

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay. Our first witness
3 this morning is Dan Glenn, Manager of the Pantex Site
4 Office, who is an employee of DOE/NNSA [National
5 Nuclear Security Administration]. And, Dan, I will
6 put in the record your background, which will go into
7 the record prior to your speaking.

8 Welcome, Dan.

9 MR. GLENN: Thank you, sir.

10 Well, good morning, Mr. Chairman and
11 members of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety
12 Board, and members of the audience.

13 Thank you for this opportunity to provide
14 testimony on the Pantex Site Office's current
15 practices for oversight and management of our
16 management and operating contractor activities at the
17 Pantex Plant.

18 Transition from the long-standing roles
19 and responsibilities to the re-engineered NNSA
20 presents some challenges, but these challenges are
21 needed as we strive to improve the effectiveness, the
22 efficiency, and most importantly the safety of our
23 site operations. I fully support the NNSA re-
24 engineering effort and believe that the appropriate
25 level of contractor oversight to ensure adequate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 protection of the health and safety of the public and
2 the workers within the Pantex Plant community will
3 continue after this re-engineering is completed.

4 The Site Office has three primary
5 responsibilities, all of which help ensure that
6 contractor operations are conducted in a safe and
7 environmentally sound manner. They are: first of all,
8 complying with legal requirements; secondly,
9 administering the M&O [management and operating]
10 contract, and; thirdly, monitoring the contractor
11 performance.

12 It is imperative that Pantex Plant is in
13 compliance with all statutory requirements. During
14 the budget review process each year, a concerted
15 effort is made to ensure that the sufficient resources
16 are allocated to the work required to comply with the
17 laws. Several of these laws serve as drivers to
18 assure appropriate federal oversight of the contractor
19 work in such areas as environmental compliance and
20 financial procedures.

21 Through the NNSA re-engineering effort, we
22 have added more formality to the way in which the M&O
23 contracts are administered. All the Site Managers
24 went through an intense contracting officer training
25 program earlier this year and were issued contracting

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 officer warrants after completion. As such, I am now
2 the focal point for directing the contractor to
3 perform work at the Pantex Plant.

4 To assist me in administering the
5 contract, I have appointed contracting officer
6 representatives both within the Pantex Site Office and
7 at Headquarters. There are a total of 12 contracting
8 officer representatives assigned to the contract at
9 the Pantex Plant.

10 I've also hired two contract specialists,
11 one of whom is a warranted contracting officer and the
12 other is scheduled to receive his warrant in December
13 of this year. They will assist me in administering
14 the day-to-day contract activities.

15 Implementation of this process has
16 enhanced contractual control and formalized
17 communication and tasking of work to the contractor.

18 Information is provided to me from a
19 number of sources regarding contractor performance.
20 Facility Representatives play an important role in
21 monitoring contractor work activities, but they are
22 [the] only way in which we monitor overall
23 performance. In addition to Facility Representatives,
24 I also rely on subject matter experts [SME] within the
25 Site Office to monitor contractor activities on a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 daily basis in their respective areas of
2 responsibilities. I have subject matter experts in
3 areas such as systems engineering, authorization basis
4 [AB], occupational safety, radiological safety,
5 explosive safety, environmental compliance, safeguards
6 and security, projects, legal, and business areas.

7 In addition to our own oversight, I
8 receive input on contractor performance from various
9 external sources, to include NNSA Headquarters, the
10 DOE Office of Independent Oversight and Performance
11 Assurance [OA], and other federal and state government
12 entities. Agencies such as Environmental Protection
13 Agency [EPA], the Texas Commission on Environmental
14 Quality, and the State of Texas Bureau of Radiation
15 Control, all of which are concerned with various
16 environmental aspects of the Pantex Plant, perform on-
17 site reviews.

18 The Office of Inspector General [IG] and
19 the General Accounting Office [GAO] also conduct
20 audits of various activities at the Plant and provide
21 reports on contractor performance. It is not
22 anticipated that there will be any changes in the
23 foregoing reviews as a result of the NNSA re-
24 engineering effort.

25 And one tenet of the NNSA re-engineering

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 effort calls for placing more accountability for
2 operating the Plant in a safe and environmentally
3 sound manner with the contractor. As such, the
4 contractor has been charged with developing and
5 implementing a more robust internal assessment
6 program. To strengthen its assessment program, the
7 contractor has done several things to include:

8 (a) Developing and implementing the
9 Contractor Assurance System [CAS] which places
10 emphasizes both on self-assessments and independent
11 assessments;

12 (b) The establishment of nuclear safety
13 officers who are responsible for the in-depth
14 knowledge and execution of the Authorization Basis and
15 other safety documents for facilities and processes
16 that involve nuclear, nuclear explosive, and non-
17 nuclear hazardous operations, and;

18 (c) Increasing the size and involvement of
19 their Quality Assurance [QA] staff.

