

00-0001304

Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

June 26, 2000

RECEIVED
00 JUN 27 PM 4:20
DNF SAFETY BOARD

The Honorable John T. Conway
Chairman
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
625 Indiana Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Please find enclosed eight (8) copies of the Workshop Results Summary for the DOE Facility Representatives Annual Workshop that was held on May 16-18, 2000. This year's workshop was a real success. The Department appreciates the participation of Mr. Mark Sautman of your staff. His remarks were cogent and well received.

The Department continues to pursue a variety of actions aimed at sustaining and enhancing the effectiveness of the Facility Representatives in contributing to safe operations at DOE facilities. The Department remains open to any feedback or suggestions from the Board on this program. If you have any questions concerning the enclosed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or your staff may contact Mr. Joe Arango, the Department's Facility Representative Program Manager, at 202/586-7599.

Sincerely,

Mark B. Whitaker
Departmental Representative
to the Defense Nuclear Facilities
Safety Board

Enclosure



**DOE FACILITY REPRESENTATIVE
ANNUAL WORKSHOP**

WORKSHOP RESULTS SUMMARY



RECEIVED
00 JUN 27 PM 4:20
DNF SAFETY BOARD

MAY 16-18, 2000




Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

June 15, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: 
Joseph Arango, Program Manager
DOE Facility Representative Program (S-3.1)

SUBJECT: Facility Representative Annual Workshop

The DOE Facility Representative Annual Workshop was held in Las Vegas from May 16 - 18, 2000. The purpose of the workshop is to promote sharing lessons learned from Facility Representative Programs across the complex, and to foster the growth of the Facility Representative community. At the workshop, the 1999 Facility Representative of the Year Award was presented to Mr. Benton J. Harp from the DOE Office of River Protection. A total of 88 DOE personnel attended, representing almost every major program and field office.

The workshop achieved its objectives. The attached workshop summary provides the following information:

- Workshop Agenda and Attendees
- Summary of Achievements of the 1999 Facility Representative of the Year Nominees and Winner
- Summaries and Action Items from the Workshop Breakout Sessions, and
- Survey Feedback from Participants of the Workshop.

This year's workshop was a real success; we received many positive comments from participants who found the workshop to be valuable. Based on participant feedback, we have begun planning next year's workshop for the May timeframe in Las Vegas. Please call me at (202) 586-7599 if you have any questions or comments regarding the results of this workshop.

Attachment

RECEIVED
JUN 27 PM 4:20
ENERGY BOARD



J. Arango to Distribution
June 15, 2000

Distribution:

T. Gioconda, DP-1
D. Reicher, EE-1
D. Michaels, EH-1
C. Huntoon, EM-1
R. Gee, FE-1
W. Magwood, NE-1
I. Itkin, RW-1
J. Decker, SC-1

R. Glass, DOE-AL (Albuquerque Operations Office)
R. San Martin, DOE-CH (Chicago Operations Office)
B. Cook, DOE-ID (Idaho Operations Office)
K. Carlson, DOE-NV (Nevada Operations Office)
L. Dever, DOE-OR (Oak Ridge Operations Office)
C. Yuan-Soo Hoo, DOE-OAK (Oakland Operations Office)
S. Brechbill, DOE-OH (Ohio Operations Office)
K. Klein, DOE-RL (Richland Operations Office)
R. French, DOE-ORP (Office of River Protection)
B. Mazurowski, DOE-RF (Rocky Flats Field Office)
G. Rudy, DOE-SR (Savannah River Operations Office)

E. Livingston, OSE
B. Costner, OSE
T. J. Glauthier, S-2
M. Hurd, S-2
M. Whitaker, S-3.1
D. Stadler, EH-2

Facility Representative Sponsors
Facility Representative Steering Committee
Workshop Attendees

Facility Representative Workshop Results Summary

I. Workshop Objectives

The DOE Facility Representative Annual Workshop was held in Las Vegas from May 16 - 18, 2000. The purpose of the workshop is to promote sharing lessons learned from Facility Representative Programs across the complex, and to foster the growth of the Facility Representative community.

II. Workshop Design

A. Workshop Attendees

Field and program office managers were requested to provide representatives to this workshop. A total of 88 DOE personnel attended, representing almost every major program and field office. Twenty-five percent of DOE's Facility Representatives attended this year's workshop; the initial goal for next year's attendance is fifty percent. Facility Representatives from the Los Alamos and Kirtland Area Offices had to cancel their attendance due to a fire near the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Appendix A provides a complete list of the workshop attendees and a summary of the percentage of Facility Representative attendees per operations office.

B. Workshop Agenda

The workshop agenda included a combination of joint sessions, panel discussions, and breakout sessions. Appendix B provides the expanded workshop agenda and descriptions of the afternoon breakout sessions.

C. Workshop Presentation Materials

Workshop presentation materials have been made available on the Facility Representatives Web Site at <http://dr.tis.doe.gov/facrep>. Over the next month, plans are to migrate this site to a new location at <http://facrep.doe.gov>.

III. Workshop Results

A. 1999 Facility Representative of the Year Nominees and Winner

At the workshop, the 1999 Facility Representative of the Year Award was presented to Mr. Benton J. Harp from the DOE Office of River Protection. There were many fine nominations for this year's award. Appendix C provides a summary of the achievements of this year's nominees and winner. This summary may be useful for other Facility Representatives to learn about the level of performance that merits this recognition.

B. Workshop General Sessions and Panel Discussions - Summary

Mr. Jerry Lyle from the Idaho Operations Office provided the key-note address and set an appropriate tone for the workshop by urging all Facility Representatives to have a questioning attitude especially when something does not “feel” right in the operations. General session topics discussed at the workshop covered a broad spectrum including program goals, readiness reviews, lessons learned, integrated safety management, contract performance indicators, technical capability, leadership, and career progression. Each of the three days included a panel discussion that allowed for questions and answers and some lively discussion on career progression, management expectations, and effective facility oversight.

C. Workshop Breakout Sessions - Summary and Action Items

The facilitator of each workshop breakout session was requested to provide a summary of breakout session discussions and actions. Appendix D provides these summaries and action items for each workshop breakout session.

D. Summary of Participant Surveys

Workshop participants were requested to complete a survey regarding the workshop. Appendix E provides the survey results.

Appendix A
2000 Annual Facility Representative Workshop
ATTENDANCE
May 16 - 18, 2000

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Fac. Rep./Facility	Telephone	E-Mail
Debra	Abraham	S-3.1/VISTA	HQ	202-586-1706	debra.abraham@eh.doe.gov
Josephine	Ahsam	S-3.1/VISTA	HQ	202-586-5128	josephine.ahsam@eh.doe.gov
Ronnie	Alderson	DOE	FAC REP / NV	702-295-0177	alderson@nv.doe.gov
Joe	Arango	S-3.1	FAC REP PROG. MGR.	202-586-7599	joseph.arango@hq.doe.gov
Cliff	Ashley	DOE-RL	FAC REP / RL	509-376-1056	clifford_a_ashley@rl.gov
Greg	Bazzell	PADUCAH	FAC REP / PAD	270-441-6808	bazzellga@oro.doe.gov
Brian	Biro	DOE, RICHLAND	FAC REP / HAN	509-376-7660	babiro@owt.com
Jose	Blanco	DOE-SR	FAC REP / AMHLW	803-208-0092	jose.blanco@srs.gov
Eugenia	Boyle	EH-33	HQ	301-903-3393	eugenia.boyle@eh.doe.gov
Teresa	Brant	DOE-SR	FAC REP / SR	803-208-2644	tbrant@srs.gov
Nat	Brown	DOE-OH	FAC REP SPONSOR / OH	937-865-5050	nat.brown@ohio.doe.gov
William (Bill)	Brumley	DOE	OR	865-576-0752	brumleywj@oro.doe.gov
Briant	Charboneau	DOE-RL	FAC REP /RL / HAN	509-373-6137	briant_L_Charboneau@rl.gov
David	Compton	S-3.1/VISTA	HQ	202-586-1034	david.compton@hq.doe.gov
David	Cook	DOE-OH	FAC REP / WV	716-942-4469	dcook@wv.doe.gov
Doug	Dearolph	DOE-SR	SR	803-725-9607	dj.dearolph@srs.gov
Jack	Dennis	AMARILLO	FAC REP / PTX	806-477-3176	jdennis@pantex.com
Joseph	Desormeau	DOE-OH	FAC REP / FERN	513-648-3047	joe.desormeau@fernald.gov
Leah	Dever	ORO	OR	865-576-4444	deverl@oro.doe.gov
Maria	Dikeakos	DOE-CH	FAC REP / BNL	631-344-3950	dikeakos@bnl.gov
Rick	Dion	DOE/RF	FAC REP / RF	303-966-9697	richard.dion@rfets.gov
Larry	Earley	DOE-RL	FAC REP / RL	509-373-9309	Larry_D_Earley@rl.gov
Charles	Eberle	DOE-OR	FAC REP / ETTP	865-241-6679	eberlecrjr@oro.doe.gov
Jody	Eggleston	ESHD	AL	505-845-5623	jeggleston@doaal.gov
Ruston	Eleogram	DOE/NV	FAC REP / NV	702-295-7497	eleogram@nv.doe.gov
Daniel	Emch	FACILITY ASSES.	FAC REP / RFFO	303-966-7382	daniel.emch@rfets.gov
John	Evans	S-3.1/VISTA	HQ	202-586-3685	john.evans@eh.doe.gov
Don	Galbraith	DOE-CAO WIPP	FAC REP / WIPP	505-234-8365	galbrad@wipp.carlsbad.nm.us
Michael	Glasman	ORO	FAC REP / Y-12	865-574-3499	glasmanmm@oro.doe.gov
Roger	Gordon	DOE-RL	FAC REP / HAN	509-372-2139	roger_m_gordon@rl.gov
Benton	Harp	DOE-ORP	FAC REP / HAN	509-376-1462	benton_j_ben_harp@rl.gov

