

1 standardized programs. The engineers have to use
2 those tools, and you're restricted to the level of
3 freedom you have on how to do something when the
4 computer will only accept certain input, so that's
5 helped some, but we did have to do, and still do,
6 perform a lot of training.

7 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay. Thank you.
8 Thank you, gentlemen.

9 MR. HENSCHER: You're welcome.

10 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: And how we'll get to
11 the last two of the witnesses this morning. Mr.
12 Lockhart?

13 MR. LOCKHART: Yes. Thank you. My name
14 is Fraser Lockhart. I'm the Manager of the Rocky
15 Flats Field Office. I've been Manager now for six
16 weeks, and I met with all of you on my first day on
17 the job, and thank you for the opportunity to come
18 back six weeks later and present some of my views on
19 how I'm going to conduct oversight. I don't have a
20 prepared testimony. I've organized my slides and
21 presentation along your lines of inquiry, and I hope
22 by going through that to give you also the
23 perspective on my philosophy and approach to
24 oversight.

25 Looking at the top level, starting from

1 the guidance documents, I see our DOE Policy 450.4 as
2 being one of the key things, the Safety Management
3 System Policy or the ISMS as one of the most key
4 documents that defines how we look at the work that
5 needs to be done, and oversee that. Also, the policy
6 memo that came out of Environmental Management at the
7 end of May on project oversight and assessment has
8 been a key guidance document, and that, along with
9 other DOE policies, have gone into a Rocky Flats
10 manual, 220.2A, which is our Closure Project
11 Oversight Program manual, what we refer to as our
12 CPOP [Closure Project Oversight Program]. That was
13 created back in the late '90s, has undergone
14 revision, but still forms the basis of the structure
15 for our oversight.

16 Looking also at how that is performed,
17 and the responsibilities, as part of coming on as
18 the Manager, and the downsizing that's occurring at
19 the Site, I'm also taking steps to significantly
20 restructure the organization and flatten it, get more
21 direct lines of authority and accountability. I will
22 have three direct reports to me, and underneath those
23 three direct reports will be the staff, so a much
24 flatter and more direct organization. I also have
25 taken one of my very senior Facility Representatives,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you met him the first time, Ed Westbrook, who will
2 serve as my Senior Safety Advisor, reporting directly
3 to me. He will also serve as the program sponsor for
4 the other Facility Reps. Those Facility Reps will
5 continue to function in the role that they have. In
6 fact, I hope to restrengthen and re-emphasize their
7 role. They maintain stop work authority, they
8 maintain that position as the first and most
9 immediate interface with the contractor and with the
10 contractor's operating personnel in the facilities,
11 and those Facility Reps also have direct access to
12 me. I've re-emphasized that point to them, and they
13 also have access through Ed Westbrook as the Senior
14 Safety and Technical Advisor to me.

15 At this point in time, I do have several
16 challenges that I'm dealing with. The first is that
17 we are very much in the middle of transition. It's a
18 transition that I believe will play out in early
19 January, but right now things are somewhat stirred
20 up, and the Site is also in the closure mission,
21 entering one of its most dynamic phases, and I know
22 that Alan Parker will talk about that more, but we're
23 getting into a point where the demolition activities
24 and the clean-up activities are very dynamic.

25 What I look to is the role of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Facility Reps performing their function, as well as
2 the Authorization Basis process to continue to
3 provide the stability during that somewhat turbulent
4 period that we've been moving through the last few
5 months. Next slide.

6 As I look at the, more specifically now,
7 the contractor oversight activities, I group those
8 into three basic approaches to going through the
9 oversight. The Authorization Basis and approval
10 process is one of the formal processes that I use. I
11 retain approval authority for Authorization Basis on
12 the site, and also for any changes or waivers to that
13 Authorization Basis process, and I get a very formal
14 technical briefing from my staff when any of those
15 documents are brought forward to me.

16 Also, formal processes in the DOE monthly
17 safety review. This is a review conducted by my
18 staff, where their conclusions are presented and
19 discussed with me. Quarterly, we go through a safety
20 evaluation with Kaiser-Hill and get their perspective
21 on performance and safety, and also we do quarterly
22 evaluations on the full project perspective. There
23 are also DOE assessment program, as well as Kaiser-
24 Hill's assessment program, and some of those are
25 joint, where we join up with them and do a joint

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 assessment of performance on the Site. That's an
2 area that I have highlighted as one that I have
3 identified a very clear weakness within the Site,
4 and it's an area that's going to get my very positive
5 attention to correct. We also have quarterly
6 processes where we look at the contract and the
7 performance under the contract, and it's through that
8 process that we determine the fee payments that we
9 will make to Kaiser-Hill.