20 Another tenet of the NNSA re-engineering
21 effort involves enhancing the Pantex Site Office
22 oversight of contractor operations. There is a
23 significant amount of work performed by the federal
24 employees that I rely on as input to assess contractor
25 performance. Some of this work is routinely recognized

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as conforming to the conventional oversight programs,
2 such as the current reporting reviews, duty officer
3 assignments, Facility Representative assessments, ES&H
4 program assessments. However, the day-to-day
5 operations of the Site Office encompass significantly
6 more work, which often is not recognized for the in-
7 depth contractor assessments that they are.

8 As the Site Office Manager, it is my
9 responsibility to review and evaluate much of the
10 contractor's performance via the required approval or
11 disapproval of program documents. For example, as the
12 approval authority for the Site Safeguards and
13 Security Plan, the Documented Safety Analysis, the 10-
14 Year Comprehensive Site Plan, the Master Authorization
15 Agreements, Emergency Management Plan, and the
16 delegated authorities associated with the Energy
17 Systems Acquisition Approval Board, my staff performs
18 in-depth reviews and assessments of the information
19 and related actions contained in each of these
20 documents. All of this work constitutes a significant
21 effort on the part of the federal employees to oversee
22 the contractor's operations. The results of this
23 work, along with additional inputs, serve as input to
24 a formal annual assessment via the Performance
25 Evaluation Plan. Many elements in this plan are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 specifically dedicated to effective safety program
2 performance. When evaluating the oversight programs
3 of the Site Offices, I believe it is essential to
4 recognize not only the conventional oversight
5 mechanisms, but also the efforts that are a direct
6 result of fulfilling our day-to-day responsibilities.

7 To further bolster our oversight program,
8 we are in the process of developing and implementing
9 a Line Oversight Plan, which is intended to enhance
10 and formalize our assessment activities. The newest
11 part of this development is development of an
12 integrated assessment plan.

13 To date functional assessments have been
14 performed, but they weren't well-coordinated,
15 resulting in either redundancies or lapses. Better
16 integration with our own staff, BWXT reviews, and the
17 external reviews should not only provide the desired
18 efficiency gains, but also improve the overall quality
19 of our assessment program. We will continue to
20 utilize Facility Representatives and subject matter
21 experts in the Plant as they will provide input
22 through readiness assessments, QA surveys, duty
23 officer coverage, safety system evaluations, safety
24 basis review teams, nuclear explosive safety reviews,
25 and business and budget reviews.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 In conjunction with developing the line
2 oversight plan, we are shoring up our self-assessment
3 program. The Pantex Site Office has six
4 organizational elements that will be involved in the
5 self-assessment program. Self-assessments of the
6 safeguards and security function are already well
7 established and functioning, and the business function
8 has recently developed its program.

9 The other Site Assistant Managers will
10 have self-assessment programs established and
11 implemented by the FY04 [Fiscal Year 2004]. This
12 effort will include updating our local procedures to
13 establish program requirements based on applicable
14 orders or NNSA guidance.

15 As the various oversight and assessment
16 programs identify findings and issues that require
17 corrective actions, they are forwarded to the
18 contractor or assigned to the appropriate Site Office
19 organization for action. Tracking of these actions is
20 currently accomplished by the cognizant Assistant Area
21 Manager's organization. Both paper and electronic
22 processes are used. BWXT Pantex is in the process of
23 acquiring new issues management software that should
24 be installed by December of 2004. This software
25 system is being purchased to support the new line

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 oversight/Contractor Assurance System program at
2 Pantex. We are coordinating with BWXT to have access
3 to that system and will use it in the future to
4 provide one common system for the Plant with
5 appropriate isolation between the federal and the
6 contractor data.

7 I'd like to spend a few minutes talking
8 about the staffing activities and departments at the
9 Site right now.

10 To perform our mission, each Site was
11 allocated a personnel ceiling, or what we call full
12 time equivalents [FTE] during the NNSA re-engineering
13 process. The Sites were charged with developing and
14 implementing a managed staffing plan which outlined
15 the organizational structure and personnel required to
16 do its work. In developing the Pantex Site Office
17 managed staffing plan, I took advantage of
18 recommendations made by several workload reduction
19 initiatives to streamline work, as well as some
20 initiatives that were in the process at the Pantex
21 Site Office and within the contractor's organization.

22 Two initiatives underway were: first of
23 all, building up the Quality Assurance staff by the
24 contractor, and; developing and implementing their
25 contractor assurance system. The Pantex Site Office

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 managed staffing plan showed an increase of personnel
2 in the business and project management areas to handle
3 the additional responsibilities being placed in these
4 areas.