Appendix A
2000 Annual Facility Representative Workshop
ATTENDANCE
May 16 - 18, 2000

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Fac. Rep./Facility	Telephone	E-Mail
Tyrone	Harris	DOE/ORO	OR	865-576-0953	harrist@oro.doe.gov
Stacy	Helmann	DOE-RL	HAN	509-373-3841	helmann_stacy_l@doe.rl.gov
Timothy	Henderson	NNSA	FAC REP / LLNL	925-422-6305	tim.henderson@oak.doe.gov
Fred	Holbrook	MEMP	FAC REP / OH	937-865-4677	fred.holbrook@ohio.doe.gov
Mark	Holzmer	DOE-CH	ANL-W	208-533-7446	mark.holzmer@anlw.anl.gov
Charles	Hughey	US NRC	BWX TECHNOLOGIES	804-847-7343	cah2@nrc.gov
JJ	Hynes	MATERIAL STAB	FAC REP / SR	803-208-2645	jj.hynes@srs.gov
Kenneth	Ivey	OPS MGMT. DIV	OR	865-574-0277	iveykd@oro.doe.gov
Brian	Jones	DOE/AEO	FAC REP / PTX	806-477-5200	bjones@pantex.com
Stan	Keach	DOE/AL HRTD	KAO	505-845-4050	skeach@doeal.gov
Joseph	King	DP-45	GTN, MD	301-903-6150	joseph.king@dp.doe.gov
Larry	Kirkman	DOE	FAC REP SPONSOR / AL	505-845-6121	lkirkman@doeal.gov
PW	Kozak	DOE-SRS	FAC REP / SRS	803-208-1977	peter.kozak@srs.gov
Chip	Lagdon	EH-22	GTN, MD	301-903-4218	chip.lagdon@eh.doe.gov
John	Langendorf	DOE/NV	FAC REP / NTS	702-295-7487	langendorf@nv.doe.gov
Jack	Lenten	FAC ASSESS	FAC REP / RFFO	303-966-2107	jack.lenten@rfets.doe.gov
Jerry	Lyle	DOE	ID	208-526-1148	lylejl@id.doe.gov
Steve	McDuffie	DOE-RL	FAC REP / HAN	509-373-6766	stephen_m_mcduffie@rl.gov
Lafayette	McMorris	WSI	NV	702-295-7901	mcmorris@nv.doe.gov
Jerry	McNew	IDAHO	FAC REP / INEEL	208-526-5108	mcnewjl@id.doe.gov
Mike	Moore	EH-73	HQ	202-586-0712	michael.moore@eh.doe.gov
Kris	Morris	EM-5	HQ	202-586-7610	kristine.morris@em.doe.gov
Peter	Munding	DOE NEVADA	FAC REP / NV	702-295-1008	munding@nv.doe.gov
Scott	Nicholson	HLW	FAC REP / SR	803-208-0097	scott.nicholson@srs.gov
Delmar	Noyes	FPA	RF	303-966-3001	delmar.noyes@rfets.gov
Jeffry	Parkin	FAC ASSESS	FAC REP / RFFO	303-966-3525	jeffry55@aol.com
Fred	Penrod	DOE/NV	FAC REP / NV	702-295-1564	penrod@nv.doe.gov
Lloyd	Piper	DOE	FAC REP SPONSOR / RL	509-376-6278	lloyd_l_piper@rl.gov
Robert	Poe	ORO	FAC REP SPONSOR / ORO	865-576-0891	poerw@oro.doe.gov
Ken	Powers	DOE/NV	NV	702-295-3211	powers@doe.nv.gov
Don	Rack	RFFO	FAC REP / RFETS	303-966-2024	don.rack@rfets.gov

Appendix A
2000 Annual Facility Representative Workshop
ATTENDANCE
May 16 - 18, 2000

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Fac. Rep./Facility	Telephone	E-Mail
Jeffry	Roberson	DP-45	HQ	301-903-8026	jeffry.roberson@ns.doe.gov
Tom	Rollow	ES&H	HQ	202-586-7449	tom.rollow@eh.doe.gov
David	Roth	MA-3	HQ	202-426-1323	david.roth@hq.doe.gov
Mark	Sautman	DNFSB	HAN	509-373-0101	marks@dnfsb.gov
Roy	Schepens	SRS	FAC REP SPONSOR / SR	803-208-6072	roy.schepens@srs.gov
John	Scott	DOE	FAC REP / CH /FERMILAB	630-840-2250	john.scott@ch.doe.gov
Robert	Seal	ID	FAC REP / INEEL	208-533-4562	sealre@id.doe.gov
Zack	Smith	DOE	SR	803-332-3816	zack.smith@srs.gov
Joe	Sondag	RFFO	FAC REP / RFETS	303-966-7980	joe.sondag@rfets.gov
Robert (Bob)	Stallman	DOE	FAC REP SPONSOR / ID	208-526-1995	stallmrm@id.doe.gov
Jefferson	Tedrow	DOE/AAO	FAC REP / AAO	806-477-3174	jtrow@pantex.doe.gov
Richard	Tom	CH/ARG-W	FAC REP / ANL-W	208-533-7734	richard.tom@anlw.anl.gov
Edmond	Tourigny	NUC FAC	GTN, MD	301-903-3679	edmond.tourigny@hq.doe.gov
James	Tower	MA-53	HQ	202-586-4294	james.tower@hq.doe.gov
Scott	Traeger	SITE MGMNT	FAC REP / NV	702-295-5366	traeger@nv.doe.gov
Glyn	Trenchard	DOE - ORP	FAC REP / HAN	509-373-4016	glyn_d_trenchard@rl.gov
John	Trevino	DOE-RL	FAC REP / RL	509-372-4220	john_e_trevino@rl.gov
Sandy	Trine	DOE-RL	FAC REP / HAN	509-372-2346	sandra_L_Trine@rl.gov
Heather	Trumble	CARLSBAD	FAC REP / WIPP	505-234-8127	trumbh@wipp.carlsbad.nm.us
Eric	Turnquest	DOE-CH	FAC REP / ANL-E	630-252-9812	eric.turnquest@ch.doe.gov
Steve	Veitenheimer	DOE-RL	HAN	509-373-9725	s_j_steve_veitenheimer@rl.gov
Moe	Villanueva	AMEP	FAC REP / SRS	803-952-2250	moses.villanueva@srs.gov
Ken	Wade	ORP	FAC REP / HAN/ORP	509-373-9961	kenneth_g_wade@rl.gov
Michael	Weis	RFFO	FAC REP SPONSOR / RFFO	303-966-4526	mike.weis@rfets.gov
Steve	Wellbaum	NADP-67	FAC REP / Y-12	865-574-3963	wellbaumse@oro.doe.gov
Ed	Westbrook	FAC ASSESS	FAC REP / RFETS	303-966-7074	ewestbrook@rfets.gov
Mark	Whitaker	S-3.1	HQ	202-586-3887	mark.whitaker@eh.doe.gov
Jeffrey	Williams	DOE-ID	/FAC REP / RWMC	208-526-5240	williaja@inel.gov
Brandon	Williamson	DOE-ORP	FAC REP / HAN	509-373-2649	brandon_l_williamson@rl.gov
Ted	Wyka	SMIT	HQ	202-586-2979	theodore.wyka@eh.doe.gov

Appendix A

Percentage of Facility Representatives at the Workshop from Each Office

Ops Office	Total Number of FR	Number of FR at Workshop	Percentage
NV	9	6	67%
RP	7	4	57%
RF	15	7	47%
RL	23	8	35%
CH	16	4	25%
OH	13	3	23%
ID	16	3	19%
AL	27	5	19%
SR	40	6	15%
OR	27	4	15%
OAK	9	1	11%
Totals	202	51	25%

Number of Facility Rep Sponsors at Workshop: 7 out of 11 = 64%

Number of Facility Rep Steering Committee Members at Workshop: 13 out of 34 = 38%

