

1 whatever oversight system you want to put on it,
2 adequate performance is going to depend on us putting
3 the systems in that everything else rides on.

4 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Let me put it a
5 different way then. What changes, if any, are you now
6 going to implement because NNSA is requiring you to do
7 something different, or because of their changes that
8 they are making from their point of view? So I've
9 concluded you would be doing this anyway.

10 ADMIRAL NANOS: Yes. No, I can't think of
11 anything that I'm going to change, unless they decide
12 to forbid us from doing things. If you're trying to
13 get done. And Ralph has indicated he's going to
14 forbid me making any improvement.

15 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: With that, then I want
16 to thank you very much for the time and effort you put
17 into preparing your testimony, and we wish you success
18 in your operations. Thank you all. And with that,
19 we'll ask for the contingent from Livermore. We'll
20 start with you, Camille, if I may.

21 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Okay. That's fine.

22 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: If you want to at any
23 time put your statement in the record to summarize,
24 they'll do it whichever way you want to do it.

25 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: I shall do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board,
2 thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in
3 regards to the Livermore Site Office's oversight of
4 the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Because I
5 have submitted for the record, I will go ahead and
6 summarize.

7 As you are aware, in the December Fiscal
8 Year 02, realignment of NNSA, one of the major
9 missions of the Site Office is for operations
10 oversight, contract administration, as well as the
11 [risk] acceptance official for NNSA.

12 In that role as the Site Manager, I take
13 my responsibilities in the area of safety and security
14 extremely seriously. I am committed to a technically
15 sound and effective safety program.

16 I'm going to describe to you today the
17 federal organization, as well as the staffing
18 capabilities that I've put together towards this
19 oversight role, as well as our model for oversight.
20 And I will also make some comments on the lessons
21 learned from the Shuttle Columbia accident.

22 When I first became Site Manager, I looked
23 internally within our organization, and I wanted to
24 determine what I needed to do within the organization
25 so that I could be the "risk acceptor" and do that job

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 well.

2 In such, I looked at the organization, I
3 looked at the staffing, as well as our technical
4 capability of the staff, such that it can provide me
5 with the analysis, and the advice and recommendations
6 for me to make the final decisions as the "risk
7 acceptor" for NNSA.

8 To that end, for the Livermore Site
9 Office, as far as our organization is concerned, I
10 have implemented a structure that has been approved by
11 Ambassador Brooks of a two Deputy concept. One Deputy
12 for National Security Operations, and one technical
13 Deputy for the Safety and Environmental Programs area.

14 And the first Deputy for the National Security is
15 responsible for all program oversight at the Lawrence
16 Livermore Laboratory, including the projects, our
17 infrastructure activities, safeguard security,
18 business management, and the overall coordination of
19 the contract performance evaluation process.

20 The second deputy is a technical Deputy,
21 responsible for all the areas that you're looking at,
22 which is in the areas of nuclear safety, ES&H, the
23 implementation of ISM, the Environmental Management
24 [EM] Programs. And that Deputy is responsible for
25 having a system in place to assure that the nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety Authorizations Bases are adhered to at the
2 Site.

3 With those two technical deputies, I rely
4 on them, as well as other professionals within our
5 organization and outside of our organization to
6 provide me with the advice to make the final decisions
7 that I need to make.

8 In regards to staffing, I believe you were
9 out at our Site in September of '02. At that point in
10 time, we committed to you that we would move subject
11 matter experts into our Site Office in the areas of
12 fire protection, Quality Assurance, seismic, as well
13 as fill a systems engineering position, as well as a
14 senior ES&H advisor. To this date, we have completed
15 all of those actions within the NNSA Approved Staffing
16 Plan of 90 FTEs, approximately 35 people are devoted
17 to the area of ES&H. That is up from 29 in 2002.

18 I currently have five FRs in the nuclear
19 facilities, and three in the non-nuclear facilities.
20 We are down by two FRs, and that is the recent
21 departures. The two FRs received promotions elsewhere
22 within the NNSA and DOE system. I am in the process
23 of backfilling those positions.

24 In addition, I am advertising for a Health
25 Physicist position. The SME that we had has been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reassigned and, therefore, our Radiation Protection
2 Program has suffered. And this is an area that I need
3 to pay particular attention to until we fill that
4 position, and get someone capable to take on the
5 responsibilities.