5 Staffing level has remained fairly
6 constant in the areas of safeguards and security,
7 authorization basis and environment safety and health.
8 We are planning slight reductions in the areas of QA
9 and Facility Representatives.

10 Our intent was not to back away from the
11 current level of oversight until we could verify our
12 contractor had implemented and we had validated the
13 essential elements of the Contractor Assurance System.
14 However, in actuality, we have experienced some
15 unplanned reductions in the Site Office due to
16 transfers and retirements prior to validating the full
17 Contractor Assurance System. We are managing to those
18 impacts via prioritization of our work while we
19 attempt to fill our vacancies.

20 The Pantex Site Office managed staffing
21 plan reflects a FTE ceiling of 82. Currently I have
22 70 personnel on board and we're actively recruiting to
23 fill those vacant positions. We are a technically
24 focused organization. Of the 70 personnel I have on
25 board, 44 of them are in the technical qualification

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 program. Of those 44, 33 are fully qualified under the
2 qualification program, 8 are in process of completing
3 our requirements for qualification. And we are in the
4 process of developing and issuing qualification
5 standards on three.

6 Many of the staff on the TQP [Technical
7 Qualification Program] also possess other
8 qualifications such as certified professional
9 engineers, certified hazardous materials manager,
10 certified safety professional, and certified
11 environmental manager.

12 In addition to the 44 in the technical
13 qualification program, 13 other personnel are also
14 engaged in professional certification programs to
15 include personnel in the safeguards and security,
16 Quality Assurance, contracts and procurement, and
17 property management.

18 There are several areas where I have
19 requested part-time technical support from the NNSA
20 Service Center. These areas have been identified
21 because they demand specific expertise, and the Site's
22 workload does not warrant a full-time position. The
23 specific technical areas I have requested are:
24 criticality safety, Software Quality Assurance,
25 seismic engineering, and the assessment of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 contractor's training programs.

2 I recognize the Board's concern with the
3 decrease in the number of Facility Reps at the Pantex
4 Site Office, and I would like to share my perspective
5 regarding our FR [Facility Representatives] needs.

6 As some of you are aware, I began my
7 career in DOE as Facility Rep for the production
8 reactors at the Savannah River Site Office. That
9 experience solidified in my mind the benefit and the
10 need to have federal employees on the floor who have
11 unencumbered access to all areas of the Plant and have
12 technical understanding of the contractor's work
13 activities and processes. Over a period of years, I
14 have also come to recognize that the Department and
15 its contractors have significantly improved the
16 formality of its operations since the inception of the
17 FR program.

18 In my opinion, it is appropriate for the
19 NNSA to utilize the flexibility inherent in the FR
20 standard for Sites to re-evaluate the effectiveness
21 and the staffing levels of their FR programs. I led
22 the Workload Reduction Initiative Team charged with
23 developing guidance for the NNSA Facility Rep program.
24 I volunteered for this assignment because: first, I'm
25 one of the few senior managers in DOE and NNSA who

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 qualified and held the position as a Facility
2 Representative, and; second, I believe that I would
3 provide invaluable input to ensuring that FR program
4 remained effective and viable.

5 I want to make it very clear I fully
6 support the FR program and rely on it to manage my
7 site. However, I believe there is room for improving
8 the effectiveness and the efficiency of FR program
9 while also providing reasonable adjustments to account
10 for the significant maturation of the contractor's
11 conduct of operations which has taken place over the
12 last ten years.

13 The FR Program Implementation Guidance is
14 intended to better focus the Facility Rep's attention
15 on the proper implementation of technical safety
16 requirements while ensuring the contractor continues
17 to protect the workers from standard industrial
18 hazards. Efficiencies are gained through a better
19 integration and prioritization of our Site Office
20 subject matter experts resources, not through the
21 cessation of contractor oversight.

22 It is accurate to say that the manner in
23 which I have distributed by staffing allocation does
24 not provide substantial backup capabilities in the
25 Facility Rep ranks. Nevertheless, I submit that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Site Offices by design have breadth with little depth.
2 We are an organization that must possess diverse
3 technical expertise with very little redundancy.
4 Although redundancy does provide additional
5 confidence, it is not mandatory to provide reasonable
6 assurance of contractor performance.

7 By integrating my staff's subject matter
8 expert oversight capabilities with an effective
9 Contractor Assurance System, I believe the Facility
10 Rep staffing level is appropriate at Pantex. We will
11 continue to evaluate our organizational needs and make
12 any adjustments as part of our continuous improvement
13 process.