APPENDIX B

FACILITY REPRESENTATIVES ANNUAL WORKSHOP MAY 16-18, 2000

EXPANDED AGENDA

Day 1: Tuesday, May 16, 2000

Theme: Sustaining the Success of the Facility Representative Program

- 8:00 a.m. Opening Remarks - Joe Arango, Facility Representative Program Manager
- Joe Arango works at DOE Headquarters in the Office of the Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. He has been the Facility Representative Program Manager since October 1999.*
- 8:05 a.m. Welcome - Kenneth W. Powers, Deputy Manager Nevada Operations Office
- This is the fourth year the Nevada Operations Office has hosted the Workshop. As Deputy Manager, Kenneth Powers is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the 1,350-square-mile Nevada Test Site located 65 miles northwest of Las Vegas. He also serves as Contracting Officer for DOE/NV's largest contracts, which includes Bechtel Nevada.*
- 8:15 a.m. Deputy Secretary Remarks - T. J. Glauthier, Deputy Secretary of Energy
- Deputy Secretary Glauthier will provide videotaped remarks for the Facility Representatives Workshop attendees.*
- 8:30 a.m. Keynote Address - Jerry Lyle, Idaho Operations Office, EM-1 Director for Site Operations (12/99-3/00)
- Jerry Lyle is the Assistant Manager for Environmental Management at the Idaho Operations Office. From December 1999 to March 2000 he served at DOE Headquarters as Director of Site Operations on the staff of the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.*
- 9:00 a.m. Facility Representative of the Year Presentation - Mark B. Whitaker, Departmental Representative
- Mark B. Whitaker, Jr. is the Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and will be presenting the Facility Representative of the Year Award. This year's award winner was chosen by a selection panel, which consisted of DOE Headquarters Program Office and Field Office personnel. All 11 nominees were very strong candidates and are commended for their selection.*
- 9:30 a.m. Break
- 9:50 a.m. Program Results and Goals - Joe Arango, Facility Representative Program Manager
- Joe will provide a status of the Facility Representative Program and will outline goals and objectives for the program.*
- 10:10 a.m. Management Panel/Questions and Answers (Joe Arango, Jerry Lyle, Bill Brumley, Mark Whitaker, Lloyd Piper, Roy Schepens)

The Management Panel will field questions from the workshop attendees. The Panel consists of senior managers from around DOE. In addition to those who already gave presentations this morning are Bill Brumley, Assistant Manager for Defense Programs at the Oak Ridge Operations Office, Lloyd Piper Administrator, Office of Performance Evaluation at the Richland Operations Office, and Roy Schepens, Assistant Manager for High-Level Waste at the Savannah River Operations Office.

11:30 a.m. Readiness Reviews - Jeff Roberson, Defense Programs

Jeff Roberson is a member of the Office of Technical Support, Defense Programs, at DOE Headquarters. He has participated in and led numerous Operational Readiness Reviews and Readiness Assessments. He also led the Headquarters team for the recent complex-wide review of the implementation of DOE Order 425.1A, Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities.

12:00 noon Lunch

Breakout Sessions: (for details see Appendix B, Attachment 1, "Afternoon Breakout Sessions")

<u>Time</u>	<u>Track A</u>	<u>Track B</u>
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Facility Representative Standard/Roles and Responsibilities (David Compton - S-3.1)	Facility Representative Sponsor Meeting (Joe Arango)
3:00 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	Operational Readiness Reviews/Readiness Assessments (Jeff Roberson - DP)	Facility Representative Steering Committee Meeting (Joe Arango)
4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.	Training and Requalification (Bob Seal - ID)	Recruiting, Hiring, Retaining High Quality Technical Staff (David Roth - MA-3)

Day 2: Wednesday, May 17, 2000

Theme: Sharing Lessons Learned for Increased Effectiveness

- 8:00 a.m. Lessons Learned Sharing - Joe Arango, Facility Representative Program Manager
Joe will provide an overview of the Day 2 topics.
- 8:05 a.m. Major Mishaps/Lessons Learned - Chip Lagdon, Office for Oversight
Chip Lagdon is an engineer for the Office for Oversight at DOE Headquarters. He will provide a summary of recent accident investigations and their lessons learned.
- 8:45 a.m. Integrated Safety Management/Work Planning - Ted Wyka, Director, Safety Management Implementation Team
Ted Wyka has been the Director of the SMIT since July 1999. He will discuss field and headquarters actions for sustaining Integrated Safety Management.
- 9:15 a.m. New DOE Lessons Learned Standard Rollout - Tom Rollow, Director, Operating Experience, Analysis & Feedback
Tom Rollow has been the Director of the Office of Operating Experience, Analysis & Feedback at DOE Headquarters for 5 years. He will discuss elements of the recently revised DOE-STD-7501-99, The DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Program.
- 9:45 a.m. Break
- 10:00 a.m. Making Your Observations Count/Leading Indicators - Mike Weis, Rocky Flats Field Office
Mike Weis is the Acting Deputy Manager at the Rocky Flats Field Office. He will discuss leading indicators being used under the new Rocky Flats closure contract.
- 10:45 a.m. Facility Representative Panel/Questions and Answers: Ben Harp {Facility Representative of the Year 1999}; Michael Glasman {Facility Representative of the Year 1998}; Ken Ivey {DOE Oak Ridge}; Mark Sautman {DNFSB Site Representative}, Charlie Hughey {NRC Resident})
The panel members will provide some introductory comments regarding on-site safety and operations oversight and then will answer questions from the Workshop attendees. In addition to the Facility Representatives of the Year for 1998 and 1999, joining the panel will be Ken Ivey, a former Facility Representative at Oak Ridge Y-12, Mark Sautman, DNFSB Site Representative at Hanford, and Charlie Hughey, NRC Resident Inspector at Lynchburg, Virginia.
- 12:00 noon Lunch

Breakout Sessions: (for details see Appendix B, Attachment 1, "Afternoon Breakout Sessions")

<u>Time</u>	<u>Track A</u>	<u>Track B</u>
1:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m	Reporting and Feedback - Logkeeping, Performance Indicators (Richard Tom - ANL-W)	ORPS - Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (Eugenia Boyle - EH-33)
3:00 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	Field Observations Trending/Field Assessment Oversight (Delmar Noyes -RFFO)	Own Your ORPS Destiny (Stan Keach - KAO)
4:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.	FR Program at Richland (Stacy Helmann - RL)	Contract Management (Jim Tower - MA-5 & Mike Moore - EH-73)

Day 3: Thursday, May 18, 2000

Theme: Developing Leaders for Today and Tomorrow

8:00 a.m. Leadership Development - Joe Arango, Facility Representative Program Manager

Joe Arango will provide an overview of the Day 3 topics.

8:15 a.m. Technical Capability and Leadership - Roy Schepens, Savannah River Operations Office

Roy Schepens is the Assistant Manager for High-Level Waste at Savannah River, a position he has held since January 1999. He is also the Savannah River Facility Representative Program Sponsor and agent on the Federal Technical Capabilities Panel. Roy will share a senior manager's perspective on technical capability, leadership, and career development.

8:45 a.m. Career Progression - Mark Holzmer, Argonne National Laboratory - West and Zack Smith, Savannah River Site

Mark Holzmer and Zack Smith, two former Facility Representatives, will discuss their experiences and thoughts, and provide some practical advice on career progression. Mark is the Team Leader at Argonne West and Zack is the Director of the Laboratory Research Division at Savannah River.

9:30 a.m. Abilene Paradox Video/De-brief

The theme of the Abilene Paradox video is that in order to effectively manage group agreement, each individual must stand up and speak his/her views. A brief discussion will follow.

10:15 a.m. Break

10:35 a.m. Leadership Development Panel - Making Yourself Heard, Making Yourself Effective (Joe King, Roy Schepens, Zack Smith, Doug Dearolph, Scott Traeger, and Steve Fellows {Nevada Test Site Device Assembly Facility Deputy Manager}).

Leading the Panel discussions will be Joe King from the Office of Technical Support in Defense Programs at DOE Headquarters. Joining him will be Doug Dearolph from the Engineering and Analysis Division at Savannah River Operations Office, Scott Traeger, a Facility Representative currently on a detail assignment at Nevada Operations Office, and Steve Fellows, Deputy Manager at the Device Assembly Facility at the Nevada Test Site.

12:00 noon Lunch

1:00 p.m. Tour at Nevada Site

Meet in the lobby of the Embassy Suites Hotel at 1:00 p.m.

6:00 p.m. Return to Hotel

APPENDIX B
(Attachment 1)

FACILITY REPRESENTATIVES
ANNUAL WORKSHOP
MAY 16-18, 2000

AFTERNOON BREAKOUT SESSIONS

DAY 1: TUESDAY MAY 16, 2000

TIME

TRACK A

TRACK B

1:30 P.M. - 2:45 P.M. **Facility Representative Standard/Roles and Responsibilities (David Compton - S-3.1)**

During the recent revision of the Facility Representative standard, roles, responsibilities, and authorities for all levels of management involved in the Facility Representative program were added. These will be discussed, as well as their relationship to DOE M 411.1-1A, DOE Safety Management Functions, Responsibilities, and Authorities.