10 That has been supplemented by some fee-
11 determining criteria, a term we've given it, but it
12 provides some supplemental information, specifically
13 on areas of concern for safety and security that go
14 even beyond the contract, that indicate our areas of
15 emphasis. The final formal one I'll mention is our
16 Joint Evaluation Team we use for a new operation or a
17 start-up. This is becoming less important just
18 because of the nature of the project. There are not
19 that many new new things we're going to do.

20 Looking at some informal processes, there
21 is, of course, the daily Facility Rep interaction.
22 Also there are weekly DOE management workspace tours
23 and surveillances. This is an area that I believe
24 has also been a weakness and is going to be one of my
25 areas of emphasis moving forward, both for myself to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 get out into the workspaces, and also to require my
2 senior managers and the technical professionals below
3 the management level, since I won't have that many
4 managers and supervisors left, to get out and really
5 see and experience the work first-hand, and to not
6 rely solely on the Facility Reps for that eyes and
7 ears experience.

8 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: You know, of course,
9 that last survey, if you will, that we sent an
10 experienced technical person [who] had previously
11 been a Facility Rep there, indicated there was a
12 fall-off in the DOE representation at the work areas.
13 Have you seen that report?

14 MR. LOCKHART: I have read that report,
15 and I do not disagree with the observations that he
16 found. I have had a similar assessment that there
17 has been a fall-off over the last probably nine to 12
18 months. I believe that is detrimental, and it's
19 something I intend to correct.

20 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: We were informed that
21 senior management out there at the Site had in fact,
22 told their personnel that they didn't want them going
23 into these places, to ease off in their actual on-
24 site representation.

25 MR. LOCKHART: I do not believe that is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 correct.

2 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: A number of people,
3 more than one, have so informed us.

4 MR. LOCKHART: Again, it's an area that I
5 intend -- it is my philosophy that you need to know
6 and see and understand the work if you're going to
7 contribute technically, and so that is the direction
8 I intend to go.

9 A couple of other informal exchanges I
10 make use of. One is a weekly one-on-one discussion
11 with Alan Parker where we go over issues of concern.

12 Safety issues are always first up on that meeting
13 agenda, and bi-weekly, I have a discussion with
14 Kaiser-Hill's safety vice-president, again to go over
15 very specifically issues and trends that are of
16 safety concern.

17 I also highlight two areas here that I've
18 put under the heading of participatory, and the first
19 of those is the Daily Safety Analysis Center
20 meetings and review of the events for the previous 24
21 hours. It is an interchange that we participate in,
22 if not myself, my Senior Safety Representative is at
23 that meeting, and that, I indicate, is participatory
24 because it represents a dialogue. We don't just
25 review facts and statistics, but there is an exchange

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and an active dialogue and discussion that goes on in
2 that session. The other one that I would put in the
3 same realm is a weekly meeting that Kaiser-Hill
4 organizes, but includes DOE representatives, their
5 facility leads, and also representatives from each of
6 the bargaining units, each of the labor
7 organizations, to go over the statistics, the key
8 events for that week, and to provide concerns and any
9 issues that any of those parties believes exists and
10 needs emphasis. Next please.

11 Going into a bit more detail on the DOE
12 self-assessment, the DOE self-assessment program is
13 really one of the keys to how we have to move forward
14 with our work. As I mentioned earlier, all of the
15 oversight is defined in our CPOP manual, our 220.2A.
16 Chapter 8 deals specifically with self-assessment,
17 and one of the elements of that self-assessment is an
18 oversight and evaluation database that is set up for
19 the DOE specifically to use as they go out and either
20 do formal assessments or as they go out and do
21 assessments that are in the realm of surveillances or
22 just work site tours. The self-assessments I see in
23 two major categories.

24 The first is the scheduled self-
25 assessments, really those that look at the more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 structured, comprehensive approach, looking at
2 programs and processes on a broader perspective.
3 Criteria for these, of course, can come from a number
4 of sources, and the current manual requires that two
5 of these be done per year for each of the direct
6 reporting organizations. This is also the area that,
7 again, is a weakness. This has not been [done] very
8 well at all within the last year, and it's an area
9 that I intend to improve.