14 The Pantex Site Office is in frequent
15 communications with Headquarters personnel, either
16 through email, telephone conferences, meetings as we
17 carry out our mission. On a monthly basis, I provide
18 the Administrator with an update of activities that
19 are going on at the site. I also include in this
20 communication any issues or concerns which I believe
21 he should be aware of. I usually receive an immediate
22 response from the Administrator.

23 I also participate in a weekly conference
24 call with the NNSA Acting Chief Operating Officer
25 where information regarding activities at the various

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 site and Headquarters is exchanged.

2 I also participate in the periodic
3 Leadership Coalition meetings that are led by the
4 Administrator. The Leadership Coalition consists of
5 the Administrator and representatives from his
6 immediate staff, Deputy and Association
7 Administrators, Site Managers and Service Center
8 Director.

9 In addition, my staff is in frequent
10 contact with Headquarters personnel regarding their
11 areas of responsibility to include: (a) weekly
12 televideo conferences with NA-12 & 13 [NA-12: Military
13 Application and Stockpile Operations; NA-13: Program
14 Integration] regarding the programmatic activities;
15 (b) monthly telephone conferences with the Associate
16 Administrator for Facilities and Operations; (c)
17 weekly telephone conferences with the Office of
18 Business Operations; (d) weekly conferences with
19 Office of Planning, Programming, Budget and
20 Evaluation. In addition to these scheduled calls, the
21 Site Office personnel are in frequent contact with
22 Headquarters personnel to provide information or seek
23 guidance. All of the aforementioned forms of
24 communications and contacts serve to help NNSA
25 Headquarters be informed on an ongoing basis of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 activities at my Site.

2 I'd also like to spend a few moments
3 talking about the Columbia Investigation Report and
4 the actions that we have taken.

5 Upon receiving the copy of the Columbia
6 Investigation Report, I distributed it to my senior
7 staff and made it mandatory reading for my technical
8 managers. I also provided a copy to the BWXT Plant
9 Manager and his Deputy and commenced a dialogue with
10 him on the report.

11 I believed that the lessons learned
12 identified in the report were extremely important for
13 both NNSA and the contractor managers at the Plant to
14 understand. Therefore, I convened an offsite meeting
15 with my technical managers and BWXT Pantex technical
16 managers to discuss the implications and
17 recommendations outlined in the report.

18 The offsite meeting focused on Chapters 6,
19 7, 8, and 10 of this report. The meeting was
20 structured in such a way that a brief summary of each
21 chapter was presented, which was followed by an open
22 discussion by all participants. The meeting concluded
23 with a brainstormed listing of critical success
24 factors that are both necessary and sufficient to
25 improve the safety throughout all the Pantex

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 operations.

2 The next steps include condensing this
3 list into a concise list of factors that will be
4 further developed into Pantex-specific actions to be
5 undertaken in the near future.

6 Areas that have captured my attention are
7 the concept of the normalization of deviance, and the
8 role and effectiveness of the independent safety
9 organizations. We are taking a serious look at the
10 events surrounding this tragedy and those conditions
11 that contributed to the accident in a sincere effort
12 to apply the lessons learned to our own operations.

13 In conclusion, I believe that the
14 identified federal oversight of contractor activities
15 at the Pantex Plant resulting the NNSA re-engineering
16 is sufficient to ensure safe and environmentally sound
17 operations. A portion of the Pantex Site Office re-
18 engineering actions is based on placing increased
19 accountability on the contractor. As such, the
20 contractor is charged with developing and continuing
21 to improve a Contractor Assurance System to formalize
22 the manner in which it would bolster its internal
23 oversight activities.

24 The contractor initiated the
25 implementation on their plan on October 1, 2003, with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 full implementation scheduled for October 1, 2004.

2 I am monitoring the effectiveness in the
3 Contractor's Assurance System in relationship to its
4 staffing decisions I made during our re-engineering
5 efforts based on a robust Contractor Assurance System.
6 I will make internal staffing adjustments or request
7 additional resources if I am not convinced that the
8 CAS is working as intended or the Service Center
9 support is available as I desire it.

10 Again, I would like to thank you for the
11 opportunity to share my perspective on the NNSA re-
12 engineering effort. And I am available for any
13 questions.

14 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Thank you, Dan.

15 Dr. Eggenberger?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: You made a
17 reference to what you needed was the appropriate level
18 of oversight. What is the appropriate level of
19 oversight?

20 MR. GLENN: The appropriate level of
21 oversight is to have an understanding of all the work
22 activities that my contractor performs at the site so
23 that there is not a situation where I would find that
24 the federal staff is unaware of either contractor work
25 activities or the programs that they use to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 That does not mean that my federal staff is aware of
2 every single activity that takes place, but there is
3 a process in place that assures that we sample, we are
4 made aware of issues, and that we develop corrective
5 actions to address those deficiencies that come up.

