

DOE ISM AND EFCOG SUB-GROUP

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT WORKSHOP AUGUST 1, 2002 IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA MEETING NOTES

Dave Amerine, acting for Bob Pedde, opened the meeting with round-the-table introductions of attendees. He provided a brief review of previous meetings where performance metrics were discussed including the May 1 Workshop at the Savannah River Site (SRS) and the May 7-8 ISM Workshop in Albuquerque. The purpose of the meeting was to finalize the point paper and pamphlet; develop recommendations for the focus areas; define colors and definitions for all sites to use; receive DOE-HQ feedback; and discuss any other issues.

DeWitt Beeler (RFETS), Chair of the EFCOG Sub-Group on Performance Metrics, reviewed the point paper. Senior DOE leadership has asked EH-1 to provide regular reports on the status of DOE sites against a set of top-level performance metrics or Focus Areas. DOE leadership has asked that the information be provided in the “annunciator panel” format used by the commercial nuclear industry. The center of interest is to provide a common set of Focus Areas but not to design a new, comprehensive performance metric system for the DOE Complex. It is expected that most sites have a set of performance metrics that they are currently using, which can be rolled up into the common Focus Areas. The planned performance metrics reporting process will be based on a standard “format” but will not require standard content. In other words, each site will be able to use whatever set of metrics that meets their business needs. In addition, the desired approach is to get something workable in place, then improve as needed.

DeWitt also provided a brief overview of a draft memo to be sent by Bob Card and NNSA to all departmental elements and major contractors. The memo will be discussed with Mr. Card at a meeting on August 7th and will be to all departmental elements and major contractors. It calls for a set of top-level focus areas around which report to DOE-HQ will be structured and standard reporting format, color codes and definitions.

Larrie Trent and Chris Cantwell provided information on how Pantex has been able to adopt the INPO format. Jon Hoff, WIPP, described how WIPP has been using the INPO-type format for the past 2 years.

Ron Farchmin from West Valley Nuclear Services Company described the process used there for developing performance metrics. WVNSC uses an Access database tied into their Local Area Network for user friendly input by the subject matter experts. This software also provides the ability to provide other reports. He stated that the move from operations to D&D has eliminated some of their previous metrics. The triggers for success at West Valley included the following:

- Embraced by senior management
- Subject matter experts and managers owned the performance metrics in that they developed the measures
- Regular reviews to staff on progress and changes
- Review and change of metrics that add no value
- Request of feedback from stakeholders
- User-friendly data entry

Jim Tarpanian from Bechtel Hanford reported on a 12-step process to develop performance objectives, measures, and indicators. These steps include:

1. Identify the customer
2. Define the objective(s)
3. Determine the questions that need to be answered
4. Select indicators
5. Standardize definitions
6. Choose a model
7. Establish counting criteria
8. Establish baselines and goals (decision criteria)
9. Define reporting mechanisms
10. Determine additional qualifiers
11. Collect data
12. Consider human factors

The focus areas used at Bechtel Hanford are ES&H Performance, Compliance and Oversight (Feedback), Business Management, and Mission Accomplishment. Jim also provided some examples of the metrics used by BHI.

Gail Jernigan, Savannah River Site, provided an overview of SRS metrics. Benefits include the flexibility of the system, ability to integrate a significant volume of data and performance knowledge into visually effective metrics, ability to quickly drill down to source of problem areas; and continuous improvement through an effective tool, leading to efficient application of limited resources. She described the format used at SRS and how DOE is involved in the process. The SRS system also shows the last four quarters of data, showing trends over time. The group agreed that having historical information was useful.

Jay Larson provided information from the Office of Science. SC uses three categories of indicators: Safety, Environmental, and Management indicators. Using a rotation, performance is measured annually. In addition, this group uses 3 colors, described as follows:

- Green: No management intervention is required.
- Yellow: Management attention may be needed.
- Red: Management action is needed.

His recommendations are shown below.

- Limit the number of indicators
- Use existing data, if possible
- Use annual data in trending
- Consider proposing a second alternative with annual focus

Frank Russo, EH, provided a review of the request from DOE leadership. Bob Card wrote an email and meeting summary as a result of the Quarterly Safety Summary meeting. The email discussed his view on performance metrics. (Frank agreed to send the email to Gail Jernigan, who will forward it to the attendees.) Card would like to see monthly rolling averages with line organizations providing the presentations at some point. He has noticed an increase in electrical issues and car accidents and would like to know if there is some commonality across the DOE Complex. He is interested in the following:

- Safety Related Mission Areas of Interest
 - What is accomplished towards mission
 - Risk Reduction
- Areas for Management Attention
 - Issues site provided
 - Risk Avoidance
 - HQ Obligations
- TRC and LWC Ranking for Sites
- TRC and LWC Ranking by Program

The top 10 projects that are most important are:

1. Yucca Mountain LA
2. Yucca Mountain transportation
3. Rocky Flats
4. Hanford vit (HLW)
5. Fernald
6. SRS HLW
7. INEEL TRU
8. SNS
9. Climate change
10. Clean Coal

