planned oversight model will address this issue. That concludes my remarks this morning subject to any questions from the Board.

2.1

I look forward to hearing from the representatives of the Department.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Mr. McSlarrow, welcome.

MR. McSLARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, I appreciate having the opportunity to address you today. In my role, as the Deputy Secretary of Energy, I serve as the Department's Chief Operating Officer, and I have responsibility for providing direction to all DOE organizations, including NNSA.

The subject of today's event, safety oversight, is a critical component of the Department's management system. The Secretary and I take our responsibility to ensure the Department's missions are performed safely very seriously. And the Secretary has made this clear from his first year in office.

Just to give you one example, the Secretary's stated remarks at the 2001 Executive Safety Conference, and I quote: "I want to speak about safety, because nothing is more important. If we do this well, everything else will fall into place. If we fail, nothing else we can do can make up for

that failure."

There is almost nothing I can add to that statement to make it more clear how important this is to the Secretary. All of our Department leaders share that commitment. And we honor this commitment by understanding our operations and the associated hazards in establishing appropriate systems for controlling the hazards and managing the inherent risks in the work that we do.

We strive to cultivate a questioning attitude in every level of the organization. We are committed to continuous improvement of our operations. Our goal is to establish and maintain a strong and enduring safety culture, with safety as an integral part of all of our work practices.

I personally appreciate having had the opportunity to work with the Board, and I strongly believe the Board plays an important role in providing an independent and critical perspective on the Department's defense nuclear facilities activities.

External scrutiny is necessary and helps us to improve. We believe the Department is on a good path, but one that will require continued attention by the Department senior leadership and continued close scrutiny by the Board, which will benefit the

Department and help us to stay on course.

2.2

An effective safety management system includes senior leadership commitment and focus on safety, a comprehensive set of safety requirements, a technically skilled and qualified federal work force, and effective contracts that communicate clear expectations, [and] allow us to hold contractors accountable.

Oversight is conducted to ensure all parts of the safety management system work as intended. Integrated Safety Management, ISM, remains the foundation of the Department's safety strategy. In addition to safety hazards, safeguard security environmental issues are and should be considered when planning any of our activities.

Over the past five years, ISM has proven to be an effective system for improving safety performance by ensuring that safety is an integral part of all our work activities, from the initial planning stages through project closure.

As a key part of ISM, the Department requires that contractors establish feedback and improvement mechanisms to verify that safety requirements are being implemented and ensure continuous improvement.

However, we cannot and do not rely solely on contractors assurance programs. ISM also requires DOE line management engagement oversight to ensure that contractor programs are effectively implementing DOE safety expectations.

We believe that ISM has improved safety performance. The benefits of this approach are seen through the review of various performance metrics, such as the downward trend in injury and illness rates at our facilities.

And I believe Bob is going to go into some more detail on that. Our plan is to continue to use the ISM framework to further enhance our safety systems in the coming years.

But we recognize that there is more to do. While ISM continues to improve and mature we, nevertheless, recognize that there are weaknesses in our implementation that need continued attention and improvement.

For example, we do not always identify all hazards adequately. And the feedback and improvement steps still need significant work. We believe that a fully developed ISM system will address these and other problems, however, and are committed to the ISM system as an enduring part of our safety culture.

I can just take a moment to talk a little bit about oversight. Oversight is a required element of any rigorous safety management system. Oversight is the method by which our Department is assured that its policies are implemented.

And appropriate oversight must be performed at every level of the organization. The missions and goals of the Department are set by the Secretary. The environmental, safety, and health framework under which we conduct those missions and meet those goals are articulated in DOE orders, rules, manuals, and guides.

We have rigorous processes in place for managing changes to those requirements. The Department has, for example, continued its multi-year focus on improving its requirements by removing overly prescriptive, redundant, and conflicting requirements, where possible.

I recognize that many people question whether or not we are throwing out rules that are necessary, or whether or not we need to even conduct a review. But let me just suggest that there is no government agency anywhere on earth that can't usefully benefit from such a review.

And for us what matters is that the

primary principle in our efforts to streamline requirements has been and remains that DOE requirements must ensure adequate safety.

The two Under Secretaries implement our missions through their program offices and contracts with private companies. Appropriate contract clauses ensure that contractors perform missions in a manner that is consistent with DOE safety expectations and requirements.

So we use performance-based contracts to encourage innovation, to ensure progress towards goals, and to promote cost effective approaches. We must continue to strive to clearly define safety requirements, as well as mission goals, in our contracts, so that the contractors are held accountable and rewarded for accomplishing work safely, and not rewarded if safety is degraded.

There are a number of examples that I have provided in my written testimony, Mr. Chairman. And in the interest of time I'm going to skip over them. But let me just say that it is clear that we have been willing to hold, if you look at these examples over the last few months, contractors accountable.