6 DR. MANSFIELD: Let me ask a question I
7 asked of Mr. Erickson. The two FRs who have moved on
8 due to promotions, how long did it take them to become
9 qualified?

10 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: It took them around 12
11 to 18 months to become qualified.

12 DR. MANSFIELD: How long did they stay in
13 the FR positions?

14 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: They were fairly new.
15 They were about three years.

16 DR. MANSFIELD: Okay. Well, that's longer
17 than the six months we were talking about.

18 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes. And again, they
19 did move onto other FR positions at other Site Offices
20 [one as an FR and one to Headquarters].

21 DR. MANSFIELD: All right. That's good.
22 That's all right.

23 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes, so they're still
24 within the NNSA-DOE system.

25 DR. MANSFIELD: That's good. On the issue

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the radiological SME, was he assigned at his own
2 initiative, or did you just need to pick him up for
3 the Radiological Systems Program? In other words,
4 since he was doing SME work for Radiation Safety
5 Oversight, why wasn't it possible for him to do the
6 Radiological Assistance Program at the same time,
7 without giving up the SME?

8 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: I see. Yes, we had him
9 doing both at the same time. The Radiological
10 Assistance Program after 9/11, the activities
11 increased significantly. And Headquarters has decided
12 that they want to designate full-time Radiological
13 Assistance people. And, therefore, he was designated
14 as one who is full-time. That is why I am in the
15 process of backfilling.

16 DR. MANSFIELD: Okay. For a subject
17 matter expert, do you have a formal qualification
18 program, it's not like a fac rep where you need to
19 know every pipe and cable run. A subject matter
20 expert is qualified immediately, in effect, by being
21 an expert?

22 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Exactly, through their
23 education, as well as their experience.

24 DR. MANSFIELD: Thank you.

25 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Okay. I also -- and,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mr. Chairman, you have asked previously to dwell on
2 the NNSA Service Center for experts from time to time
3 where those positions are not needed full-time on
4 Site. And I do have a Service Level Agreement with
5 the Service Center for that.

6 In terms of our Technical Qualifications
7 Program, that was the other thing that I looked into,
8 and am aggressively pushing on. This is a program
9 where I think statistically, we are behind, but
10 there's a reason for that. In terms of our Technical
11 Qualification Program, we totally have revamped that
12 program, to bring more structure, formality, and rigor
13 into the program. And as a result, we have asked
14 everyone to re-qualify, and so people have been
15 re-qualifying. We're about over 50 percent re-
16 qualified as of this date, and that's been an
17 aggressive effort. And I expect to continue with that
18 effort. And we will meet that 75 percent
19 qualification from a departmental average, I think
20 early sometime next year.

21 In terms of my role as the Risk Acceptance
22 Official, that is delegated to me through NNSA, and
23 through the official NNSA Functions, Responsibilities,
24 and Authority Manual, or the FRAM. And I carry out
25 those responsibilities through my role as a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Contracting Officer.

2 To assist me in terms of the Contracting
3 Officer role, I do have Contracting Officer
4 Representatives that have been formally appointed both
5 at the Site Office, as well as within NNSA
6 Headquarters. And in that role, I do integrate the
7 direction to the Laboratories, as well as provide
8 contract requirements where it comes to ES&H, as well
9 as nuclear safety, and so on.

10 And, as well as, as part of my
11 responsibility in terms of the ultimate acceptor of
12 risk, I need to also assure myself that I have a
13 oversight model in place that will provide me with the
14 feedback that the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory is
15 performing as expected by the Department.

16 So with that, I will describe our
17 oversight model, and give you some indications as to
18 the maturity, or whether it's in the developmental
19 stages or not.

20 Our oversight model is based on it being
21 constructive, as well as value-added. And we focus on
22 metrics, observations, assessments, and validations,
23 certifications to assure ourselves that the elements
24 of risk are controlled. And we separate our oversight
25 model into five different components.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The first one is our operational awareness
2 activities. And that is simply defined as day-to-day
3 activities to determine how well the contractor is
4 performing their requirements. And we do that via
5 walk-throughs, surveillances, validations, checking on
6 corrective actions to determine whether it's been
7 done, looking at some of the documentation, and also
8 the meetings and communications with contractors from
9 a real-time standpoint.