The template provided by Frank Russo showed the key performance areas are as follows:

- Near misses (number)
- Radiological concerns
- Shipping QA
- Fire Safety
- Criticality Infractions
- AB Infractions
- Safeguards and Security
- Environmental Releases/Compliance

Dave Stadler, EH, discussed the three focus areas, which he has developed. These were Management Systems, Programmatic and Mission Performance, and Infrastructure/Facility Life Cycle Management. The Level 1 metrics that Bob Card specifically has mentioned as important to him are:

- Authorization Bases
- Risk Reduction
- Radiation Protection
- Criticality Safety
- Fire Protection
- Project Management
- Environmental Protection
- Transportation Safety/Shipping QA

He told the group that the panel system allows the flexibility to add windows, as needed if issues arise. He also provided some examples of the types of metrics that would roll up to the Level 1s. For Safety Culture, examples include Disciplined Operations, Personnel Errors, and Near Misses, Procedure Violations. Project Management would be focused to ensure that safety is integrated with construction and project management. Transportation Safety would focus on shipments of spent nuclear fuel, special nuclear material, and waste. Risk Reduction examples were waste shipments, D&D, reduction of contamination areas, and reduction of number of steps in a process for reducing risk. Regulatory Compliance would include Price Anderson Act and missed commitments to state regulatory agencies.

The group had several comments on the terms for the three focus areas. After discussion, it was decided that comments should be sent to DeWitt Beeler and Gail Jernigan to be summarized for DOE-HQ for use in the Card meeting on August 7. Due to time limitations, comments were to be provided to DeWitt and Gail by Monday, August 5, COB. They would summarize the comments on Tuesday morning and provide additional feedback to Dave Stadler and Frank Russo.

The group also discussed the individual performance metrics. Dave Stadler stressed that the metrics he described were only to be used as examples and were not mandated metrics from DOE-HQ. First and foremost, metrics should be used by site management to manage the site. The second use of metrics is to provide Bob Card with some quick view of how sites are doing. It was also stressed that the metrics should not be compared among sites. Each site will be setting their own goals and have their own set of metrics, so comparisons are not meaningful. While the metrics should be devised to be objective, there may be some subjectivity involved. Dave also reminded the group that some metrics will be deleted as missions change. He said that posting of the metrics is encouraged for every facility as part of continuous improvement.

DeWitt Beeler led the discussion on Focus Areas. Based on previous discussions, he raised several questions for additional discussion. Below are the questions and responses.

- What if the Focus Area requires me to report on something I don't do? *Answer: Sites are only to report on meaningful performance metrics.*
- Do I have to use all the Level 1 performance metrics? *Answer: No.*
- Do I have to use any of the Level 1 performance metrics? *Answer: No, however, most sites have some metrics that can probably be rolled up into the Focus Areas.*
- What do I have to measure? *Answer: Only measure what is meaningful for a site.*
- How will I be compared to other sites? *Answer: The intent is to NOT compare sites.*

DeWitt reminded the group that the basic principle is to preserve the ability of the sites to measure what is important to them and to report the results in a consistent and clear manner.

Gail Jernigan reviewed several possible colors and their definitions. Dave Stadler also provided a set, which recommended that there should be four colors (Blue, Green, Yellow, and Red) and that White should be used to designate either insufficient data or that the metrics is not

applicable. However, since not all were in agreement, comments are to be sent to DeWitt and Gail to be summarized with the focus areas.

Joe Yanek briefly told the group of other EFCOG activities and explained how this effort fits into other EFCOG work. He announced that there will be an EFCOG Working Group meeting in Las Vegas on October 23-24. The group decided that this should be a meeting to discuss any lessons learned.

Issues from the meeting:

- Send out list of attendees (Gail Jernigan)
- Clarify and comment on the process for reporting to DOE-HQ (logistics, players, roles and responsibilities, etc.) and how these are to be transmitted (electronic or paper). Is there existing software (PV Views) that could help with this effort? (Frank Russo and Dave Stadler)
- What is the relationship between this effort and Card's six principles, BMR and LCAM? (DeWitt Beeler and Dave Stadler)
- Feedback on focus areas, Level 1s, and colors/definitions. (All to provide to DeWitt Beeler and Gail Jernigan by COB, Monday, August 5.)
- Send the focus areas, Level 1s, and colors by Friday, August 2. (Gail Jernigan)
- Develop four workshops to be held across the DOE Complex to train sites on this performance measures process. (Dave Stadler and DeWitt Beeler)
- How should this effort be communicated to the PSOs, Field Office Managers, etc.? (Frank Russo and Dave Stadler) Attendees were encouraged to talk to their DOE counterparts to start the discussions about performance metrics.
- Define roles and responsibilities of site offices and contractors. (contractual issues – some sites' contracts may not include this effort) (Frank Russo)
- Distribute Frank Russo's slides. (Frank Russo to send to Gail Jernigan, who will distribute them.)
- Update Point Paper and schedule. (DeWitt Beeler and Gail Jernigan)