



LAWRENCE  
LIVERMORE  
NATIONAL  
LABORATORY

LLNL-PROC-667724

# Lessons in Nuclear Safety, Panel on Integration of People and Programs

D. Pinkston

February 26, 2015

EFCOG NFS Safety Basis Workshop  
Albuquerque, NM, United States  
March 3, 2015 through March 5, 2015

## **Disclaimer**

---

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

# *Lessons in Nuclear Safety – Panel on Integration of People and Programs*

2015 Safety Basis Workshop,  
Nuclear and Facility Safety, EFCOG

David Pinkston, LLNL



LLNL-PROC-667724

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC



# Nuclear Safety Historical Perspective

## History

- Successive waves of change
  - Golden age of funding and production, becomes...
  - Consolidation age around surviving complex, becomes...
  - Reduction age, shrinking both capability & funding footprint
- Current conditions
  - Staff reductions at all sites
  - Increasing workload due to increasing requirements
  - Audit and review expectations continually escalate
- People and programs are no longer aligned

# Nuclear Safety – Systemic Misalignment

- Available resources do not match expectations
  - Cascade of work too often perceived as simply something to be critiqued
  - Accelerates staff moving on to other jobs or retiring
  - “One man deep” concerns cited by both DOE and contractors
- Demographic cliff developing
- Promulgation of increased expectations and new requirements proceeds unabated

# Nuclear Safety – Needs

- Financial stability
  - Management theory and commitments to excellence have become the Band-Aid for this
  - They can't cover the gap
- Operational stability
  - Attributes of operation (e.g., procedures, training, safety basis) are elevated in significance above the actual operation itself
  - Constant change becomes the norm
  - Drives off staff & detrimental to actual worker safety
- Succession planning
  - Young people are sensitive to perceived funding issues
  - Overloaded staff limits mentoring opportunities
  - Opportunities to retain select senior staff close off with each audit

# Nuclear Safety – “The System”

- The current universe of requirements is too large for the resource pool available
- The current universe of requirements has too many different sources of interpretation
- So many indicators it's hard to know what is leading (or important)
- The net result can come to defy integrated comprehension at the worker level

If “The System” was a SAC  
It Would Fail Human Factors Analysis



**Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory**