0029572

CORRES. CONTROL
INCOMING LTR. NO.

C-291-RF-90

McKinley
C. C. Ds

d States Government

Department of Energy

emorandum

Rocky Flats Office

000025592

DUE DATE as stated

ACTION D Van Leuven

MAR 13 1990

DIST.	LTR	ENCL
ALLHOFF, F.H.	X	X
BREEN, J.H.	X	X
BRETZKE, J.C.		
BURLINGAME, A.H.		
DAVIS, J.G.	X	X
FERRERA, D.W.		
FERRIS, L.G.		
FRANCIS, G.E.	X	X
GOODWIN, R.	X	X
HEALY, T.		
HOECKER, E.H.		
KERSH, J.M.	X	X
KIRBY, W.A.	X	X
MAJESTIC, J.R.		
McKINLEY, K.B.		
MELLEN, J.B.		
PARNELL, R.F.		
POTTER, G.L.		
RHODES, J.L.		
RISNER, V.L.		
SANFORD, T.J.		
SHANNON, W.W.		
VAN LEUVEN, D.B.	X	X
WARNER, B.P.	X	X
YOUNG, E.R.		
BETCHER, D.H.		
CARNIVAL, G.J.		
HARMAN, L.K.		
HEBERT, J.L.		
HOFFMAN, R.B.		
KLAMMAN, R.L.		
KRIEG, D.M.		
LOUDENBERG, G.E.		
NAIMON, E.R.		
NEWBY, R.L.		
TURNER, H.L.		
VELASQUEZ, R.N.		
CORRES. CONTROL	X	X
CONTRACT ADMIN.		

Received for Addressee
Corres. Control RFP

2-13-90
Date By

Ref. Ltr. #

AMC:DS:5302.

DOE Comments on Conduct of Critiques--
Request for Additional Action

B. P. Warner
General Manager
EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.

On January 4, 1990, EG&G management issued Standing Orders and provided guidance on the reporting and investigation of events by conducting critique meetings. DOE/RFO personnel have attended a majority of the critique meetings conducted during the past two months. (Attachment 1 provides a list of general comments that DOE/RFO personnel have made from observations during these critique meetings.)

In a number of cases, there appears to be a problem with mid- and lower-level management compliance with EG&G's Standing Orders. Thus far my office has not seen evidence of senior management assessments to determine if the Standing Orders are being followed. Also, as we have discussed, it is apparent that critique meetings are not being consistently conducted in accordance with the Standing Orders. It appears to me that the conduct of critiques should be formalized in an approved procedure.

RFO considers that the EG&G critique program and the Standing Orders are high priority items which must be in place early in the process of improving the culture safety at Rocky Flats. Results to date have been mixed as is described in the attachment. Please review the implementation of these items and assure that adequate attention is being directed toward them.

I would like to use Dave Simonson, Deputy Manager, as the focal point for RFO on compliance with Standing Orders and with the conduct of critiques as part of his overall responsibility of reviewing formality of operations. I suggest that your staff meet with Dave to discuss RFO observations.

MAR 13 12 55 PM '90
CORRES-CONTROL CONTROL

ADMIN RECORD

SW-A-002968

I would also recommend that EG&G initiate trending for each critiqued event, identifying each event by building area and root cause and that there be a system for tracking each event and assuring the root causes related to the event are indeed corrected.

for Robert M. Nelson, Jr.
Manager

ATTACHMENT 1

GENERAL DOE-RFO COMMENTS ON CONDUCT OF CRITIQUES

1. FAILURE TO CONDUCT CRITIQUE IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER - Standing order number 3 provides guidance on the reporting and conduct of critique meeting. In review of the Unusual Events (UE's) several UE fit the category for conduct of a critique meeting. However, in only 20% of the events are critique meetings actually being conducted.

2. FAILURE TO CONDUCT CRITIQUES WITHIN 24 HOURS OF THE EVENT - Of the 44 critiques reviewed, that were conducted since January 8, 1990, only 21 were conducted within 24 hours of the event (approximately 50%).

3. FAILURE TO ESTABLISH THE ROOT CAUSE OF PROBLEMS - In most critique meeting personnel are not getting to the root cause of problems. They tend to skim the issues vice trying to determine what actually happened, so that root causes can be determined.

4. FAILURE TO ISSUE CRITIQUE MINUTES WITHIN 24 HOURS OF THE EVENT - None of the critique minutes were issued within 24 hours of the event, about 14% were issued within 24 hours of the critique meeting.

5. CRITIQUE ATTENDANCE - In two cases the involved personnel were not in-attendance at the critique meeting. In one case the critique was cancelled and rescheduled when those personnel could attend, in the other the critique was conducted without the involved personnel. In about 50% of the critiques Directors were not in attendance.

6. FAILURE TO ADDRESS SITE-WIDE CORRECTIVE ACTION - In critiques attended where Directors were not in attendance, the issue of site-wide corrective action fails to be addressed, or if addressed does not appear in the minutes with who will address the action site-wide. In most cases the building personnel tend to treat the problem as an isolated event vice looking for global issues.

7. COMPLETENESS OF MINUTES - In most cases the critique minutes fail to address all the questions that were asked at the critique meeting. In some case corrective action is not identified in the critique minutes for problems identified at the critique meeting. On some critique minutes personnel are not assigned a completion date for when the corrective actions are to be completed.

8. Some improvement has been noted in critique performance, most has been as a result of Directors attending the critiques and in most cases where they run the critique. For example, Burlingame and Majestic both run excellent critiques.

9. FAILURE TO BRING PROCEDURES AND SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION TO CRITIQUE MEETINGS - Procedures and supportive documentation is not being brought to critiques, this information routinely has to be requested.

10. FAILURE TO ASSIGN RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL AND CORRECTIVE ACTION DATES TO IDENTIFIED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS - Individuals and dates corrective actions are to be complete are not being assigned in all cases. Building personnel are in some cases being tasked with the Site-Wide corrective actions, without having any guidance on how to implement such global action.

11. FAILURE TO ADDRESS AT THE START OF THE CRITIQUE THE PURPOSE OF THE MEETING - In some case personnel are not explaining the purpose of the critique at the start of the meeting, i. e. that they are not for finger pointing, but to get the fact out and provide corrective action.