assistance, and one other comment I guess, and that is 371 I've seen to be a problem for a long time. Are you satisfied you've got good management control there?

MR. PARKER: I am absolutely convinced that our management will get that job done. It's --

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Well, it's just been --

371 traditionally has been a problem area.

MR. PARKER: It's a tough building.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Jessie, did you want to say something? Please come forward. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, sir. Three things --

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Jessie, for the record, would you tell us who you are so the record shows.

MS. ROBERSON: Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management for DOE.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: And former Member of this Board.

MS. ROBERSON: And former Member of the Board. Thank you very much. I really enjoyed today. There were three things that I really feel fairly strongly that I would like to comment on. Those three are the proposed -- the new draft DOE oversight policy, accelerated clean-up (and its impact on
safety], and Mr. Hicks' statement of yesterday.

On DOE's oversight policy, DOE as everyone knows, is a broad-based organization. Even though the Board's interface is primarily within NNSA and EM, we have to keep in mind that DOE's policy is structured to accommodate all of its program missions. Second, DOE's policy in this area is a floor, not a ceiling, and it does not eliminate the need for managers to manage their business. It establishes boundaries, it doesn't tell us specifically how to do that, and we have to look at the work that we're doing, [that], fit within that boundary, so that when it comes to oversight, I think Roy probably said it best, but I think you heard it from each one of them. The expectation is that we have very capable, technical resources because there is no way to cover every area in writing. We need smart people who contribute to the work that we're doing, and that's what we expect our managers to do, and that's the expectation of me.

In accelerated clean-up and its impact on safety, I wanted to make sure that we didn't attribute changes in DOE to things that weren't the drivers. The policy itself, as you've probably heard, is draft. We've made changes in the way we
carry out oversight, not necessarily because of a draft policy, it's because we believe it's good business practice, it's the thing to do. Accelerated clean-up is the same way. We actually started changes to our infrastructure in this program before there was an accelerated clean-up program. When I came into the program, it doesn't take very -- you don't have to look very deep, and the Board sees these areas of concerns too, as there were lots of assessments and lots of corrective actions, but very few things being changed. What we're interested in is an effective assessment program, both DOE and contractor, that is affecting what's actually being done. So the measure is what actually gets done, for us. Accelerated clean-up, you can eliminate the word accelerated, and just say get work done, because that's what we're about and that's what we're interested in. At the end of the road, we still have to get work done. Where we introduce the new hazards in the accelerated clean-up program is the process by which we get there. The thought process and the rigor, and we have somewhat different approaches at each site, but I think you will see that the themes run through all of those operations consistently.

Then, I actually did have the opportunity
to read Mr. Hicks' statement. Some of the NNSA folks from yesterday were gracious enough to call me last night and make sure I saw that, and I appreciated that. You raised this with some of the other managers who had not had the opportunity to do that, so I wanted to address it. I certainly cannot take issue with his assessment of what he sees. His statement was primarily focused on NNSA with one sweeping characterization of the EM program, and that characterization was that EM is eliminating requirements that have provided the defense-in-depth protection from major consequences, and I didn't want to let this go without saying that I totally and completely disagree with that, and if I didn't, if I thought it were true, then I wouldn't be doing what I was doing, because that obviously is not the goal of what we're trying to accomplish.

On the Columbia report, the thing that was most striking to me, and we've spent a couple of days with our managers and a subset of our Facility Reps, talking about it, the most striking thing to me was the fact that the technical organization, which we are, and is also, you know, a characterization of the nuclear industry, very highly technical organizations developed over some period of time an
air of arrogance in that it only knows the way to do things, and so we are not just looking at statistics, although those statistics are requirements and are provided, but many of the things that we're doing is to ensure that we don't become an arrogant organization in thinking that just because it was the way it always was that it's the right way to do it.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Did you get General Barry's presentation?

MS. ROBERSON: We did.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: It's pretty good.

MS. ROBERSON: We sure did. It was very good, very good. I heard nothing but glowing comments, and we're considering, if we can afford him, to have him speak to our broader staff. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Thank you very much. Anybody? Thank you. As always, you make it very succinct and right to the point.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you. I know it's lunch time.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: No, it's past lunch time. Okay, well, thank you all, and is there anyone in the audience that wishes to say something at this point? If not, from henceforth hold your tongue.