6 So, as long as there is input in the
7 different functional areas that make its way up
8 through the system and are evaluated in all the
9 different work activities, then I consider that
10 sufficient oversight.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Do you need to
12 be overseen?

13 MR. GLENN: Sir, the work that we do is
14 very important for the nation, and it includes there
15 inherent risk associated with that. Because of those
16 risks, the direct answer is yes. I think we talked
17 about that's one of the lessons from the Columbia
18 accident investigation. You get redundancy in the
19 oversight.

20 I welcome external reviews of my work
21 activity at the site. I want to make sure that I'm
22 doing the best job for the citizens of this country.
23 So any review is welcomed, and we try to take the
24 lessons or the recommendations that come from those
25 reviews and improve our operations.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: What is that
2 appropriate level of oversight on you; have you
3 thought about that?

4 MR. GLENN: Well, it would include sort of
5 the same type of activities that I set for the
6 oversight for overseeing my contractor. It is that
7 anyone that looks at the Pantex Site Office should be
8 able to take a look at our methods, our processes that
9 we use to determine: have they covered all the
10 functional areas? Are they aware of security aspects?
11 Are they aware of the weapons disassembly aspects?
12 Are they aware of the industrial hygiene program?
13 Those kind of questions external oversight should look
14 at the Pantex Site Office and convince themselves
15 that, yes, the Pantex Site Office is aware of all the
16 programs, they are looking at areas that are important
17 for the safe operation of the site. And they should
18 be able to then assess whether they filled their voids
19 in the scope of the oversight that I'm doing or if
20 there are -- I mean, we will always find differences
21 in the depth that you go into the oversight as far as
22 opinions from different groups. But I think the most
23 vital part in assessment: have we, as a Site Office,
24 covered the adequate breadth of it.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Now, you made

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a list of oversight activities both by yourself and by
2 Headquarters, and you kind of went through that list;
3 Facility Representatives, SMEs out of your office, the
4 broad issue of just NNSA Headquarters not details, GAO
5 IG, and it went on. It was a long list.

6 Now, how does that list fit together into
7 the appropriate oversight program? Just a list of
8 things, in my view, isn't very useful.

9 MR. GLENN: Yes, sir. I think the --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: That's why I
11 asked what is appropriate oversight, and I was hoping
12 that you would come up with an oversight model or an
13 oversight theory, and I hadn't heard that yet. So
14 maybe you might want to --

15 MR. GLENN: Sir, the Pantex Site Office is
16 responsible for overseeing all the work activities.
17 My oversight program needs to cover all of that. I
18 don't rely on external Sites to fill complete areas
19 that my Site doesn't cover. What I do rely on is that
20 the external oversight, to take a look at the areas
21 that my Site is looking at and determine if that's
22 sufficient or not.

23 The GAO, IG, those topics come in. Many
24 times those topics are identified for other reasons.
25 What we do is we take those reports, we look at those

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 recommendations to determine, "Do I need to make
2 changes to my oversight program to enhance or redirect
3 it so that they cover the voids that are there?" But
4 I believe that the Site Office oversight needs to
5 cover and needs to stand on its own, and then all
6 those other items that I mentioned are the
7 redundancies that are built into the system to make
8 sure that there aren't voids in it.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: One way maybe
10 of looking at it is that maybe somebody could divide
11 what you do at Pantex into two things: one associated
12 with operations, and one associated with
13 infrastructure, engineering and analysis. And, of
14 course, engineering and analysis overlap into both the
15 operation itself and the infrastructure part of the
16 operation.

17 Now, you said that you're weak on some of
18 the infrastructure items in the form of certain
19 experts that you need in order to do those kinds of
20 things. And you would expect to get them from another
21 source, such as this Albuquerque -- I forget what the
22 word.

23 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Service Center.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Service Center
25 operation.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'm going to give you an example and then
2 I'm going to be quiet. We put together a list of
3 things that the Board has unearthed and that you have
4 unearthed and Headquarters has unearthed that the
5 contractor did not unearth across NNSA. And the
6 bottom line for that list is the necessity of having
7 a coordinated and well structured oversight program.

8 Now, the thing that irritates the Board is
9 that the Board finds things. You know, we're a little
10 entity and we shouldn't find anything. We're not
11 oversight. We just find things. Let me give you an
12 example. This is an example that didn't cost very
13 much money, and it's very small but it's highly
14 important. And this is called the roof cracking issue
15 in 12-64 [a Pantex Plant facility]. You're familiar
16 with that?

17 MR. GLENN: Yes, sir.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Okay. That
19 was first talked about formally by us in June of 1998.
20 Informally, it was talked about earlier. That is an
21 infrastructure issue and a safety issue. Okay? They
22 were both safety issues.

