to a near miss where a jackhammer rolled over and cut a 480V electrical cord. Corrective actions included revising the work plan, assigning designated spotters, and adding respiratory protection requirement. Also, FRs observed two instances of drums being moved without being strapped down. The FR ensured immediate corrective actions were taken to prevent future occurrences.
- At OH/West Valley, both FRs participated on several surveillances during this period to include the following:
  - Combustions loading and ignition sources
  - ORPS categorization
  - Independent Review Team Investigation of Unplanned Radiological Dose to Facility Workers
  - Resumption of Operations.
- At Richland, FRs widely used the operational awareness database entering 650 entries identifying 350 issues. Also, FRs led and participated in an assessment that investigated BHI remediation planning and execution as a result of a significant worker plutonium uptake at the 618-2 burial ground. Significant issues were identified in hazard identification, hazard controls, radiological controls, and Authorization Basis controls.
- At River Protection, FRs performed a series of reviews aimed at improving Integrated Safety Management. As a result of FR feedback on work package planning and work performance, improvements have been noted in worker responses to increasing radiation or contamination levels while performing high risk work activities. This effort to change radiological work planning and engage all workers in understanding the new requirements for action limits, safe condition limits, and void limits has significantly improved the timeliness and correct response to abnormal or unplanned radiological conditions.
- At Savannah River, an FR identified deficiencies in the contractor's laser inventory and safety audit program, which led to a laser system stand down until a compliance assessment was completed and reviewed by line management.

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2005)

<u>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>
Livermore	11	9	9	82	0	78	78	48	65
Los Alamos	19	15	10	53	0	90	60	34	60
Nevada	9	9	7	78	1	100	71	33	51
Pantex	10	8	8	80	0	88	75	29	76
Sandia	11	8	8	73	0	100	63	32	61
Savannah River	4	3	3	75	0	67	67	64	73
Y-12	12	10	8	67	1	100	100	44	68
<b>NNSA Totals</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % 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 Los Alamos, an FR served on a joint LASO/LANL team conducting facility reviews and status verifications of preparations to conduct a Hydrodynamic Test at the Dual Axis Hydrodynamic Radiographic Test (DARHT) facility. An issue identified by the FR was the failure of the contractor to comply with requirements pertaining to access control to Very High Radiation Areas. The test was successfully executed 1 April 2005. Also, in preparation for the Pu-238 Scrap Recovery Line DOE Readiness Assessment an FR is working with the facility in closure of contractor pre- and post-start findings. The FR is working with the facility to ensure adequacy of the Start Up Notification Report (SNR), Plan of Action (POA), and Implementation Plan (IP).
- At Sandia, an FR has been providing oversight to the planned accelerator, Radiographic Integrated Test Stand, which will become operational at the end of this fiscal year. Also, the FR assigned to the Annular Core Research Reactor completed >80% of ACRR Qualification Card requirements during this quarter. Anticipate full ACRR FR Qualification during the 2nd quarter of CY05.
- At Y-12, an FR served as the Conduct of Operations assessor for a "For Cause Radiation Protection Appraisal" at another site (LLNL). His contribution was recognized as extremely valuable to the team and will help guide the site in improving their radiation protection program. Also, following extensive efforts by an FR to raise awareness of criticality safety at his facility, facility personnel recognized that some nuclear materials had not been stored or characterized in a manner to ensure compliance with their respective criticality safety limits. This developed into a site-wide issue in which several FRs drove a commitment by the contractor to completely overhaul and modernize the process.
- At Savannah River, FRs conducted 24 hour coverage of tritium operations during Deliberate Operations and completed a 100% Validation of WSRC Corrective Actions from resulting from the conduct of operations issues identified in early 2005. Also, FRs supported the review of the TEF SAR and the verified the readiness of WSRC to introduce inert gasses into TEF.

## OFFICE OF SCIENCE SITES

**Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2005)**

<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	28	85
Argonne	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	24	82
Brookhaven	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	38	88
Fermi	2	2	2	100	0	100	50	35	66
Oak Ridge (SC)	2	2	1	50	0	50	50	50	60
Pacific Northwest	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	42	79
Princeton	0.5	0.5	0.5	100	0	100	100	43	69
<b>SC Site Totals</b>	18.5	18.5	17.5	<b>95</b>	0	97	<b>91</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % 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, two FRs participated in the contractor planning efforts and then observed the successful encapsulation of 16 Pu-Be sources from a BNL medical facility for a planned shipment offsite.
- At Fermi, FRs continued to support the technical review of the NuMI safety assessment document (SAD) and the activities associated with the NuMI readiness review. Also, FRs participated in a review of potential safety impacts of the proposed BTeV Project.
- At Pacific Northwest, an FR surveillance identified an inability of the prime contractor to demonstrate knowledge that appropriate contact clauses were flowed down to subcontracts. The prime contractor could not provide evidence of formal agreement among subcontractors on use of construction safety and health plans. Also, an FR surveillance identified significant issues in the PNNL Lockout/Tagout program definitions and training. Formal contractor response was required.

## OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (1QCY2005)

<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>
Idaho (NE)	11.5	11	8	70	1	100	100	35	62
Oak Ridge (NE)	5	5	5	100	0	67	50	40	52
<b>NE Totals</b>	16.5	16	13	<b>79</b>	1	87	<b>81</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % 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 Idaho, the FRs at the Materials and Fuels Complex participated in the reviews of facility specific Documented Safety Analyses (DSA) during the new contractor transition. These reviews, along with additional reviews of ongoing activities, contributed to a Vulnerability Assessment (VA) issued by NE-ID. This VA ultimately tasked the contractor to develop a long-term plan to upgrade MFC's DSAs. Interim action was implemented by the contractor in those areas where physical safety of the facility, worker, and/or public was in question.
- At Idaho, a FR at the Reactor Technology Complex identified that the laboratories had erroneously excluded materials in 6M drums from the facility radioactive material inventory, and had therefore exceeded the Hazard Category 3 threshold limits without appropriate safety basis documentation. Laboratory personnel continued to receive radioactive materials even after this issue was raised. DOE and contractor management stopped further receipts and worked toward resolution of the safety basis issues.