10 And this is a fairly mature system for us.

11 We do also have standard operating procedures within
12 our office. FRs are stationed in the nuclear
13 facilities. We do have space, and they're stationed
14 there. The subject matter experts are also required
15 to do walk-throughs on at least a monthly basis. Even
16 Senior Managers, including myself, are required to do
17 walk-throughs. And the walk-through results are
18 documented and fed into the system for review.

19 The second area that we do are in the form
20 of reviews and audits. And the reviews and audits
21 take from the form of external reviews, to internal
22 reviews are done by the Site Office. External reviews
23 could be from entities, such as the California state,
24 the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency], the Office
25 of Performance Assurance (Glenn Podonsky's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 organization), IG [Inspector General], GAO [General
2 Accounting Office], that type of reviews.

3 In addition, that is complimented by our
4 own internal reviews, and those reviews could be
5 periodic reviews to for-cause reviews. And again,
6 those reviews are always coordinated in terms of
7 notify to Headquarters so that they are aware of the
8 reviews. And for the reviews that we conduct
9 ourselves, we generally ask whether the Headquarters
10 organizations would like to participate. There is an
11 opportunity for that.

12 Thirdly, in terms of reporting system
13 monitoring, as you're well aware, the Department has a
14 number of systems in place for reporting safety
15 issues. And we do do that, and we do communicate with
16 NNSA in terms of the areas that we have issues with,
17 as well as real-time notification when the issues are
18 significant. And this is an area where we need to put
19 a little more work into, in the regard that while the
20 data is in the system, we have not done as well as we
21 should in terms of analyzing the data, and in tracking
22 and trending it. And that is one area where we're in
23 the process of making sure that we can put systems
24 together to improve upon that.

25 The fourth area is in terms of contractor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 performance measures and metrics. And that, in
2 itself, deals with the University of California
3 contract, the Appendix F process, which we have
4 developed so-called top objectives that have been
5 accepted by the NNSA Senior Leadership, the University
6 of California, as well as the Laboratory Directors.
7 And specifically, in the area that you're interested
8 in, we have a performance objective dealing with
9 maintaining a secure, safe, environmentally sound, and
10 effective and efficient operations in terms of the
11 mission objectives.

12 And tiered down from that particular
13 objective, we do have performance measures in terms of
14 continuing improvement in the ISM area, as well as in
15 terms of improvements in the performance of the
16 nuclear safety area. So those areas are specifically
17 evaluated on an annual basis, and with Ambassador
18 Brooks being personally involved.

19 The review is supported not only by
20 lessons learned self-assessments, but also by results
21 of the areas that I mentioned before in terms of
22 internal-external reviews, our operational awareness,
23 tracking and trending of data that is in the current
24 system.

25 Lastly, in terms of our contractor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assurance is the new Contractor Assurance System. And
2 that is in the developmental stages. Both Lawrence
3 Livermore is putting together an extensive effort to
4 get a solid Contractor Assurance System in place, and
5 we are working with them. And that is, again as I
6 said, it's evolving.

7 Now I also wanted to make some comments in
8 regards to the Headquarters interactions, as well as
9 their role in terms of oversight. I have never found,
10 from my standpoint, a lack of interest from
11 Headquarters, may it be Ambassador Brooks, or Dr.
12 Beckner on down, in terms of the activities on Site,
13 whether they're ES&H or program activities. They are
14 always accessible in terms of telephone calls,
15 e-mails, etcetera.

16 And we do keep them aware, and we
17 generally use staff within Dr. Beckner's office as the
18 focal point when we have safety issues. We call,
19 report, either e-mail or what, discuss it with them.
20 And that is usually where the requests go in as far as
21 if anyone would like to participate in any of our own
22 on-Site reviews.

23 I consider myself as the Site Manager,
24 part of NNSA, an extension of Ambassador Brooks. So
25 from that standpoint, while the NNSA realignment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 strived to reach clarity in terms of roles and
2 responsibilities, from the Headquarters' standpoint as
3 well as Site Office standpoint. And again, we're in
4 the process, and I think we get better day by day from
5 that standpoint.

6 I don't see it as a Headquarters versus
7 Field or Site Office standpoint. We all perform the
8 same function, but we just have different roles and
9 responsibilities. We're accountable for different
10 things.