23 You are not staffed to deal with the
24 analysis and issues that were bound in the roof
25 cracking situation. The Department was not. The

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Department is not. You are not. We've been hassling
2 with this simple sophomore engineering problem for
3 five years. It's five years. And finally something
4 has come about that.

5 Those things should never happen in an
6 oversight operation that understands what's important
7 and how things work. It's just very irritating that
8 things like this happen.

9 So we can go down each one of these other
10 items also. And my message to you is: I think you
11 need to give it some thought on what oversight you
12 really need and what oversight needs to be given to
13 you on your operation. And Headquarters certainly
14 should give a lot of thought to this.

15 The disbanding of the technical group in
16 Headquarters just doesn't fit with what I just
17 discussed.

18 So that's all I want to say. And I just
19 think that you don't have the situation under control
20 yet. The two things -- operations: you do a
21 reasonable job at operations. The engineering and
22 infrastructure needs a lot of help.

23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Dr. Mansfield?

25 DR. MANSFIELD: My concerns are similar,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and some of the examples that I might cite are equally
2 familiar. Some problems that you run into are just
3 too hard to do and you're not expected to have, for
4 instance, a nationally known lightning expert. But
5 the Department is supposed to have one if it's going
6 to carry on nuclear weapon activities. You know, the
7 Department has got to be self-sufficient, and they've
8 got to be able to provide you with what you need when
9 you need it. And you have to have, not considerable
10 certainty, not a warm feeling, but absolute certainty
11 that you're going to be able to get the technical help
12 from wherever, from Sandia or from the Service Center.

13 My worry is that as you dilute your
14 technical capability by relying more on the CAS -- and
15 I think it is a dilution, it's certain diminution if
16 not a dilution -- it becomes harder and harder for you
17 to recognize what you don't know.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: That's right.

19 DR. MANSFIELD: And that frightens me.

20 Furthermore, at your level you know this
21 is something of a zero sum game. I mean, BWXT has to
22 add capability or take the reassigned capability to do
23 the CAS system while you're lowering your number of
24 people and diminishing them of FTEs that did similar
25 things before. You're relying on the CAS system to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tell you what your own people told you before.

2 The next step up the chain is that
3 Headquarters no longer has the capability to really do
4 technical analysis and oversight to find out what's
5 going on. They're relying on your understanding of --
6 BWXT's understanding of what the problems and
7 solutions are. Diminution of your technical
8 capability in the Site Office coupled with essentially
9 the elimination of it at Headquarters is really
10 frightening to me. And especially when it's manifest
11 in the fact that you say that you talk to Headquarters
12 weekly and your people talk to them weekly. It would
13 seem to me the more appropriate time would be hourly;
14 that somebody at Headquarters would always be bugging
15 you about the status of some corrective action.

16 I could just imagine if, say, Naval
17 Reactors [NR] would have written testimony like yours.
18 Can you imagine [Admiral] Rickover's organization
19 allowing any shipyard to say that I'll talk to you
20 weekly? I mean, they were talking to them all the
21 time. Every issue has got somebody at Headquarters
22 that tracks it.

23 For instance, on MoveRight, the problems
24 with MoveRight that became obvious almost as soon as
25 we started implementing it. Who at Headquarters did

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you notify? Who at Headquarters bugs you on this?
2 That's an important enough program. You're relying on
3 it, and you're relying on it. I'm pointing to Mr.
4 Glenn and Mr. Mallory. You're relying on it for an
5 important safety function. It's mysteriously failing
6 in ways that might have been fixed during its design
7 but weren't.

8 You know, this is sort of like a failing
9 brazing in a sea water system, right? Headquarters in
10 the Naval Reactor program would never, never let that
11 go without daily attention. Who at Headquarters was
12 providing daily attention to you on MoveRight?
13 Anybody?

14 MR. GLENN: When the issues happened at
15 the Plant, I contacted Dr. [Everet] Beckner and Dave
16 Beck. They were my primary interfaces on the
17 operational issues that occurred. What we've done is
18 the contractor's put together a whole plan. The
19 issues with MoveRight were the overall movement of
20 material at the site program. We've identified those
21 problems, and we are trying to -- you know, they are
22 working on those issues.

23 DR. MANSFIELD: Yes, I realize that. But
24 that's the answer that I expected. But did, for
25 instance, Dr. Beckner or Mr. Beck say, "I want you to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 be in contact everyday with such-and-such?" Fill in
2 the name; who's the name? Who at Headquarters knows
3 enough about software assurance to make sure that
4 you're doing the problem right and that Beckner knows?

