

Proposal to change FacRep Qualifications, Rev 0.1

Understanding the DOE-STD-1063 is up for revision (or will be shortly) and that 20 years as a FR (8 as a supervisor) has exposed me to many things, I find it is easier to start a discussion if something (anything!) is on paper as opposed to ideas being tossed out without reference.

My time as an FR has shown me that our T&Q process is onerous, time-consuming and possibly not targeted at the actual need, and that some portions of it do not provide the appropriate return on investment. So, to simplify the qualification/requalification process and try to make it more appropriate to the situations we find ourselves in, I propose the following for consideration. I apologize in advance for any personal sentiments or passions that may be included in the following.

1. Core Qualification will consist of successful completion of DOE-STD-1146 and DOE-STD-1151. This will be done once in an FR's career (assuming s/he is continuously in the program; returnees are addressed later). This will provide an FR suitable for duty across the complex. I propose that the FR steering committee (or Human Capital Management training folks) develop a 40-50 question test bank to which all sites will avail themselves to create a 25-30 question written exam to demonstrate acceptable knowledge (at the 80% level) by the candidate.
2. Interim Qualification- delete this qualification, as it is a paperwork drill that adds nothing of value to the program or individual
3. Full Qualification will consist of Core Qualification plus training on Field Element (Federal) and Site (M&O) regulations/policies/practical items identified locally as being necessary to safely & credibly perform the duties of an FR. For example:
 - a. Field Element: Contract specifics, stop work, organization, oversight reporting/documentation, etc. Current EIS, permits, Future Year Site Plans and other documents that put oversight in perspective or establish limits. Performance-oriented items, such as: plan/conduct an assessment, Review/evaluate ORPS report & Corrective Actions, "shadow" an M&O assessment, etc., as desired, would fit in here.
 - b. M&O: CONOPS, WP&C, ISM, Radiation Protection, Safety Management Programs and other program policies; functional training required of employees, such as: HAZWOPER and ladder, LASER, pressure, Beryllium, material handling, and non-ionizing radiation safety; M&O organization and site layout; etc. Note- much of the functional training could be done in parallel with Core Qualification.
 - c. Nuclear/high-hazard safety: the various DSAs (or non-nuclear equivalents) will be reviewed to obtain knowledge and awareness of the critical SSCs, hazards and TSR-level controls implemented at the M&O and how they vary from facility to facility.

The foregoing would provide the candidate with the knowledge s/he would need to go into any facility at a site and provide a junior professional's (apprentice, if you will) level of oversight.

Rather than a written exam, a "controlled discussion" of 2-3 hours would be conducted by a "board", led by at least an Assistant Manager-level incumbent (STSM qualified) and consisting of

2-5 others (other AMs, FR Lead, RP lead, etc). Rather than a traditional (as I see it) Oral Board, where scenarios are posed & the candidate is evaluated on situational responses, this board would engage in (guided) give & take discussion to examine the candidate's understanding of the FR role and his/her higher-level knowledge and integration abilities (5 step process as it applies to oversight).

No Facility Evaluated Walkthrough (FEW) would be conducted, as general field capabilities would have been established during Core Qualification and the "controlled discussion" would identify knowledge issues.

4. Qualification on additional facilities after full qualification: This item would be replaced by "facility assignment" (or other term) that identifies the FR now has 1 or more functionally-specific areas to oversee. For example, at Los Alamos this could be the Plutonium Facility & associated buildings, the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (LANSCe- the 800MeV linear accelerator), Weapons Engineering Tritium Facility (WETF) or the explosives areas, among others. The FR, having a workman's knowledge (enough knowledge to be valuable [or dangerous, as the reader sees it]) across the board, would now take up residence, obtain unescorted access and perform detailed study of that facility's controlling documents and learn its specific operations. A checklist would be provided by the supervisor to assist in what must be done, which would be returned upon completion for records purposes, but no examination would be conducted – the FR should be presumed to be a professional & capable of obtaining the required information.

This would make the FR the "expert" on the particular facility, but ensure s/he can back up any FR at the M&O for most issues.

5. Periodic Requalification: For Core Qualification, I submit a continuing training tracker such a provided by NNSA-Albuquerque would be sufficient. Annually, each person in a TQP (not just FRs) are sent a checklist of TQP-related DOE or NNSA-level documents (Orders, STDs, etc) that have changed, with the requirement that the incumbent obtain training on the subject (classroom, self-study, etc) over the next 9-10 months, obtain supervisor & FTCP agent concurrence and return for the record. For Full Qualification, a competent FR keeps up on the changes at their location just to be able to do the job & maintain credibility with the M&O, while the supervisor can ensure currency on the Field Element's policies. Thus, I propose eliminating this requirement (side note- I've held my PE license since 1987 and haven't had to take the exam again, so why should FRs have to?)
6. Regaining proficiency: After not performing the FR function for a set period of time (for reference only- currently less than 40 hours in a calendar quarter), an FR would have to: update his/her Core Qualification reading (if training trackers were not maintained), retake any lapsed training (HAZWOPER, RadWorker, etc), and review DSAs that had been updated since the last performance of FR duties. Successful completion of the foregoing would be documented in a

memo to file by the FR supervisor/lead after a one-on-one discussion with the returning prodigal. The FR would then be assigned a new location & complete item #4 (above).

I envision initial qualification to continue to take the 12-18 months currently identified in the Standard; with a rough breakdown of: 9 months for Core Qualification, 6 months for Full Qualification, and 3 months for the final location.

Table 1 – FACILITY REPRESENTATIVE QUALIFICATION

QUALIFICATION PROCESS	DOE-STD-1146, General Technical Base Qualification Standard	DOE-STD-1151, FR Functional Area Qualification Standard	Site-/Facility-Specific Competencies	Facility Evaluated Walkthrough Examination	Exam Type	Oral Board
1. Core Qualification	X [Note 1]	X	-	-	Written [Note 2]	-
2. Interim Qualification	X [Note 1]	X	<u>And</u> as determined by the Field Element Manager when an FR provides interim coverage in a facility for which he or she is not fully qualified.			
3. Full Qualification	Core Qualified as Noted in Row 1, <u>and</u> →		X	X	Written [Note 2]	X [Note 4]
4. Qualification on additional facilities after Full Qualification	-	-	X	X	Written and/or Oral check-out [Note 4]	-
5. Periodic Requalification [Note 3]	Items added, and areas of theory or fundamentals, if any, as determined by the Supervisor.		Changes to system, process, and facility documentation, as determined by the Supervisor.	[Note 5]	Written and/or Oral check-out [Notes 4,5]	-
6. To regain proficiency after inactivity as an FR	Any items added	Any items added	Any items added	[Note 5]	Written and/or Oral check-out [Notes 4,5]	-

Notes:

1. Satisfactory completion of the General Technical Base Course on the DOE Online Learning Center may be used.
2. Written exams for Core Qualification and Full Qualification may be combined into a single written exam.
3. The steps in Row 5, Periodic Requalification, may be combined with steps in Rows 4 and/or 6 to meet those qualifications concurrently, if necessary.
4. Oral check-outs and boards are described in more detail in DOE-HDBK-1080, *Guide to Good Practices for Oral Examinations*.
5. A Facility Evaluated Walkthrough Examination may be utilized in place of a Written and/or Oral check-out.