11 As far as our own self-assessment program
12 is concerned, we have had a self-assessment program.
13 It can be improved, but I think that it has been a
14 fairly structured self-assessment process; especially
15 in the ES&H area. What is still in the developmental
16 stages is in all the other functional areas. We have
17 not done as well in the other areas for
18 self-assessments. However, we have conducted ISM
19 self-assessments, and I would say on almost an annual
20 basis. We're in the process of conducting one now, as
21 well as the Service Center has just finished up a QA
22 assessment. But before they came, we performed a
23 self-assessment ourselves.

24 So it's my expectation that we perform
25 self-assessments, and what we need to do now is to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make sure that the self-assessments we do are of good
2 quality, high standards. We defined the craft to be
3 used, and conduct them. And also have outside
4 participants where resources are available to do that.

5 Now as far as the Shuttle Columbia is
6 concerned, when that report came out, and I read the
7 report, and it gave me great concern in terms of
8 making sure that we within NNSA take lessons learned,
9 and we benefit from those lessons learned, as
10 difficult of an accident as it was. So from that
11 standpoint, we talked with the Laboratory. The
12 Laboratory also read the report, got the teams
13 together. Our Senior Nuclear Safety Advisor is a part
14 of the team with General Haeckel, and is working
15 actively in terms of looking at NNSA-wide Lessons
16 learned. While we also have an internal team within
17 our Site Office that is looking at areas that we could
18 learn from from a Site Office standpoint. And that
19 team also works with the Livermore contractor in terms
20 of their efforts, in terms of the lessons learned.

21 So I guess in conclusion, let me just say
22 that I am committed to a technically sound and
23 effective Safety Operational Oversight Program. And I
24 believe that there is continuous improvement that we
25 will continue to undertake. And in the areas of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety, it takes a commitment, a culture, and a
2 continuous practice. And for me to do my job well in
3 the long-run, I think, Mr. Chairman, you've said in
4 previous testimony, is that we're all here in terms of
5 the long-term viability of the science at our national
6 laboratories. And so if I do my job well, that is an
7 indication in terms of their long-term viability. But
8 at the same time, if I do my job well, I think that
9 the workers at Livermore, as well as the community and
10 the general American public, can be assured that NNSA
11 is performing its federal role.

12 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Thank you. Dr.
13 Eggenberger.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: With respect
15 to the Columbia accident, and with respect to safety,
16 are there any changes that you anticipate or can see
17 in your organization with respect to how it does
18 assessments and analysis of safety data?

19 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: What we are seeking in
20 our organization is that there are several factors
21 that can be learned. One is in terms of the
22 communication process, and I, for one, do not want to
23 have any indication from folks that they cannot come
24 to me with a difference in opinion in terms of any
25 safety issues. And so from that standpoint, from an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 open door standpoint, whenever we review any safety
2 document, the team is invited to present to me their
3 recommendations and advice. And that's all team
4 members. And so, that's one lesson from the Shuttle
5 Columbia, but we've already implemented that, and had
6 that in place prior to the report coming out.

7 In addition, some of the other issues
8 related to whether safety professionals are considered
9 as support staff, or an integral part of conducting
10 the mission of the Laboratories. And that is one that
11 I think that we, as well as the Laboratory, have to
12 work on more, because I think whenever you're in an
13 area where there are specific rules and regulations
14 that you have to comply with, there is always the
15 perception that you are dealing with compliance, for
16 the sake of compliance, versus mission accomplishment.
17 And I think that is a culture that we need to
18 continue to move with, from the standpoint that safety
19 is not -- it's not one or the other - safety or
20 mission accomplishment. Safety is integral to mission
21 accomplishment, and we do both together.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Dr. Mansfield.

24 DR. MANSFIELD: Nothing.

25 DR. MATTHEWS: Your role as the Risk

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Acceptance Official, it's a powerful statement, in my
2 opinion.

3 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes, it is.

4 DR. MATTHEWS: And I'll ask the same
5 question I asked Mr. Erickson. What do you see as the
6 three biggest risks at the Livermore Site? And how do
7 you convince yourself that the risks are acceptable?
8 In fact, what processes do you use to assure that?

9 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Okay. I would say that
10 the three that I probably am most concerned about,
11 certainly the Superblock activities, our plutonium
12 activities. The second one would be the explosive
13 activities that we have at Site 300. Can I give you
14 four?