5 MR. GLENN: There wasn't a name on --

6 DR. MANSFIELD: That's the answer. That's
7 the answer I expected. I want to point out that the
8 situation we're designing normally will have nobody at
9 Headquarters that will be technically on top of fixing
10 things when major safety issues comes up. You will
11 have someone and they will be, you know, as good as
12 you can make them. But let it be noted that
13 Headquarters, who is singularly responsible for the
14 safe operation of the system, doesn't have anybody.

15 Now, would that happen in Naval Reactors?
16 I just don't think so.

17 The fundamental point that I'm getting at
18 is that you changing the system or DOE and NNSA is
19 changing the system, making you change the system, in
20 ways that are very much in the direction opposite of
21 what organizations that did difficult engineering have
22 found worked very well.

23 You mentioned [chapters] 6, 7, 9, and 10
24 of the Challenger report. But Chapter 11 is even more
25 instructive in the technical characteristics of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 engineering management organizations that have proved
2 correct in the past.

3 I want to point out that I'm far from
4 being happy that this is going to work or satisfied
5 that this isn't going to work. Because it's too much
6 different, too unlike engineering management
7 organizations that have worked in the past.

8 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Dr. Matthews?

9 DR. MATTHEWS: Yes. Dan, I want to pursue
10 the line of questioning on risk and balancing safety
11 and productivity as they've talked about.

12 You talked about risk in the draft policy.
13 And in Ambassador Brooks' testimony, they said that
14 the NNSA plans to focus oversight and resources on the
15 highest risk facilities. Pantex, obviously, has some
16 pretty high risk facilities and operations. And I
17 wondered if you could sort of cite what today's three
18 highest risk activities are, and give me some ideas of
19 how you assess those risks, what processes you use to
20 assess those risks, and what criteria you use to
21 prioritize them?

22 MR. GLENN: In general, the three highest
23 risks are dealing with the direct weapons operations
24 we do. And those risks are the thermal, the
25 electrical, and mechanical insult to the weapon.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We have developed our authorization basis
2 for individual weapons activities that go through the
3 hazard analysis. That then gets reviewed by the
4 safety review team in federal staff with laboratory
5 participation. That then gets approved by me as the
6 risk acceptance official, and in that document, as you
7 know, we develop the controls that are then
8 implemented as a result of that. So I would say all
9 the risks or essentially the highest level risk are
10 associated with the nuclear explosive operations. And
11 we think we have that well defined.

12 Along with that is assessment of the
13 facility design and support; where we do that work
14 activity. Again, in compliance with the 10 CFR 830
15 [Nuclear Safety Rule] requirements to establish an
16 authorization basis for the whole site, we have also
17 worked through a lot of modules that define both the
18 facility design and the general natural phenomenon
19 events that occur at the site so that the work that we
20 are doing recognizes the environment that it's being
21 done in. And we try to establish the controls to
22 mitigate or to prevent, put accident mitigators into
23 the process.

24 Did that answer?

25 DR. MATTHEWS: Well, sort of. I thought

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you'd be a little more specific in your answer, but
2 that's okay.

3 Do you use a classic risk base process for
4 looking at consequence and likelihood when you
5 identify [risks]? Because the reason I'm getting to
6 this is that your resources are going to be focused on
7 those high risk activities, and so there has to be a
8 good solid basis for deciding where you put your
9 limited resources.

10 MR. GLENN: Yes. I think we do use the
11 standard and the risk assessment techniques identified
12 on DOE Standard 3009 [Preparation Guide for U.S.
13 Department of Energy Nonreactor Nuclear Facility
14 Safety Analysis Reports], which is primarily a "what
15 if" technology and then some individual cases of
16 further risk analysis. But, yes, most of those are
17 with the focus on the mechanical insults. The threats
18 exist in all three areas; the thermal, electrical, and
19 mechanical. So we have devoted a lot of our attention
20 on interrupting the mechanical threats to the weapon
21 primarily. Do more of that early in the process on
22 those.

23 DR. MATTHEWS: And so I assume you'll
24 focus your oversight in those areas primarily?

25 Okay. Now, as you said, you're now the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 risk acceptance official.

2 MR. GLENN: Yes.

3 DR. MATTHEWS: You're also the contracting
4 officer. Therefore, you have both the responsibility
5 for safety and programmatic delivery and security, I
6 assume, in there?

7 MR. GLENN: Correct.

8 DR. MATTHEWS: So you've got to balance
9 those three major activities. And so I was curious,
10 how you going to do that balancing? How you going to
11 make that decision whether to take a risk, put more
12 resources on it? You know, and as part of that what
13 are your three primary programmatic mission
14 deliverables, too, so you've got that down? So how do
15 you make that balance? Are you the decision maker or
16 does it go up to Headquarters? And how do you get the
17 data to make sure you don't miss something and the
18 like?