And what is key about that is that DOE took these actions long before performance reached a

level where workers were seriously injured. 1 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: We will include them in 2 3 the record as if read. MR. McSLARROW: Ultimately each of the DOE 4 program organizations are accountable for determining 5 that their directions and policies are implemented 6 7 They can only do this by performing correctly. effective oversight. 8 The Secretary and I have insisted that the 9 contractor responsibilities for safety are clearly 1.0 11 defined and that we aggressively hold them accountable for the performance. 12 13 The DOE line organizations have recently 14 reviewed and restructured their organizations, or are 15 The overall in the process of doing so now. 16 Department qoal is to clearly define roles 17 responsibilities, promote efficiency so that finite 18 resources are used most effectively, improve our 19 oversight efforts, and make sure that the appropriate 20 technically qualified staff are available at all levels. 21 22 Both Under Secretaries will speak to the 23 actions they are taking for their areas of 24 responsibility. I want to make clear that I expect an 25 effective and efficient organization that clearly

communicates the Department safety requirements and policies, verifies that these policies are being followed, and validates appropriate outcomes as being achieved as a result of those policies.

1.0

2.1

And this verification and validation can only come through proper oversight. The Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance [OA] provides an independent verification of the effectiveness of line management's implementation of safety requirements.

OA evaluates the effectiveness of the oversight programs of the contractors, the field element, and the program offices. They also provide critical information on the effectiveness of the policies in meeting our safety goals.

This feedback is important to allow DOE to continuously improve our safety performance, our oversight, and our safety requirements. We have long recognized the need for a comprehensive DOE oversight policy.

As the Board is aware, we initiated an effort, early this year, to develop departmental directives to guide more effective and consistent oversight for safety, as well as for critical functions, such as security, cyber security, and

emergency management.

We have drafted a new policy, and associated DOE notice, that provides implementation instructions. Copies of these draft directives have been provided to the Board, concurrent with our internal review. And we welcome input, from the Board, as we move forward with implementing this important --

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: We were waiting the conclusion of these hearings before we submitted back to you our comments.

MR. McSLARROW: One final note, Mr. Chairman, because we had, actually, this discussion when we met last. I know everybody here agrees that one of the hallmarks of a strong safety culture is learning from experience, including the experience of others, such as the tragic Columbia accident.

The Secretary and I have each reviewed the Columbia Accident Investigation Report. In reviewing this report I was struck by some parallels between NASA and the Department of Energy.

For example, our pride in our long history of technical accomplishment could lead to overconfidence, and the loss of the critical eye and questioning attitude essential for sustained

excellence.

1.3

We have organizational barriers that sometimes prevent prompt and effective communication, and we both depend on contractors for significant portions of our work. All of these challenges are issues that we have identified and are in the process of correcting. But there are, undoubtedly, others.

And, therefore, the Secretary has directed all Headquarters and field senior managers to review the Columbia investigation report and take necessary actions based on lessons learned.

We have also begun scheduling meetings with NASA senior managers on specific topics of common interest. I know that Ambassador Brooks will update you on some initiatives along these lines that he has directed.

The bottom line is; we are committed to learn from the events that led up to the Columbia accident and make changes to the Department's policies and procedures, as appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I believe that our safety management system has a sound foundation, and individual components are substantially in place and functioning. What is important is that the DOE record shows that we are steadily improving our safety

performance, while aggressively expanding the kinds of missions that we are implementing.

So we are proud of that, but we also understand that we need to stay on top of this. Our senior management team fully intends to continue this trend. And we believe that working with you, and the other Members of the Board will allow us to achieve that goal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Thank you. I have two questions I would like to put to you. DOE already has a policy, 450.5 [Line Environment, Safety and Health Oversight], that establishes a policy for line management oversight. Why do you need a new policy?

MR. McSLARROW: Well, there are a couple of reasons. First, the new policy is more comprehensive; it is more than just safety. As I mentioned in my testimony the new policy covers security, emergency management, and cyber security.

And we feel that it is important to have a common approach, that you can't stovepipe safety oversight and the others because in many ways they are all linked together. They are certainly linked in terms of how we approach management.

And we would argue, and the reason for

fashioning the policy this way, they are linked at the oversight level too. Part of the challenge when it comes to oversight, and I know you will probably have questions for others later on this, is the tempo and duration of oversight activities themselves, whether at Headquarters, or in the field office, or at the contractor site.

And what we are trying to do is ensure that we have the most streamlined, most effective

2.2

And what we are trying to do is ensure that we have the most streamlined, most effective oversight that canvasses all of those activities, ideally, at once, but at least in a coordinated fashion.

The other thing I would say is the policy that you referenced, 450.5, addresses DOE line management but does not address DOE independent oversight assessment processes. So we believe all of these should be pulled into the same policy.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: And do you believe that DOE management and oversight can be streamlined without degrading its ability to ensure safety?

MR. McSLARROW: Absolutely. You can go too far, and that always has to be a concern. But there is no question, in my mind, that you can streamline how we do business.

The Board knows, as well as I do, there

was a time when every single element in the line management chain conducted oversight of operations. And people were literally tripping over each other. I doubt, seriously, they were getting as much done as they possibly could.