15 DR. MATTHEWS: Sure. Two will do, but
16 four....

17 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Certainly, we also have
18 our Waste Operations. The other one that I continue
19 to be concerned with, and I know that Mike is actively
20 working with, is the integration of ISM, and the
21 integration of corrective actions across the whole
22 laboratory, as opposed to just looking at it in a
23 stovepipe fashion between each directorate.

24 DR. MATTHEWS: So the second part of my
25 question is: what process do you use to convince

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yourself that the risk is acceptable?

2 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Oh, yes. Okay. The
3 process I use is through a number of factors; the
4 advice that I obtain from my technical professionals
5 within the Site Office; and that is through their
6 day-to-day surveillance, walk-throughs, my personal
7 walk-throughs. For instance, whenever I am about to
8 approve a particular safety document, there have been
9 times where I have gone out to take a look at exactly
10 what that entails.

11 I also, whenever I look at the risk
12 associated with things, I also do not hesitate to call
13 some of my counterparts, or folks within NNSA to
14 discuss on a more generic basis, the issues that I'm
15 faced with, to just get some outside opinion.

16 I also have experts within the Lawrence
17 Livermore Lab that I also seek out advice from, so
18 that I make sure that I get advice and recommendations
19 from all sorts before I make that recommendation, so
20 that I can better assess the level of risk that I'm
21 accepting.

22 DR. MATTHEWS: Do you use any formal
23 risk-based criteria that looks at the consequence and
24 likelihood?

25 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Our Nuclear Safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Experts do.

2 DR. MATTHEWS: Okay. And one final
3 question. Mr. Erickson testified that he has no
4 programmatic responsibilities in his role. Is that
5 true for you too?

6 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: It is true from the
7 sense that we do not have delegated programmatic
8 responsibilities from Dr. Beckner in the DP [Defense
9 Programs] side of the house. We do have some
10 delegated programmatic responsibilities on the EM
11 side of the house, outside of NNSA.

12 DR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Did I understand you to
14 say you've entered into an agreement with Albuquerque
15 Service Center?

16 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes. The NNSA Service
17 Center, we have Service Level Agreements for each of
18 the functional areas. And that would entail what do
19 we expect from the Service Center; for instance, in
20 the area of ES&H, or in the area of security, and so
21 on.

22 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: So these are formal
23 agreements?

24 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes, they are. And
25 these agreements are intended for -- and, obviously,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this last year was the first year that we've put these
2 things in place, but they are intended that we would
3 update it periodically, about a year basis, to
4 determine, you know, as we mature in terms of this new
5 Site Office concept, as the Service Center gets more
6 established, then what type of services can be drawn
7 from them.

8 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: If you ran into a
9 problem, and it's not specifically mentioned in your
10 agreement, you can't just call upon them to send you a
11 Subject Expert?

12 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: No, it's not as formal
13 as that. We provide, basically, an outline of
14 expectations in terms of what type of services we
15 would like. That way, the NNSA Service Center can
16 also determine their manpower, staffing requirements
17 based on what the customers may need. However, on
18 occasion, there will be things that will not be
19 written down, that will just happen. And what we do
20 is, we can just simply call the Service Center, and
21 talk with them. And then determine where best to get
22 those resources.

23 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay. Kent, did you
24 have a question?

25 MR. FORTENBERRY: Yes. Just, I would like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a little better understanding, both Admiral Nanos and
2 yourself talked a lot about Appendix F.

3 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes.

4 MR. FORTENBERRY: I believe those are very
5 similar, if not identical.

6 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: They are basically
7 identical.

8 MR. FORTENBERRY: Right. And there's sort
9 of a sense that that Appendix drives the performance
10 assessments. And looking at it, you read off a couple
11 of things which were, in fact, probably, at least half
12 of the safety-related items: achieve continual
13 improvement in ISM, continue to comply and improve
14 performance with the CFR 830 Rule, manage inventories
15 of material consistent with approved plans, maintain a
16 purchasing management program. And that's the level
17 of detail, and there may be -- maybe I left out an EM
18 item here.

