

**DRAFT Meeting Summary Excerpt**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

February 1-2, 2001

Kennewick, Washington

**FLUOR HANFORD WORK FORCE REDUCTION**

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), brought up the subject of the work force reductions by Fluor Hanford that will eliminate approximately 300 jobs. The reason for the layoffs that he was given were different than the reasons given in the newspaper. The reasons he was given pointed to mismanagement. The reasons given in the newspaper did not. Jeff said that the HAB has always been told that the workers are the number one resource of DOE and the contractors. Funding for this year is greater than last year, so funding should not be a reason for the layoffs.

The announcement was that workers currently working on “low-priority jobs” would be laid off; however, workers have never been informed which jobs have a low priority. They are not given a choice of what to work on. Jeff Luke feels that they should know how their jobs are classified and have the opportunity to move to “high-priority jobs.” If the workers are truly the number one resource, they should have this option. Managers have been told that the low-priority work will still need to be done, but with fewer workers.

Jeff Luke took a paragraph from the advice summary document prepared by Ken Niles relative to work force and would like to send it to Fluor with a request for consideration of alternatives to layoffs. The Board was in sympathy with Jeff’s ideas.

A summary of the Board discussion follows:

Betty Tabbutt doesn’t want to pass up the opportunity to address this issue, particularly because the Board has issued previous advice on the topic. Jim Trombold concurred. Leon Swenson said that every time reductions in work force occur they are handled in a less effective manner. . The previous advice should be the basis for the present response by the Board. Harold Heacock reminded everyone that the Board has encouraged DOE to cut costs consistently. Jobs have been cut as a result. The Board needs to be careful to avoid inconsistency.

Ken Niles said that the excerpt of the advice on work force issues was very appropriate; however, the Board needs to look at the entire piece to see if it all applies or if the Board needs to create new advice.

Gordon Rogers was concerned about responding before hearing management’s point of view. Keith Smith said that he has asked directly about the lay-offs and has not received a response. He feels that the present lay-offs do not reflect previously stated goals relative to health and safety.

After discussion and consideration, it was decided to write a letter to DOE with an excerpt from the Board discussion about this issue. In the end, it was decided to classify this as an advice rather than just a letter because it then will require a response and follow-up and be posted on the website.