



**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY IDAHO OPERATIONS OFFICE
FY 1995 DRAFT WORKFORCE RESTRUCTURING PLAN**

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory discussed the DOE-ID FY 1995 Draft Workforce Restructuring Plan at its February 7-8, 1995, Board meeting. The Board's objective was to discuss six specific issues relative to the plan and bring to bear the range of perspective among the Board members. The following comments were provided in writing by individual Board members following a one and one half hour discussion of the plan. No attempt was made to bring Board members to consensus, and no editing has been done to the written comments provided by Board members.

EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

What is your opinion/perspective regarding employee specific issues: retirement packages, severance packages, specific benefits, time to make personal decisions regarding packages?

- The time to make personal decisions regarding packages is "dictated by federal budgets to some extent."
- "Any future packages should offer a more timely response."
- "While employees should have some input - can't drive. Lockheed needs to create impression that it cares."
- "Need for more employee involvement."
- "It's a fair package."
- "There is no way all employees will be pleased with a 'downsizing' program. Don't expect it, but communicate openly with them in a timely fashion."
- "Involve employees in such plans early-on."
- "Work on principle, not on amounts."
- "Losing safety training."
- "Need more employee involvement; could have avoided many of angry responses by more involvement; DOE responses to concerns did not seem genuine so far."
- "Had plenty of time to make decisions."
- "Retirement packages is better than other industry."
- "Many people outside in other jobs would settle for half as much."

SKILL MIX

DOE-ID is restructuring the work force in order to maintain a skill mix to fulfill their future mission. What is your opinion/perspective regarding the future skill mix and the plan's ability to meet it?

- "Involuntary separations are a more reasonable way to get the skill mix desired, but is perceived as unfair."

- "Restructuring plan should contain a proposed skill mix for future mission and mechanism used to determine this."
- "A properly conducted skills assessment needs to be done to maintain core competencies for current & future missions."
- "Plan does not seem to address skill needs/core competencies for future INEL mission."
- "I trust Lockheed to retain skill mix."
- "Plenty of redundancy in staff/administrative positions to cut & consolidate (ex. HR. budget, information/PR, practice & study people, etc.)"
- "Reduce levels of management."
- "Question the method of personal evaluation. Possibly Department heads should be evaluated. All skills, education and past performance should be criteria for evaluation and not personal feelings. Possibly outside evaluations should be used."
- "Plan doesn't reflect mix needed possibly - let chips fall where they may, seems to be outcome."
- "Losing institutional memory - is issue in old facilities - need skilled Workforce."
- "Projected skill mix is apparently not shared with employees and needs to made more open."
- "Lockheed didn't get where they are by not knowing what is needed and how to get it. I give credit to DOE-ID and Lockheed to know how to get the right skill mix."

ECONOMIC IMPACT

What is your opinion/perspective regarding the economic impact and the effort to influence the economic impact of this plan and it's implementation?

- "Bad - impact on local & state tax base & market place, loss of skills & experience."
- "Good - spin-offs, skill mix attracting industry."
- "If handled right and proper provisions are included in package for placement of displaced employees, impact would be minimal."
- "Going beyond redundancy to downsizing will have economic impact - unavoidable."
- "Impact is inevitable -- but don't do damage to core competencies which will cost more to repair later."
- "Plan recognizes."
- "Identify the problem, work towards those goals, stipulations from the Galvin Report indicates. Let employees make suggestions on projects, not just Lockheed appointed department heads."
- "Requirements in 3161 to rehire; flow down of laid off employees and contract requirement for flow down don't seem to be addressed."
- "Such a large employer in Idaho has impact and this plan will."
- "Will be a negative impact to area and state. Lockheed was awarded the contract to operate the INEL on a profitable basis. It will be good for Lockheed stockholders and it should be good for the taxpayer - should help reduce the budget deficit."

LONG-TERM SITE PERFORMANCE

What is your opinion/perspective regarding the overall effectiveness of the INEL post-restructuring and the long-term stability and performance of the Site?

- "Maintain core-competencies - require long-range planning, clear cut goals - difficult when mission is determined by Congress and changing administrations."

- "DOE-ID/INEL has to decide its future mission. Up in the air."
- "Employee involvement needs to be enhanced and to curb morale problems that exist."
- "Backwards process - designed to cut costs should be done to increase productivity in mission/objective areas."
- "Mission needs to be better articulated, so restructuring can contribute to that direction."
- "Need more stable mission identification from Washington."
- "Restructuring plan should be evaluated by employers, not just by department heads. Again, I reiterate, Department heads should also be evaluated."
- "Effort should be made to retain site core competencies - Galvin commission goals to keep research and not push technology transfer seem to be at odds with Lockheed contract goals."
- "Maintain core competency."
- "It will be effective if employees will take a positive approach and work toward removing the strangle-hold OSHA, EPA, State of Idaho and the bureaucracy has on the workforce. The tax payer wants a bang for the buck. It can be long term stability and good performance."

TAXPAYER ACCOUNTABILITY

To what degree is this plan accountable to the taxpaying citizens, both in terms of it's economic impact and it's viability?

- "Must look at long-range impact preserving this country's capabilities in technology development and ability to respond to national emergencies."
- "Reorganize the process of efficiency & prioritize certain work out in order to save money on overhead."
- "Institute efficiencies - don't merely cut \$'s."
- "Need to do better in maintaining employee morale - avoiding damage to future missions."
- "Prioritization - good direction."
- "If the issue of placing the right employee in the right slot and efficiently doing their jobs, that will generally satisfy the taxpayer, namely efficient rapid clean-up of Site."
- "Very mixed."
- "Rethink 'standard' operations and to improve efficiency. Keep capabilities for technological development and respond to emergencies."
- "Taxpayer needs to be involved and aware."

GENERAL COMMENTS

- "Need a similar plan for DOE employees. It is inequitable to restructure contractors and not DOE. Same redundancies, etc., could be addressed now."
- "I strongly feel that this issue should never have been brought to the SSAB. Workforce restructuring, budgets, and other internal administrative procedures do not come under the purview of the SSAB. Furthermore, union/labor issues have specific rules for resolution - the SSAB does not fit these rules."
- "There has to be a commitment to the workforce."
- "More involvement of lower level employees."
- "Less whining - more working together for productivity."