3:00 P.M. - 4:15 P.M. **Operational Readiness Reviews/Readiness Assessments (Jeff Roberson - DP)**

There will be a brief review of the ORR/RA implementation review highlighting some of the issues identified at specific sites. The purpose of the resulting Order and Standard changes will be described regarding how it is hoped that these issues will be addressed. Feedback will then be solicited from the participants regarding 1) their perspectives on the roadblocks to successful implementation of the requirements, 2) what might be done to eliminate or at least reduce these roadblocks, and 3) any success stories that might benefit the audience as a whole.

4:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M. **Training and Requalification (Bob Seal - ID)**

The purpose of the Training and Qualification Breakout Session is to learn from the experience of others by sharing information concerning three elements of the Facility Representative Training and Qualification Program which are required by DOE-STD-1063-2000; Requalification, Proficiency, and Continuing Training. Information pertaining to these three elements, including strengths, weaknesses, and planned improvements, has been gathered from DOE sites across the DOE Complex. This information will be provided to workshop attendees for their review and discussion during the breakout session.

Facility Representative Sponsor Meeting (Joe Arango)

The eleven Facility Representative Program Sponsors from the field offices will meet to discuss various topics related to the Department's strategic direction for the Program. A separate agenda has been prepared for this meeting. This session is intended only for the Program Sponsors, Office Managers, and Assistant Managers.

Facility Representative Steering Committee Meeting (Joe Arango)

The normal monthly Steering Committee meeting will be held with the field office and headquarters representatives. A separate agenda has been prepared for this meeting. Steering Committee members not in attendance at the Workshop can either have a representative attend this meeting for them or call in by phone link.

Recruiting, Hiring, Retaining High Quality Technical Staff (David Roth - MA-3)

The recruiting, hiring and retention of high quality technical staff are goals of the Department's Federal Technical Capability Program (FTCP). This program carries on the activities that were originally devised in response to Defense Board Recommendation 93-3 (closed in November 1999). An action plan governs the annual activities designed to maintain the technical capabilities of the federal workforce. The Panel that directs the coordination of the FTCP is linked to the Facility Representative program and the Panels activities directly influence the recruiting, hiring and retention of Facility Representatives.

DAY 2: WEDNESDAY MAY 17, 2000

TIME

TRACK A

TRACK B

1:30 P.M. - 2:45 P.M. Reporting and Feedback - Logkeeping, Performance Indicators
(Richard Tom - ANL-W)

The intent is to facilitate open discussion of monthly reporting, logkeeping and the quarterly performance indicators report resulting in FR's sharing what works, and hopefully, some ideas for improving the process. It is recognized that the Field requirements for format and frequency of reporting and logkeeping may not be the same. Although the performance indicators were discussed in the last FR workshop, it is still worth revisiting, and maybe, some linkage can be identified with the other FR reporting requirements in addition to identifying some areas for improvement.

3:00 P.M. - 4:15 P.M. Field Observations Trending/Field Assessment Oversight (Delmar Noyes -RFFO)

The Rocky Flats presentation in this breakout session will explain the methodology used to determine which site activities warrant oversight based on the contractors planned activities; how these discrete oversight activities are prioritized and scheduled; and how the results of this oversight is collected, tracked, and trended. A laptop computer, with the database used to facilitate this process, will be available to provide a demonstration, as requested.

4:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M. FR Program at Richland
(Stacy Helmann - RL)

Stacy Helmann, the RL FR Program Manager, will discuss the recent changes at RL due to the break off of the Office of River Protection and the subsequent reorganization within RL. She will share several advancements in the program, such as the development of Team Leads, the FR retention allowance, and work process improvements.

ORPS - Occurrence Reporting and Processing System
(Eugenia Boyle - EH-33)

The purpose of this session is to inform attendees of the current status of ORPS and the Occurrence Reporting Program Order, DOE Order 232.1A, and its associated Manual, DOE Manual 232.1-1A. In addition, the session will provide a forum for attendees to present and discuss items of interest, concerning both the database and its associated requirements documents. Brainstorming of future improvements will be included, as desired.

Own Your ORPS Destiny
(Stan Keach - KAO)

Are you struggling with your contractor's performance in occurrence reporting? Does the constant battle take valuable time away from proactive activities like field observation? Control your destiny! We have and would like to share our tools for success with anyone that wants to make a difference at their site. Our strategy includes the development of rejection criteria, meaningful performance measures, and most importantly partnering with the contractor.

Contract Management
(Jim Tower - MA-5 & Mike Moore - EH-73)

This session will present a discussion of the new "Reference Book for Contract Administrators: A Reference Tool for Major Site and Facility Management Contracts." The presentation will discuss briefly the various topics covered by the Reference Book and will discuss in detail Chapter 2, "Environment, Safety & Health." Topics include: annual ES&H performance objectives and measures; ES&H performance commitments; failure to execute work in accordance with ES&H requirements; and the relationship between incentives and ES&H. The Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives DEAR clause, and the minimum ES&H program requirements contained therein, will also be addressed.

Appendix C

SUMMARIES OF ACHIEVEMENTS for Nominees for 1999 Facility Representative of the Year Award

1. William M. Bell, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Facility: Bill is a senior Facility Representative at Technical Area - 55 (TA-55), Plutonium Processing Facility. TA-55 is the only full capability plutonium processing facility operating in the DOE complex.

Achievements: Some of Bill's achievements:

- Identified a significant adverse trend in the safety performance of a LANL subcontractor at TA-55 that had resulted in several potentially serious occurrences. At Bill's urging the subcontractor's activities were stood down to emphasize the need for improved compliance with safety procedures resulting noticeable improvement in the safety performance resulted from the stand down.
- Identified significant deficiencies in the implementation of the lockout/tagout procedures, the Unreviewed Safety Question program, and the facility modification process. These processes are being revised to improve performance.

2. Joseph Desormeau, Fernald Environmental Management Project

Facility: Joe is a Facility Rep at the Waste Pits Remedial Action Project at Fernald. This project involves the construction of a 33,350 square foot facility for waste handling, waste drying, and wastewater treatment, and the excavation and removal of 700,000 cubic yards of waste from waste pits.

Achievements: Some of Joe's achievements:

- He assembled and led five DOE teams to review the contractor's readiness to proceed at various stages of the Waste Pits Remedial Action Project startup process. Joe and his teams identified a number of issues that, when they were addressed, improved the overall safety performance for the project.
- Identified a number of issues in the transition from construction to operations that could have resulted in potential hazards to workers. For example, he identified an issue related to inexperienced heavy equipment operators prior to the planned first train loadout early enough to allow these operators to receive extensive training and hands on experience.

3. Charles R. Eberle, Jr., Oak Ridge Operations Office

Facility: Chuck is a Facility Rep at the Toxic Substances Control Act Incinerator at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP).

Achievements: Some of Chuck's achievements:

- He recognized that a large quantity of uranyl fluoride had leaked from a process piping during past operations. This caused uranium compounds to be deposited within insulation all along the pipes. Upon discovery of the material, personnel immediately exited and secured the area. An evaluation team re-entered the area and verified safe geometry. Since this event, workers more quickly recognized indications of past leaks in the process pipes.
- Identified that non-intrinsically safe portable communication radios were being used in the TSCAI tank farm and drum storage area where volatile flammable liquids and mixed waste contamination is stored. After Chuck identified this issue, facility personnel performed a survey of all radios used at the TSCAI and discovered one model in use that was not certified as intrinsically safe for a hazardous atmosphere.

4. Benton J. Harp, Office of River Protection

Facility: Ben is a Facility Rep at the Hanford Tank Farms. These tank farms consist of 177 underground storage tanks with approximately 55 million gallons of solid, liquid, and sludge-like highly radioactive waste.

Achievements: Some of Ben's achievements include:

- Responded to a near emergency event and conducted follow-up investigations after an active waste transfer line failure which resulted in the spilling of highly radioactive waste to the environment. When notified of the event, Ben immediately responded to the scene, assessed the conditions, was actively involved with recovery actions, provided additional back-shift coverage, and kept his management informed with first hand information of the scene conditions and recovery actions.
- Led a team that assessed the readiness of the contractor to conduct a 550,000-gallon high level waste transfer through a newly constructed 7-mile piping system. The assessment was on his own initiative based on the first-time use of the system and the programmatic importance of the transfer. The assessment team identified and resolved issues with safety class equipment installation, valve alignments and identification, interconnected system monitoring, and support personnel training.

5. Fred Holbrook, Mound Environmental Management Project

Facility: Fred is the senior Facility Rep at Mound in the Technical Building, a Hazard Category 2 tritium recovery facility.

Achievements: Some of Fred's achievements include:

- Determined that project workers had not completed the required tritium training to work in tritium areas per 10 CFR 830.120. He further noted a large-scale problem in which the contractor had no system in place that automatically generates deficiency

reports and elevates the concerns up the management chain. He was instrumental in the implementation of corrective actions associated with these deficiencies.