10 The unscheduled self-assessment starts to
11 look more at those that are much more flexible, and
12 more focused to a key event or interest. In some
13 cases, even an event of opportunity that presents
14 itself. This would include the workspace tours,
15 visits and the management and staff walk-arounds that
16 I alluded to, and I really believe that this is one
17 of the areas that is of the greater value as we move
18 into the more dynamic environment within the site,
19 and the more active work within the buildings for
20 actual demolition activities.

21 Now to do the assessments, you do have to
22 have technical qualified staff. We have looked very
23 hard at the staff and the qualifications that we
24 need. The basis for establishing those standards has
25 been first, DOE Standard 1063, that's what speaks to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Fac Rep requirements, and then also EM policy,
2 including the project and oversight and assessment
3 policy from May of this year. The real purpose has
4 been to try and reach that balance between
5 effectiveness and efficiency to get the right people
6 with the right skills and attitude to be able to do
7 the assessments that need to be done.

8 We did our first assessment of that and
9 laid out that analysis in February of this year,
10 2003. We did a re-analysis in July, updated our
11 review, and that was prior to proceeding with our
12 reduction in force, and after we complete the
13 reduction in force activity in early January, I'm
14 intending to do another look at where we stand with
15 our staffing and qualifications in February of 2004,
16 so on roughly about a six-month cycle there.

17 What was one of the key drivers going
18 through that analysis was to look at the status of
19 the project and what has changed on the Site in terms
20 of the risks and the nature of those risks, and I
21 just highlight for you here a few of the things that
22 I looked at very specifically in that process.

23 Foremost was the Plutonium Stabilization Processing
24 System, and the completion of that work over the
25 summer. The last of our plutonium operational

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 activities being completed. We have shipped off all
2 our Category One, Category Two nuclear materials and
3 that, again, [is] a very key driver in the risk
4 profile.

5 Our protected area has been eliminated.
6 Less of an issue for safety, but a very significant
7 issue from a security standpoint. We have also
8 demolished Building 886 which was our Enriched
9 Uranium Facility, and also Building 865, while not a
10 nuclear facility, had very high beryllium
11 contamination and again, represents a key risk that
12 was eliminated from that industrial occupational
13 hazard. Also, Building 771, 776/777 combined
14 facility, and Building 559 were all declared to be
15 criticality incredible during 2003, which leaves me
16 with only two remaining facilities, 707 and 371, that
17 have criticality concerns to continue to be managed.

18 Finally, the last one, the 903 pad, which was our
19 largest environmental restoration [ER] project to
20 date, may well end up being the largest ER project
21 that we do, was completed this year, and so all of
22 those have greatly changed the profile and the risks
23 that present the DOE staff and the contractor.

24 As I look ahead, there are still some
25 very key skills that I need to maintain, and I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 pleased that in the organization I expect to have
2 after January, I will have these key skills. I'll
3 highlight just a few rather than read through all of
4 them. Fire protection is one that will remain as a
5 key and vital need. The beryllium expertise is one
6 that as we go forward, will probably actually
7 increase in its importance, as we have found on the
8 Site that beryllium contamination is more pervasive
9 than what we had even expected several years ago.
10 And the integrated work control program and the
11 associated work control issues are something that
12 will also continue to need emphasis all the way to
13 the end of the program. We do not confine our
14 integrated work controls to nuclear work. That even
15 as we move away from nuclear work and nuclear
16 contamination, integrated work control is how we look
17 at all our work on the Site, and so that will
18 continue on to the end.

19 There have been questions now and then,
20 on the technical staffing, looking kind of at those
21 requirements and drivers, where we are going with the
22 staff at the Site. Approximately a year ago, we had
23 about 156 people and they break out the way you see
24 here, 14 of those were qualified Facility Reps, and I
25 have shown here that the technical staff, Facility

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Reps and others that contribute to safe work at the
2 Site and to ensuring that that safe work is performed
3 represented about 62 percent. Moving ahead after
4 January, January 10th being the effective date for
5 our reduction in force, I'll have 58 staff. You can
6 see the management administration have been paired
7 down significantly. It's only about 16 that will
8 remain in that category, 33 will still be technically
9 skilled people in both safety as well as other
10 project and environmental and waste disciplines, and
11 I will have nine Facility Reps qualified that will
12 remain at that time. Actually ten. Ed Westbrook is
13 also a qualified Facility Rep, but I will be using
14 him in a different role as my senior safety advisor
15 and Facility Rep program sponsor. The actual
16 percentage of those individuals that are focused to
17 supporting safe work on the Site in a technical way
18 actually increases up to 72 percent.