19 That's not really a lot of detail -- in
20 other words, your contract, the contract with the
21 Laboratory, doesn't provide you the mechanism to where
22 you've communicated exactly what needs to be done in
23 this area. It's very difficult to do. You have to
24 rely on a lot of hands-on activity. For example, you
25 had some USQ issues that came up earlier in the year.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think you were fairly disappointed in what you saw
2 in terms of USQ implementation from the laboratory.
3 You mentioned you've now initiated an assessment of
4 that program.

5 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes.

6 MR. FORTENBERRY: Appendix F wouldn't say
7 anything about that. You might get there somehow
8 through the 830 Rule compliance, but we're not talking
9 about being out of compliance. We're just talking
10 about poorly implemented programs. And I just want to
11 make sure I've got the right sense of that.

12 You really have to have a lot of
13 interaction with the contractor. Your contract itself
14 doesn't really specify in any level of detail the kind
15 of self-assessments or performance assessments that
16 are needed.

17 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes. Let me clarify
18 that. The intent of the Appendix F, in terms of the
19 broad objectives - and the objectives were developed
20 broadly, so that it can be all-encompassing. And that
21 is the agreement between the University, as well as
22 NNSA, in terms of the areas that we deem important and
23 would like them to focus on.

24 MR. FORTENBERRY: And in fact, I guess
25 both Livermore and LANL, just because of the way

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they're written, depending on the expectation of the
2 Department, or maybe the expectation of the contractor
3 itself, could meet Appendix F. Currently, last year,
4 the year before. You could say, "Yes, we've continued
5 to improve ISM; we're improving performance on 830
6 Rule; we have an Emergency Management Plan."

7 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes.

8 MR. FORTENBERRY: The point I'm trying to
9 make is that the contract is just a very fundamental
10 outline. It takes a lot of interaction, hands-on.
11 You've got to communicate, the Department has to
12 communicate very specific expectations. And you can't
13 go to the contractor with a checklist that comes from
14 the contract. There's a lot of interaction there.

15 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: The Appendix F provides
16 the basic framework. However, it is tiered down below
17 to have the specific measures, as well as the
18 contractor provides basically an evaluation plan that
19 details out the areas. And we work with them in terms
20 of that, so from the broadest sense that you see, in
21 terms of the objective and what I read, it does appear
22 broad. However, it does provide the details that is
23 not -- it doesn't show up, I guess, in the top nine to
24 twelve objectives that we have developed. However, it
25 does provide the Site Office with the opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 look at specific areas, as well as provide them with
2 the feedback and the final assessment in those areas,
3 that will eventually be consolidated at that upper
4 level.

5 MR. FORTENBERRY: Okay. Thanks. And the
6 reason I was interested in that is the focus on
7 managing the contract that we're seeing, particularly
8 in the EM side, as being sufficient. You've got a
9 good contract. All you have to do is manage the
10 contract. It's extremely difficult to provide the
11 level of specificity that you need to just manage the
12 contract in this area.

13 DR. MANSFIELD: Could I follow-up on that?
14 As I understand it, the only thing that's made part
15 of the contract is the negotiated Appendix F. But
16 there is a mutually agreed set of details that support
17 that.

18 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Exactly. We need that.

19 DR. MANSFIELD: Okay.

20 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: Yes.

21 DR. ANASTASIO: And that's true for
22 safety, and for the program, and for everything. As
23 you said, milestones are achievable goals. They're
24 set up at a lower level than what you see in the
25 contract that we agree with the Site Office.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MANSFIELD: How are they maintained?
2 Do you jointly sign something that is not part of the
3 contract, that includes details like that? Are they
4 memorialized somehow?

5 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: They are in writing.
6 They are maintained by the Laboratory. They're the
7 basis for how they perform their self-assessments.

8 DR. MANSFIELD: So they can't change
9 willy-nilly.

10 MS. YUAN-SOO HOO: No.

11 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay. With that, we'll
12 turn to you, Dr. Anastasio.

13 DR. ANASTASIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 I hope that in the interest of time, you'll accept my
15 written document, and I'll try to do a quick summary.

16 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Very good.

17 DR. ANASTASIO: Mr. Chairman and Members
18 of the Board, thank you for the opportunity to discuss
19 our systems we have to assure work is performed safely
20 at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Of
21 course, these systems are dynamic. We strive to
22 continuously improve safety through self-assessments
23 and corrective actions.

24 We vigorously try to identify deficiencies
25 ourselves, and fix them. But, of course, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701