- Helped implement a complete overhaul and improvement of the Facility Representative Program and provided expert advice to the Deputy Program Manager on the conduct of the program.

6. J. J. Hynes, Savannah River Site

Facilities: JJ is the senior Facility Rep at the F Canyon and F Outside Facilities. These facilities are complex, high operational activity, Hazard Category 2 nuclear facilities that process plutonium, uranium, and americium.

Achievements: Some of JJ's achievements include:

- He was elected by the Savannah River Facility Reps to chair the Savannah River Facility Representative Council. As a result of JJ's leadership, several significant improvements have been made to the Facility Representative program. These include standardization of the requalification process across the site, development of a disciplined operations performance indicator report used by senior DOE management, and revision of the site program procedure for security assessments.
- He also led a readiness assessment team that reviewed a new Depleted Uranium/Plutonium process. He identified several procedural and performance deficiencies that would have affected the safety of the process. As a result of the correction of issues identified in this review, the campaign was performed safely and without any delays or problems.

7. Brian P. Jones, Amarillo Area Office

Facility: Brian is a Facility Rep at the Pantex Plant in the Nuclear Explosives Processing Bays and Nuclear Explosives Handling Facilities.

Achievements: Some of Brian's achievements include:

- He identified a situation where work was being performed that was not in compliance with newly established authorization basis controls. The controls were implemented as a result of a flash fire that occurred while cleaning solvent was used in the vicinity of a nuclear weapon component. He immediately notified program personnel of this non-compliance, and work was suspended and immediate corrective actions were investigated. He ensured that the new authorization basis controls were appropriately implemented and adhered to during the performance of nuclear explosives work.
- Identified several deficiencies in the implementation of lightning protection controls in a nuclear explosives facility. In one instance, he discovered a penetration in the facility wall that was not properly bonded and in another, he discovered inaccuracies regarding standoff distances for a selected weapons program.

8. Albert E. MacDougall, Sandia National Laboratory

Facilities: Al is a Facility Rep at the Annular Core Research Reactor, Sandia Pulse Reactor, Hot Cell Facility(s), Gamma Irradiation Facility(s), and Manzano Storage site. These facilities constitute a unique, and in some instances “one of a kind” testing suite that is used in direct support of critical Defense Programs weapons testing and certification programs.

Achievements: Some of Al’s achievements include:

- Led a team for the reconfiguration of the Annular Core Research Reactor from medical isotope production to pulse mode operations. This effort included support for the development of the Safety Analysis Report and Technical Safety Requirements and the required DOE Readiness Reviews.
- Worked backshifts and weekends with Sandia National Laboratory personnel during the startup of the Annular Core Research Reactor to resolve technical issues related to readiness review findings and startup. Largely as a result of his tireless efforts, the reactor met its startup date.

9. Kerry M. Schierman, Richland Operations Office

Facilities: Kerry is a Facility Rep at the Hanford Spent Nuclear Fuel Project K Basins.

Achievements: Some of Kerry’s achievements include:

- Performed detailed investigations of the contractor corrective action management program and work control processes. These investigations identified several weaknesses that had site-wide ramifications. Numerous corrective actions have been implemented to the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project and Hanford site work control processes and corrective action management programs, which have led to substantial improvements.
- Identified several deficiencies in facility component configuration, component labeling, the drawing change control processes, and general program management. Kerry’s efforts led to DOE line management performing a detailed configuration management program assessment. Kerry was an essential assessment team member on this assessment. The subsequent correction of the identified deficiencies has enabled the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project to significantly improve their configuration management program.

10. Robert C. “Bob” Seal, Idaho Operations Office

Facilities: Bob is the primary Facility Rep at the Test Reactor Area (TRA) at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. Some of his facilities include the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR), which is the world’s largest operating test reactor, and the ATR Critical Facility.

Achievements: Some of Bob's achievements include:

- He supported a number of essential reviews of the readiness for restart of TRA facilities. This included serving as a team member for the Readiness Assessment for interim Loss of Coolant Accident (LCOA) Restart of the ATR, and as Deputy Team Leader for the final Readiness Assessment for LOCA Restart of the ATR.
- Volunteered for assignment as the DOE-ID Facility Representative Program Manager, and has worked closely with the other Facility Representatives and DOE-ID management to improve the Program. He spent a considerable amount of time assisting in the training and qualification of four new DOE-ID Facility Representative candidates, performing numerous qualification oral interviews, training walkdowns, tutorial sessions, and written examination preparation.

11. Ed Westbrook, Rocky Flats Field Office

Facility: Ed is the Lead Facility Rep for the Building 707 complex, which consists of plutonium facilities with high operational activity.

Achievements: Some of Ed's achievements include:

- He reviewed work control practices in his facility and identified areas no longer covered by operable fire systems. These areas were not identified or properly controlled by the contractor. The contractor implemented the required controls to ensure continued safe operations.
- Observed deficiencies in the coverage of the Life Safety/Disaster Warning System used to communicate instructions to personnel in the event of an emergency. Due to Ed's understanding of the requirements for the system and how to implement effective and proper controls, corrective actions were successfully completed.



The Secretary of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

April 27, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR BENTON J. HARP
OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION

FROM:

BILL RICHARDSON *BR*

SUBJECT:

Facility Representative of the Year for 1999

Congratulations on your selection as the Department of Energy's (DOE) Facility Representative of the Year for 1999. Your outstanding contributions to operational and safety oversight at the Hanford Tank Farms have been instrumental in keeping this important facility operating safely and efficiently.

As a member of the Facility Representative team, you play an essential role in managing contractor performance by providing a highly competent and visible DOE presence in operating facilities. Your selection as the Department's Facility Representative of the Year distinguishes you from among this dedicated, knowledgeable, and highly respected group.

Thank you for your outstanding service and I wish you continued success in your DOE career.



Appendix D
Facility Representatives Annual Workshop
Breakout Session Summaries

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.

Breakout Session A1 - DOE Standard for Facility Representatives

Breakout Session B1 - Program Sponsors Meeting

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Breakout Session A2 - Operational Readiness Reviews/Readiness Assessments

Breakout Session B2 - Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 4:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Breakout Session A3 - Training and Requalification

Breakout Session B3 - Recruiting, Hiring, Retaining High Quality Technical Staff

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.

Breakout Session A4 - Logkeeping, Reporting, Performance Indicators

Breakout Session B4 - Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS)

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Breakout Session A5 - Field Observations Trending/Field Assessment Oversight

Breakout Session B5 - Own Your Own ORPS Destiny

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 4:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Breakout Session A6 - FR Program at Richland

Breakout Session B6 - Contract Management

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A1 - DOE Standard for Facility Representatives

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.

Session Leader: David Compton (S-3.1)

Overview. On Tuesday May 16th, David Compton (supporting Joe Arango in the DOE S-3.1 headquarters office) led a session on the recent revision to DOE-STD-1063-2000, Facility Representatives. About 60 facility representatives and other workshop participants attended this session. Compton presented 1) contents of standard, 2) summary of changes, 3) responsibilities and authorities summary, and 4) highlights of standard. Compton also handed out a summary of Should-Shall-May statements from the final standard.

Summary of Discussion Items.

- (1) Facility Representatives indicated the following topics of interest for discussion during this session: coverage matrix/methodology, development opportunities, performance metrics, and proficiency/requal. Several of these topics were addressed more fully in other sessions.
- (2) During the session, the two topics that received considerable discussion were: coverage matrix/methodology and development opportunities. The sense of the group was that FR coverage evaluations are not being given adequate priority and attention, that different methods may be appropriate beyond those described in the standard, and that field/PSO discussions are needed.
- (3) When asked about role, Facility Representatives indicated that 70-80% of role was oriented toward oversight of safety, including conduct of operations, with remaining 20-30% of role directed toward mission, efficiency, and productivity concerns.
- (4) When asked about their level of interaction with their management, 2/3 of the Facility Representatives indicated that the level of interaction was "about right," with the remaining 1/3 indicating "not enough interaction."

Summary of Action Items.

Arango/Compton - Consider the following changes to the Standard at time of next regularly-scheduled revision:

- (a) Add should-shall-may matrix as an appendix.
- (b) Strengthen recommendation for line-by-line use of Appendix B in assessments.
- (c) Expand discussion/methodology on coverage assignments - more on alternate approaches
- (d) Expand discussion on efficiency and productivity considerations
- (e) Make annual evaluation of coverage assignments a mandatory requirement (shall)
- (f) Operationalize sponsor responsibilities for development opportunities
- (g) Refine/Clarify definitions for Performance Indicators included in Appendix A.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B1 - Program Sponsors Meeting

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.

Session Leader: Joseph Arango (S-3.1)

The initial Facility Representative Program Sponsors meeting was held on May 16, 2000 as a breakout session during the Annual Workshop. An agenda had been provided the week prior to the meeting and included the following topics: 1) Transportability of qualifications between sites; 2) Career progression and promotion; 3) Process/mechanisms for Senior Managers interaction; and 4) Site discussions.