19 One of the more important things that I'm
20 looking to do in the post-RIF [Reduction-in-Force]
21 organization is a refocusing to line management
22 oversight, and line management responsibility for
23 that oversight. The Facility Reps, which have been
24 in a separate organization over the last several
25 years, are going to be moved back into the line

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 organization, and I will retain, they will retain as
2 well, the independence by their ability to go to Ed
3 Westbrook or myself if they don't feel they're
4 getting the appropriate consideration from their line
5 organization.

6 DR. MANSFIELD: Mr. Lockhart, can I break
7 in just a second. With your reduced levels, will you
8 be able to man your key technical skill needs
9 positions more than one deep?

10 MR. LOCKHART: In some cases they will
11 not be more than one deep, and I have received
12 assurances and have confidence that I will be able to
13 get in a very timely basis support that I need from
14 EM Headquarters to provide the expertise that I need.

15
16 DR. MANSFIELD: If someone leaves, okay.

17 MR. LOCKHART: If someone were to leave
18 or even for an illness or a workload. One of those
19 in particular, the criticality expertise, which is
20 one that I have, is not really one of my staff.
21 That's a staff person from Environmental Management
22 that is geographically assigned to me 100 percent of
23 the time, while I have that need, which I currently
24 predict to be through about March or April. After
25 that time, I would not have that need to have that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 resident experience, so that's how I expect to fill
2 those gaps.

3 As I mentioned, it is my intent to re-
4 energize the formal aspect of the assessments that
5 the DOE oversight is involved in, that there has been
6 a weakness, and I will be looking for my new direct
7 reports to develop and prepare their assessment plans
8 and schedules in discussion with me, and in
9 discussion with the Facility Representatives as a
10 priority effort, and have that finalized formal
11 schedule for the upcoming year in early February. I
12 also will be issuing for the new organization my
13 policy for workspace tours, and will probably hope to
14 borrow some of what Mr. Schepens has done up at ORP,
15 which I think is a good model for mandating that kind
16 of work site and technical presence in the work
17 spaces.

18 Also, the roles for the Facility Reps are
19 being refocused back to what I really believe is
20 their traditional role of maintaining an operational
21 oversight in the facility. Over the last year or so,
22 some of that role had been, of the formal
23 assessments, had been put onto the Facility Reps, to
24 actually lead and organize those, and I think that
25 distracted from their day-to-day oversight, so we're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 putting the formal assessment lead responsibility
2 back to the line and getting the Facility Reps back
3 to their job of day-to-day oversight, and as I
4 mentioned, the Senior Safety Advisor will serve as
5 their program sponsor.

6 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Mr. Lockhart, in view
7 of the time elements, may I put the rest of your
8 statement into the record, and what I think I'm
9 hearing from you is that under this new policy and
10 your new management, you are strengthening and
11 getting more line management action than your
12 predecessors had done. That's what I'm hearing.

13 MR. LOCKHART: I think that's absolutely
14 true compared to where we had been. I think --

15 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Do you attribute that
16 to the new policy or to -- you're giving more DOE
17 oversight to the contractor than had been previously?

18 MR. LOCKHART: I think it's more a case
19 of emphasis. When I look at our background, we
20 started to evolve to an integration of our DOE
21 oversight with the contractors' oversight back in
22 about 1998, so it's not really being driven. My
23 follow-on slides speak to the fact that I really see
24 the new policy that's emerging out of DOE to be
25 something that I have a very good philosophical

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 alignment with. I think trying to integrate is an
2 approach that we've been working on, and evolving for
3 a number of years.

4 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Dr. Eggenberger?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: I have no
6 questions.

7 DR. MANSFIELD: Mr. Chairman, you
8 mentioned we had heard information that the federal
9 employees were being told or counseled not to
10 interfere with the contractor operations. Now
11 there's two ways that could happen, one good, one
12 bad, obviously. The bad one, of course, is that
13 instructing people to have a hands-off approach that
14 could remove your technical oversight of the
15 contractor. The good one is the system that Mr.
16 Schepens described, where rather than everybody in
17 the DOE office being able to call anybody at the
18 contractor and direct changes, that you focus those
19 through one or two people, your three-man management
20 team, for instance, or something like that. Which is
21 correct? Which is happening?