And I doubt, very seriously, that the people who ultimately were responsible for undertaking our missions were doing their jobs. The goal here is to ensure that we empower, ideally at the Site Office, as much of the people as possible who technically are qualified and have the responsibility and the authority to back it up, to ensure that the contractor assurance program is working properly.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: But is this extra dependence, if you will, on the Site Office -- they have to have the technical competency --

MR. McSLARROW: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: -- to do that. And we are finding, now, that at a number of Site Offices, because of restrictions on hiring, they don't have the proper technical personnel to do this. So I would suggest, to you, that you check with your Site Offices and find those that don't have the personnel that they need right now. You see that.

MR. McSLARROW: Right.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: And notwithstanding the 1 restrictions on hiring, that they be given the muscle 2 that they will need to do this job. 3 Let me just note, Mr. MR. McSLARROW: 4 Chairman, we are in midstream. We agree that that is 5 And I know the Under a problem, we know that. 6 Secretaries will go into more detail when they 7 testify, in a moment. 8 But I have talked about this very subject 9 with both of them, so I know that they are committed 10 to achieving the end result that you have just 11 identified. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Mr. Secretary, 13 I basically agree with what you have said. The things 14 that I do not understand are the details in the 15 implementation of your policies on a very low level. 16 And that is where it all happens. 17 So I look forward to hearing from the 18 Ambassador, and from Mr. Card, on the details. One 19 thing that I have seen, over my career, is as time 20 marches on, people forget things. The 21 industry is built on more than 50 years of experience, 22 and we have learned a lot of things. 23 Those things, many times, get thrown out 24 the Board And we don't, with the bath water.

25

certainly does not, want those things to happen. Yesterday, in discussing some things at one of our weapons labs, some very fundamental concepts, we found, were forgotten, and they had to be reminded that those are very important to the overall success of operations, and hence oversight must consider those things.

So that is my focus: understanding what the details are. I must say, in our session that we had a month ago, Naval Reactors [NR] was able to articulate these very carefully, and down to the last line, at the lowest level, and I could understand those.

Since your program is in the developmental stage here, we have not seen all those details. So that is what my interest is.

DR. MATTHEWS: Yes, I was glad that you referred to Integrated Safety Management as a framework for where you are going, because I believe that has made a significant difference in safety, and I would be really disappointed if you didn't stay on that track, because I think it is an important one.

You also referred to the Columbia Accident
Report and a need for a critical eye to eliminate
complacency. I think that was sort of the synthesis

of what you said.

1.0

1.2

But it seems like the policies are doing two things. One is: they are reducing redundancy in oversight, Jim talked about that, but besides that story. In some things, redundancy is important in [safety] oversight.

And also streamlining Headquarters oversight. So I was kind of curious how you assure yourself, as you put more responsibility at the Site Office and the contractor, that Headquarters is confident that this complacency that was one of the root causes for a terrible accident isn't going to occur.

MR. McSLARROW: The first point I would make is that I don't think we should ever be confident that the complacency won't exist some place. I think that is part of our challenge. We have to assume, we have to be skeptical every single minute of the day, every day of the year.

And we have to fear that some place, somewhere, something is going wrong. I mean, that has to be our attitude, or otherwise this just doesn't work.

What I would say, first, as the Chairman and I discussed, we need to ensure that the people at

the Site Office are properly staffed and equipped technically with the responsibility and authority to back them up to do their job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Headquarters oversight, I don't think, is synonymous with oversight, at least in the sense I would understand Glenn Podonsky's organization. What Headquarters needs to do, I would submit, is not repeat the oversight that is being done, but is to ensure that the people in the Site Office, obviously they have more than just oversight responsibilities, are doing their jobs.

So it is a validation of how they do it, making sure that whatever quality assurance programs they have are being conducted. But I wouldn't submit that they need to repeat it. Podonsky's organization, OA, I think is the proper oversight vehicle to ensure Headquarters is holding the Site Office accountable, the Site Office is actually doing the oversight at the site, arguably with the people who know the site best, and the people and all the way, of course, down to the place where it matters most, which is the contractors.

Ensuring that whatever strengths the contractor assurance program has can stand up to being validated. I mean, that is really the nub at the end

# **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

of the day. And I accept what you are saying, that
there probably could be arguments about redundancy on
either side.

But I think what we need to point to is,
and where I don't think it is arguable, is we need to
eliminate redundancy that isn't adding value. If it

But I would submit, right now, we are confusing redundancy and duplication with actually getting the job done. And that is what we need to pull back from and make sure that whatever we are doing actually adds value and is aimed at some object other than just people feeling like they've satisfied

is adding value, okay, then we can work through that.

themselves.

It is that redundancy, that tendency to duplicate, that I think is the most concerning thing, because that is what leads to the complacency. People think all of this will do it, and it won't. So let's make sure that the procedures are right, let's never be complacent, and let's have an effective oversight organization that has the independence and the tools to do the job which, I believe, OA has.

CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Thank you. Ambassador Brooks?

AMBASSADOR BROOKS: Thank you very much,