The Department's Facility Representative Program Manager, Joe Arango, facilitated the discussions and opened the meeting with introductions. The following seven Program Sponsors were in attendance: Larry Kirkman (Albuquerque), Bob Stallman (Idaho), Bob Poe (Oak Ridge), Nat Brown (Ohio), Lloyd Piper (Richland), Mike Weis (Rocky Flats), and Roy Schepens (Savannah River). Mark Holzmer (Argonne-West) sat in for Chicago. The following three offices were not represented: Nevada, Oakland, and River Protection.

Transportability of qualifications between sites: An agreement was reached among the sites that the General Technical Base (GTB) and the functional area qualification portions of Facility Representative qualifications would be transportable when a qualified Facility Representative takes a job at a different site. The facility specific portions of the qualification would still need to be completed at the receiving site. It was decided that no memorandum of agreement among the sites was necessary to accomplish this. The Program Sponsors would make sure that senior managers at their sites were aware of this approach. The point was made that the GTB and functional area qualifications should be transportable for all disciplines and Larry Kirkman agreed that this topic could be discussed at the next Federal Technical Capabilities Panel (FTCP) meeting so that something could be promulgated in writing. Additional discussions centered on how this approach will become more important to the Department's retention of critical technical capability and Facility Representative expertise as sites move towards closure. Currently the Ohio Field Office is working on a memorandum of agreement with the Oak Ridge Operations Office to facilitate the transfer of federal employees from Ohio to appropriate open positions at Oak Ridge as Ohio sites close down. It is anticipated that this memorandum will address Facility Representative positions so the Program Sponsors agreed to monitor its progress with information being provided by Nat Brown and Bob Poe as the memorandum is finalized. An action was assigned to Mike Weis to contact the five former Rocky Flats Facility Representatives who have already transferred to different sites to determine what portions of their previous qualifications were accepted at the receiving sites. An action was assigned to Larry Kirkman to put transportability of qualifications on the next FTCP meeting agenda and to prepare a written statement to promulgate some guidance from the FTCP in this area.

There was discussion concerning non-degreed but fully qualified Facility Representatives being able to move between sites when open Facility Representative positions are competed. It was mentioned that some experiences to date might indicate that these individuals were at a disadvantage in competing for open jobs at different sites if it was perceived that the selecting official would only accept a degreed individual. The Program Sponsors discussed that job announcements usually allow non-degreed individuals with appropriate experience to compete and that this should not be a real or perceived barrier. It was agreed that the Sponsors needed to be proactive to work with selecting officials to be sure that fully qualified Facility Representatives get equitable consideration in the hiring process in cases where job experience or a degree can be used to satisfy the position requirements.

Career progression and promotion: there was an open discussion of ideas on this topic which complemented a number of discussions that had already occurred during the Workshop Management Panel earlier in the day. Additionally, the Program Sponsors noted that a number of former Facility Representatives were going to be speaking to all Workshop attendees on Day 3 concerning practical advice and experience with career planning and progression. Joe Arango took an action to develop a list of all former Facility Representatives (along with appropriate contact info) who had been promoted to new positions within the Department and provide it to the Program Sponsors. It was agreed that this list could serve as an indicator of the amount of career progression which is already occurring with Facility Representatives as well as a useful resource for current Facility Representatives who wish to contact someone in a mentoring role for input or advice on career plans and decisions.

Process/mechanisms for Senior Managers interaction: there was not much time left for discussion on this topic, but it was mentioned that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board members often ask about this when they meet with the Department's senior managers as they consider this interaction vitally important. The Program Sponsors agreed that interactions with the site's senior managers was beneficial and needed to occur but it did not necessarily have to be an elaborate process with lots of documentation in order for it to be an effective and useful mechanism for the site.

Site discussions: the floor was opened for any final points or topics and no further discussions or actions were taken.

Summary of Action Items.

- 1) Mike Weis will contact the five former Rocky Flats Facility Representatives who have already transferred to different sites to determine what portions of their previous qualifications were accepted at the receiving sites.

- 2) Larry Kirkman will put transportability of qualifications on the next FTCP meeting agenda and prepare a written statement to promulgate some guidance from the FTCP in this area.

- 3) Joe Arango will develop a list of all former Facility Representatives (along with appropriate contact info) who had been promoted to new positions within the Department and provide it to the Program Sponsors.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A2 - Operational Readiness Reviews/Readiness Assessments

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Session Leader: Jeff Roberson (DP)

During the breakout session we began with input from various FRs who had participated off-site in the ORR/RA process. Each of the FRs or former FRs discussed the benefits and career enhancement that they received from their participation in the process. These include –

- * An expanded understanding of the complex
- * An opportunity to network with other players from other sites/HQ
- * An opportunity to learn lessons from other sites
- * An opportunity to share their lessons and see the good things their site was doing

Mike Glasman, Doug Dearolph, and Zack Smith provided comments, and stated positively that their experiences had contributed to their professional advancement and in some cases, promotion.

We then moved to a detailed discussion of the startup notification report (SNR) process and the part the FRs could/should play in support of the line managers. Many of the FRs reported that they were not involved in the SNR process. While not required by order or standard, it was suggested that the FRs play a key role in validating the SNR recommendations. We discussed the specific order changes and it was agreed that there would always be some debatable startup processes, but that the SNR requirements should, in most cases, facilitate the debate and the decision occurring early in the process.

The second subject was the grading of the RA processes and the elimination of “other” review types. This discussion was very productive in facilitating understanding of the allowable flexibility and the realities of taking a justified approach to the readiness review processes. The minimum requirements ensure process integrity, while the allowed flexibility will prevent administrative burden. Emphasis was placed on the fact that an appropriate review should be conducted and the name was less important as long as scope could be justified.

Summary of Action Items.

No action items resulted from this breakout session. Jeff Roberson will be available to discuss contentious review process debates anytime in the future.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B2 - Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Session Leader: Joseph Arango (S-3.1)

The normal monthly Facility Representatives Steering Committee meeting was held on May 16, 2000 as a breakout session during the Annual Workshop. An agenda had been provided the week prior to the meeting and included the following topics: 1) Bio sheets; 2) Quarterly performance indicators; and 3) Site discussions.

Bio sheets: one page biography sheets had been provided to all of the Facility Representatives in attendance at the Workshop. The purpose of these sheets was to gather background information and experience/expertise of each of the Facility Representatives that could be posted to the web site in the future. This information can serve as a resource for Facility Representatives when they are looking for help on specific issues or topics that another Facility Representative in the network at the site or around the complex may have some experience in. An action was assigned to Steering Committee members to take bio sheets back to their sites for completion by all Facility Representatives not in attendance at the Workshop.

Quarterly performance indicators: a comprehensive summary printout of all performance indicator data from 1996 through the most recent quarter was handed out for information. Discussions centered on the staffing analyses and FTE values used in the staffing indicator. This was a continuation of the discussions on this topic from the April Steering Committee meeting. A draft Facility Representative Staffing Matrix had been provided on May 11th to support this discussion. An action was assigned to Steering Committee members to fill in missing data for their sites, review and validate the data already included and provide any updates to Joe Arango prior to the next Steering Committee meeting.

Site discussions: the following offices had representatives in attendance who provided a status on current topics of interest at their sites – Albuquerque, Amarillo, Argonne-West, Idaho, Oakland, Oak Ridge, Rocky Flats, Richland, Office of River Protection, Savannah River, Headquarters Environmental Management and Nuclear Energy. No actions assigned.

Summary of Action Items.

1. The Steering Committee members will take bio sheets back to their sites for completion by all Facility Representatives not in attendance at the Workshop.
2. The Steering Committee members will fill in missing performance indicator data on the draft Facility Representative Staffing Matrix for their sites, review and validate the data already included and provide any updates to Joe Arango prior to the next Steering Committee meeting.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A3 - Training and Requalification

Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 4:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Session Leader: Bob Seal (ID)

About 25 workshop attendees participated in the breakout session. Prior to the workshop information concerning Facility Representative Qualification Programs, Requalification Programs, Proficiency Programs, and Continuing Training Programs was solicited from each of the DOE sites. The information was compiled into a nine-page handout and provided to breakout session attendees.

Summary of breakout session discussion

Qualification Program – The information provided by the various sites was quite comprehensive. The process is implemented differently among the sites, but based on the information provided prior to the workshop and the lack of discussion during the breakout session, it seems to be the most mature portion of the Facility Representative Training Program.

Requalification Program – Appears to be implemented, but is less mature than the Qualification Program at most sites, and Program requirements vary significantly between the sites. Some site requalification programs include a comprehensive examination that includes General Technical Base and Facility Representative Functional Area Core Qualification requirements. The need to formally requalify of those particular requirements was questioned because the Technical Training Program, of which the General Technical Base and Facility Representative Functional Area Core Qualification is part of, does not require periodic requalification.