22 MR. LOCKHART: I subscribe to what Mr.
23 Schepens described very well, that the managing of
24 the contract means that the contract describes those
25 terms that the DOE is looking for and in all areas,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 not only scheduling and cost performance, but safety,
2 quality and everything else, and when we look to
3 evaluate the contractor, we look back to our own
4 contract to see what did we ask for, and what are we
5 asking for, and we don't want a number of people to
6 have the ability to have their own interpretation or
7 to have their own view of that. The contract should
8 say very clearly what's required and everyone should
9 understand those expectations, and if they don't then
10 that may be a flaw with the contract we need to
11 change, but that's done in a very formal way between
12 the DOE and again, it's reserved to a very limited
13 number of people, pretty much myself and my
14 contracting officer.

15 DR. MANSFIELD: But what I'm looking for
16 is a warranty from you, or guarantee from you, that
17 federal oversight is not limited by the instructions
18 that you've given to your employees, not reduced.

19 MR. LOCKHART: I don't believe at all
20 that it's reduced. I mean, the oversight I believe
21 will be increasing in real terms to observe the
22 contractor's performance, and to validate that again,
23 part of the integration of our two oversight programs
24 is to validate that the oversight that they are doing
25 is appropriate, is meeting the need that is intended

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 by their planning and also by our contract. To the
2 extent that it fails, then we need, you know, that
3 indicates an area of more emphasis for us. To the
4 extent that it is performing well, that may indicate
5 an area where we can back off or said better,
6 indicate an area where we can shift our knowledge and
7 resources to a more -- an area of greater concern,
8 more concern.

9 DR. MANSFIELD: A quick example. Let's
10 discuss for a short time, short, the glove box fire.

11 We believe that a potential root cause of that was
12 the use of generalized work plans instead of
13 particular ones. How do you -- how does your
14 oversight keep track of whether the proper work plans
15 are being used?

16 MR. LOCKHART: Well, it does that in
17 several ways. We do review of the work plans, and
18 there are staff that are reviewing those. That was
19 an area that also had fallen behind and we're working
20 on catching that back up. Another technique that's
21 used is with the Facility Rep interaction, and their
22 participation in the plan of the day meetings, and
23 that review where they essentially have a chance to
24 identify when something is not lining up properly.
25 There were failings along that line in the glove box

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fire, very clearly, where it was missed, and has been
2 observed at that point in time there was a greater
3 attention to PuSPS [Plutonium Stabilization
4 Processing System], the plutonium processing
5 operation that was also going on in that building,
6 and less attention being paid to that demolition
7 activity, and so that again, was a case where there
8 wasn't sufficient focus being put on that activity.

9 DR. MANSFIELD: I agree that the Fac Reps
10 are an important part of doing that job right, and
11 are you going to have enough Fac Reps to exercise
12 that degree of attention?

13 MR. LOCKHART: I believe I will. I
14 actually believe I'm in a better place than my
15 predecessor was a year ago with the number of Fac
16 Reps. Even though it is going down, in pure
17 numerical count, when I look at the risks and the
18 hazards and the way that they have decreased across
19 the Site, I believe I'm actually going to be able to
20 provide better coverage to the risks and to the
21 activities that are under way.

22 DR. MANSFIELD: Thank you.

23 DR. MATTHEWS: No questions, Mr.
24 Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Well, what I hear you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 saying is, you recognize the need to do your job
2 properly, that you need to know what's going on a
3 daily basis at the Site --

4 MR. LOCKHART: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: -- and that includes --
6 and it requires then your Facility Reps actually
7 entering the buildings and knowing what's going on.

8 MR. LOCKHART: Absolutely.

9 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay, and as I say,
10 you're not discouraging them, you're encouraging them
11 now.

12 MR. LOCKHART: I will be encouraging them
13 strongly, and I will be leading by example. I'm
14 going to be there myself.

15 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: As I said, our review
16 out there at the Site indicated that DOE
17 representation in the buildings had fallen back
18 dramatically. They were not having a presence.

19 MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Mr. Parker?

21 MR. PARKER: Mr. Chairman. I am going to
22 follow the exactly as Mr. Lockhart did, is we'll go
23 straight down the lines of inquiry, and answer those
24 questions for you. Related to self-assessment and
25 assurance resources, Kaiser-Hill deploys a broad

NEAL R. GROSS

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