Proficiency Program – Based on the information provided by the various sites and discussion during the breakout session, the Proficiency Program is not understood by some sites and is not implemented at others. The requirement in STD-1063-2000 seems clear enough, and should not create confusion.

Continuing Training Program – This topic stimulated the most discussion during the breakout session. The Program varies significantly between sites, and appears to be an area that the Facility Representative Steering Committee could become involved to make improvements. While some sites have implemented a more traditional program that includes required reading and a series of basic qualification topics, some sites are considering professional growth for the Continuing Training Program. Some relate directly to the wide spectrum of knowledge required by the Facility Representative Program, and some are more related to professional growth.

Examples include:

- Certified Safety Professional certification
- Supervisory and leadership training (DOE and other sources)

- DOE Technical Training Functional Area Qualification in addition to Facility Representative
- Selected DOE training courses that relate to Facility Representative duties (such as Accident Investigator training)
- Selected college level courses
- Professional conferences and training sessions (such as the Facility Representative Annual Workshop and American Nuclear Society topical sessions)

Summary of Action Items.

No action items were identified in this session.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B3 - Recruiting, Hiring, Retaining High Quality Technical Staff
Tuesday, May 16, 2000, 4:30 - 5:30 p.m.
Session Leader: David Roth (MA-3)

Summary: The breakout session covered the organization, charter and operations of the Federal Technical Capability Program that addresses federal staff competency issues for defense nuclear facilities with emphasis on the applicability and coordination with the Facility Representative program. Three Agents of the Federal Technical Capability Panel who are also Facility Representative sponsors for their organizations participated in the breakout session. The presentation included the critical technical workforce analyses that are part of the Program's action plan and the inclusion of facility representatives in the report that is provided to the Secretary. The updating of Technical Qualification Program (TQP) Qualification Standards and modifications to the TQP processes was presented.

Results: It was agreed that the existing close exchange of information between the Facility Representative Program and the FTCP is important. The evaluation rigor of the Facility Representative qualification process was identified as an element that differentiates it from the current TQP practices. Both programs are seeking improved definition and processes to make the requalification or continuing training parts of the programs more effective and useful. Succession planning and processes were identified as an area of concern for the Facility Representatives who participated in the session. There was concern about the lack of opportunity to get the "well rounded" management experience that seemed to weigh more than technical experience for promotions. The Panel has identified this as one of its concerns as well but most initiatives to improve promotion opportunities for technical personnel are local initiatives.

Summary of Action Items.

- (1) The FTCP will continue liaison with the Facility Representative Program. Joe Arango is on distribution for FTCP activities and will be invited to update the Panel on issues related to Facility Representatives.
- (2) The FTCP will provide the Facility Representatives Program with information on any Departmental initiatives related to technical succession planning.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A4 - Logkeeping, Reporting, Performance Indicators

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.

Session Leaders: Richard Tom(CH-ARGW)/D. Cook(OH-WVDP)

The open discussion on log keeping confirmed that the need for, frequency and format/content of formal logs by Facility Representatives (FRs) were at the discretion of DOE Field Element units. Most of the FRs kept either a hardbound logbook, or used a personal computer to record their daily activities as an electronic logbook. The formality of maintaining such logbooks varied from a supervisor reviewing the FR's logbook to the logs being only seen by the FRs keeping them. Although some DOE Field Elements did not require FR logs per se, the DOE-STD-1063-2000 requirement for FRs to keep a record of their activities and observations was met by other means. For example, many sites used a computer database that varied in detail and sophistication. Some FRs kept informal notes that were used to prepare formal reports that conveyed the results of their surveillance activities and observations/concerns to the contractor for corrective action. Many of the FRs expressed a preference to carry their logbooks with them and make entries in the field. It was noted that some contractors replaced the use of paper logbooks with palm pilots that could be easily carried around the job site. Although there was interest and one site has a purchase requisition in the works, none of the FRs present said that they used palm pilots as a log. A possible problem noted was that it would not be easy to get the palm pilot out of protected areas because of security implications. Also as a side note, Scott Traeger (NV FR) cited a personal experience where he used the entries from his FR logs to prepare a deposition as part of a legal action within the Department.

Based on discussions, most Field Element FR programs issue a monthly report. Generally, the monthly reports are used as a performance feedback mechanism for DOE contractors with a copy provided to the respective Field Element Management. In some cases, the contractor is requested to prepare a formal corrective action plan or response to the FR monthly reports. However, it was conveyed that most FR programs address issues or deficiencies upon discovery either independently or in addition to the monthly reports, on a "real time" basis resulting in no delays in fixing problems. It was also noted that one FR program issued reports on a bimonthly basis. In addition to the formal reports, some FR programs established weekly or biweekly meetings with contractor management to discuss performance and resolution of issues. Whatever the case, the established FR reporting process appears to be working as intended to meet the needs of specific site oversight programs.

Joe Arango, Facility Representative Program Manager, was present and joined in the discussions on the Quarterly FR Performance Indicator (PI) report as prescribed per DOE-STD-1063-2000. From the FR Steering Committee meeting, a clarification on the "Staffing" PI was made. The "number of FacRep positions" is based on **need** versus **approved** FR positions. The intent was to place more emphasis or attention on identified needs resulting from staffing analyses or plans. No issues or comments were identified with the "Training and Qualification" section of the PI report. The next section of the PI report concerning "Accomplishments" was discussed, and although optional, reporting

accomplishments could be useful as a performance feedback indicator to Field Element Management and HQ Program Sponsors. In that regard, not all HQ Program Offices receive copies of the FR PI reports. There was quite a lot of dialogue on the two performance indicators on "Fulfilling the FR Role." It was agreed that the same methodology was not being used by all of the FR programs in calculating these two performance indicators. The type of activities related to hours spent in plant/field versus hours FRs perform contractor oversight needs further definition. The value of reporting both or just one of these indicators was questioned, and whether one indicator was more meaningful than the other indicator. The group did not reach consensus on a path forward, but further action was deferred at this time, recognizing that the Albuquerque and Oak Ridge Field Offices are concurrently developing guidelines on these two indicators. The FR Steering Committee will review the developed guidelines, and make a decision on what makes sense. There was no expressed interest in changing the current frequency of reporting on a quarterly basis. However, it was noted that feedback on the PIs was lacking.

In summary, the obvious linkage of logs or FR records to reporting was recognized. The roll up of data from the logs into a FR report is harder for those maintaining hard copy logs versus electronic logs or databases. The use of hand-held electronic hardware such as palm pilots could facilitate the data roll up process, but no success stories within the DOE FR community, were available in using such devices. Also if formal logs are kept, FRs should be aware that the log entries could have implications later as evidence related to legal actions if they arise. In that regard, FRs should be vigilant in making factual and accurate log entries. The FR reports can be a source to identify accomplishments in the Quarterly FR PI report. The significance of events becomes more apparent collectively over a given period of time (Trends), and subsequent benefits of associated fixes or corrective actions. The current performance indicators for fulfilling the FR role need to be re-evaluated again based on the results of the Oak Ridge and Albuquerque efforts to develop guidelines that further define the scope for these two indicators. Inclusion of HQ Program Sponsors to the distribution of the Quarterly FR PI reports has value, and should be considered by those Field Elements that are not doing so at this time. Also recognition or feedback on the PI reports would result in greater interest and attention by FRs that provide input.

Summary of Action Items.

The Steering Committee will determine the path forward for clarifying the definitions for the Facility Representatives performance indicators on "fulfilling the FR Role." They will consider the input from the Albuquerque and Oak Ridge Operations Offices, which are concurrently developing guidelines.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B4 - Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS)
Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 1:30 - 2:45 p.m.
Session Leader: Eugenia Boyle (EH)

EH-33 is the Office of Primary Interest for the ORPS directives. The discussions centered on ORPS activities that are in various stages of completion including re-engineering, software changes currently under development, and upcoming Order/Manual changes. Breakout session attendees discussed the changes that are needed related to the Group 6 transportation sections and safeguards and security occurrence reporting sections of the Manual. Joe Arango took an action to send a memo to EH documenting the need for these proposed changes and asking that EH-33 initiate the appropriate ORPS directives change process.

Summary of Action Items.

Joe Arango will send a memo to EH documenting the need for ORPS directive changes and asking that EH-33 initiate appropriate ORPS directive changes.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A5 - Field Observations Trending/Field Assessment Oversight
Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.
Session Leader: Delmar Noyes (RF)

The breakout session started with two formal presentations. Maria Dikeakos provided the first presentation from Brookhaven National Laboratory on their oversight trending and tracking system. Rick Dion provided the second from Rocky Flats Field Office, on their observations trending and oversight process. The remaining period of the breakout session involved questions and answers related to the presentations and input from other Sites on the processes and tool that they use to collect and trend contractor performance data.

In summary it appeared that most, if not all, sites have some type of oversight plan that identifies which activities warrant oversight, the scope of the oversight, and how to document and track the oversight. These systems and process vary based on the specific contractual and managerial needs of the various sites.

Summary of Action Items.

There were no actions assigned.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B5 - Control Your Own ORPS Destiny

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Session Leader: Stan Keach (AL)

Mr. Stan Keach, DOE/AL, Human Resources and Training Division, presented a breakout session entitled "Control Your Own ORPS Destiny" in place of Ms. Michelle Bruns (Facility Representative, Kirtland Area Office, Albuquerque, NM). Ms. Bruns was unable to attend the workshop as she assisting the DOE Los Alamos Area Office facility representatives return buildings and laboratories back to operation following the Los Alamos fire.

Approximately 12 people attended the presentation that concluded with a question, answer, and discussion period. The following topics were covered.

- Laboratory Occurrence Reporting performance measures used for the annual Kirtland Area Office/Sandia National Laboratories Multi-Laboratory Appraisal Program. The performance measures concentrate on timely reporting, root cause analysis and preparation of occurrence reports, occurrence report rejections, appropriate corrective actions, and lessons learned.
- Occurrence reporting rejection trend analysis and results.
- Kirtland Area Office occurrence report rejection criteria (objective and subjective).
- Kirtland Area Office/Sandia National Laboratories joint Occurrence Reporting Workshop conducted in February 2000.

A discussion was conducted to discuss the advantages of conducting formal critiques prior to performing root causes analyses. The Westinghouse Savannah River Critique Training Program was cited as an excellent training program.

Summary of Action Items.

No action actions were assigned.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session A6 - Facility Representative Program at Richland
Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 4:30 - 5:30 p.m.
Session Leader: Stacy Helmann (RL)

The breakout session went very well, with good attendance. Richland has had requests for our retention allowance program, training modules, and surveillance guides. Additionally, our resolution to the GS-13/14 classification struggles has been approval to classify all Facility Representatives at the GS-13/14 level. GS-14 is achieved at full qualification.

Summary of Action Items.

No action items were identified in this session.

Facility Representatives Annual Workshop, Breakout Session Summary

Breakout Session B6 - Contract Management

Wednesday, May 17, 2000, 3:00 - 4:15 p.m.

Session Leaders: Jim Tower (MA) and Mike Moore (EH)

The Contract Management session presented a discussion of the new DOE Reference Book for Contract Administrators. The Book is a reference tool for major site and facility management contracts. Jim Tower presented an overview of the Book outlining its key elements: narrative about numerous subjects related to contract management; listing of major roles and responsibilities; and references for more detailed information. Jim discussed the reasons for the Book, which included DOE's recent change to performance-based contracting, challenges by external groups, and a diminishing of corporate memory. Tower also noted that the Book addresses several existing problems across the Federal Government with contract administration: unclear roles and responsibilities; improper training for contract oversight; lack of specific internal control measures; and unclear statements of work. Mike Moore discussed Chapter 2 of the Book entitled Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H). This chapter outlines: the key ES&H contract terms and conditions; the contract mechanisms to hold contractors accountable; the relationship between ES&H and incentives; and the roles and responsibilities of DOE managers and contractors. Mike's presentation included a specific discussion of the ES&H related mechanisms for accountability: compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and DOE directives; specific standards tailored to work/hazards; Safety Management System (SMS) submitted/approved; and SMS annually updated.

Summary of Action Items.

No action items were identified in this session.

Appendix E

Facility Representative Survey Results

Total Responses	26
Facility Reps	19
Non-Facility Reps	7

Survey Question 1: In what capacity are you attending the Workshop?

Answers

I am a Facility Rep	19
I have programmatic responsibilities for FRs	6
I am a Speaker/Panel Member	6

Survey Question 2: Generally, how informative did you find the Workshop?

<u>Answers</u>	<u># From All Responses</u>	<u>% of All Responses</u>
Very Informative	19	73%
Somewhat Informative	7	27%
Not very informative	0	0%

	<u># From FR Responses</u>	<u>% of FR Responses</u>
	13	68%
	6	32%
	0	0%

Survey Question 3: Do you think May is a convenient and appropriate time of the year for the Workshop?

<u>Answers</u>	<u># From All Responses</u>	<u>% of All Responses</u>
Yes	19	73%
No*	7	27%

	<u># From FR Responses</u>	<u>% of FR Responses</u>
	15	79%
	4	21%

* - Other times mentioned: June (4), October (2), April (1). Two people favored later in May.

Survey Question 4: Do you think Las Vegas is a convenient and appropriate location to hold the Workshop?

<u>Answers</u>	<u># from All Responses</u>	<u>% of All Responses</u>
Yes	23	88%
No*	3	12%

	<u># From FR Responses</u>	<u>% of FR Responses</u>
	17	89%
	2	11%

* - Other areas suggested: Warm near water (1), "Several locations" (1), Salt Lake City (1)

Survey Question 5: Do you think there was adequate representation from the following groups at the Workshop?

<u>Answers</u>	<u>All Responses</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Facility Representatives	100%	0%
Field Office personnel	77%	19%
Headquarters personnel	69%	27%

	<u>Facility Representatives</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	100%	0%
	74%	21%
	79%	16%

Survey Question 6: Do you have any suggestions for improving the Workshop?

Answers

No. Extremely well organized.

Not really - you made this a great program this year.

I think this was a stellar workshop.

The format and content of this year's meeting was excellent.

Maybe more HQ PSO types should attend; PSOs need to hear more about our challenges.

Add Field Element Mgmt. speakers on how they support and plan on using their FRs.

Get more field management, sponsors, and HQ personnel involved.

I was a little disappointed that Mr. Glauthier was unable to attend.

Award additional FR honors, e.g. First runner up, Second runner up.

Need some way to encourage interchanges between FRs at other sites - mix it up.

Some session devoted to overseeing National Labs; our daily duties are somewhat unique.

More briefings on significant safety topics or events (e.g., HEPA filter task force results).

Have some "hands-on" exercises - scenario development, ORPS reports reviews.

Demonstration of tools (FR homepage, LL program, inspector tracking systems, etc.).

Add one or two formal training classes prior to start of session. Example topics:

DOE contracting, DOE complex history, env compliance, leadership/mgmt skills.

Maybe a joint FR Sponsor / FR Steering Committee meeting would be beneficial.

Shorten the workshop - we have had speakers on ORPS and ISM two years in a row.

Have only two breakout sessions per day in each track.

NTS tour shouldn't be crammed into one afternoon when travel time is 3 hrs.

Classified tour - Q.

Conference room facilities were a little cramped at times, esp. during break out sessions.

Larger room with tables.

A larger room - The conference room was somewhat confining/small.

Stay in Las Vegas.

Try to get hotel closer to the "strip."

More advance information on specific topics to be discussed (beyond agenda).

Expand this survey to provide comments on each presentation.

Survey Question 7: Do you have any other comments on the Workshop?

Answers

Appreciate your support. Thanks for the hard work. (2 responses)

Well done! Thanks! Good job. Good workshop. (3 responses)

Well done - Planning and execution was very good.

Yes. Very nicely done look forward to continued participation.

The whole conference was very well managed. The administrative folks did a great job.

This meeting gave me a boost of inspiration; I can return to my FR job with enthusiasm.

I appreciate the HQ and Field Office participation.

It was good to hear from various field/HQ managers that they value the FR program.

Lack of management (field mgt. & local) participation shows little support for program.

Good exchange of information from other sites. AM/Manager/HQ perspective are also important to understand.

Demonstrating Senior Mgmt. commitment for the program was a very positive feature.

Attendance by several AMs and comments by TJ Glauthier illustrated this point.

Increase font size on nametags for the person's location/job title.

Very well coordinated - good speakers.

Very good discussion sessions.

Good use of multiple-media to present info.

Good selection of topics. The challenge is to find similar but fresh topics in the future.

The FR of the Year ceremony was tremendous improvement over last year.

Gained valuable insight into security oversight at other complexes.

Insight on training and qualification.

Excellent input on tracking assessments and surveillances.

Mike Weis' presentation was outstanding. Very informative.

Presentations on career progressions were enlightening and informative.

Abilene Paradox video was an eye-opener.

Panel discussions and daily themes good. Breakout sessions O.K. for info. exchange.

Mechanisms to take/assign actions at break-out sessions were loose.

Put the writeups on the web from this year and previous years. Thanks!

Have a training session for FRs which could satisfy some qual/requal requirement.

Meeting room chairs would fail ergonomic assessment. No back support.

Conference room was a little crowded; you should consider a larger room next time.

Facilities a might cramped. Very little seating room. Recommend tables for all.

Great hotel/workshop facility.

Love the Embassy Suites hotel. Much better than Hotel/casinos.

The location at Embassy is great. Let's do it here in June 2001!

Many people have said this is the best DOE workshop they have ever attended.

Much enthusiasm has been generated. We need to keep the excitement going.

We need to look for ways to give the FRs a voice in contractor evaluations.

We need to give FRs the opportunity to play in the ISM follow-up activities.