19 MR. GLENN: That's a large question. See
20 how I can do to answer that.

21 The balance, first of all, my nuclear
22 operations experience gives me some -- my personal
23 opinion on what is an acceptable risk and what passes
24 the acceptance factor of formality of operations. And
25 I use that a lot when I weigh the decisions that come

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in.

2 Along with that, we have the formal
3 development of the authorization basis that identifies
4 the probability, the number of what is the probability
5 of this specific accident occurring. So I can look at
6 those numbers and focus attention on the ones that are
7 more probable than others.

8 Now, to balance that so that there's a
9 balance that goes on with understanding the
10 uncertainty of those calculations and the consequences
11 of those. And let's say I use my own personal
12 judgment, I use the results of the formal hazard
13 analysis process, and then we use the comments that
14 come in externally on the work activity that we're
15 doing to also assess that.

16 Now, you were saying that the three
17 primary mission is to -- again, I tried to identify
18 that early in my talk. My job as the Site Manager, I
19 have to comply with law, and that covers all aspects
20 of it. You know, I am expected to accomplish a
21 mission at the site, too, and there are specific
22 documents that define how many of our product is. And
23 we consider that important to the Chief. And then we
24 also assess the overall performance and recognition of
25 the safety programs already working. Are we seeing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the reduction in the total reportable incidents over
2 time? So we focus on that on the program level.

3 In there comes security, too. And as is
4 often the case they're contradicting or conflicting
5 priorities. Security changes don't necessarily
6 promote some of the mission production. But we weigh
7 that again. Under the security side I have analysis,
8 vulnerability analysis, things that are performed that
9 put it in a pretty good perspective for me. And then
10 I figure out what I am comfortable with. And I always
11 have the option of not authorizing the work to be
12 accomplished.

13 And what we are seeing right now is a
14 delay in authorization of some of this work. Some of
15 these in the reductions that we have because we've
16 lost folks and things and the transition that we see,
17 we're not turning our back to looking at the activity.
18 What is happening is it's taking us longer to convince
19 ourselves we understand it, and that's delaying some
20 of the work product. But that's where we weigh that,
21 and that's where it's coming out is delay in some
22 schedule aspects as we work through making sure that
23 we understand all aspects of the problem.

24 DR. MATTHEWS: So, for example, would you
25 delay disassembly in favor of applying the seamless

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 safety type of rigging to that unit?

2 MR. GLENN: Yes. I mean, we have done
3 that. Again, it's a balance of the work. If the work
4 doesn't present any unique hazard, and there is a plan
5 to improve, step-wise improvement of the process down
6 the road, we do take a look at that. We assess is
7 there a need to stop that work to make enhancements
8 now, or can it wait? And we do make those judgments.
9 Those judgments are reflected in an integrated weapons
10 activity plan that we developed that prioritize our
11 work to focus on our conventional high explosive
12 weapons first and then the work secondly.

13 DR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Anything else?

15 DR. MATTHEWS: No.

16 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Dan, let me say, as you
17 correctly pointed out the Board has been a strong
18 advocate the Facility Reps program. And personally,
19 I've always looked upon you as an excellent example of
20 the success of that program. You as a former Facility
21 Rep are now a key manager in one of, I'd say, one of
22 the most important sites and work that the DOE is
23 responsible for. So I've looked upon the Facility Rep
24 programs not only of the DOE having the eyes and ears
25 of their people right down on the deck plates knowing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 what's going on, but as a training program. Because
2 we've always supported the idea of the Site Reps
3 should not be kept in that position, but be given
4 opportunities to move up the chain. And that's what
5 we've been encouraging.

6 So it's a little bothersome to me when I
7 see you're being given more responsibility out at the
8 site, much more responsibility, and with less people.
9 You're being cut back on the numbers of people you
10 have at the same time you're being given more
11 responsibility. And where are you looking for more
12 people? Business management. QA is where you're
13 cutting back, Quality Assurance. And the Facility Rep
14 program at your site, you're cutting back. So you're
15 cutting back across the line on total numbers of
16 people to do the work and the place now you're putting
17 your emphasis is business management.

18 You're looking to the contractor to be
19 responsible for QA. Well, the contractor has that
20 responsibility right today. For the contractor to now
21 be told he has to improve or get improved in that
22 area, that's his responsibility right from the
23 beginning under the current way of operations. But
24 it's bothersome to me when I see what I think I see is
25 a cutback in your technical competence people and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 reliance more on the contractor in that area, which is
2 the safety area. And particularly, as I say, if we
3 start cutting back on Facility Reps, we're not
4 training the personnel that we're looking for. And
5 we're not advancing, as the Congress asked us to do,
6 to try to improve the technical competence. And
7 that's one of the reasons we've been such strong
8 support of the Facility Rep program.

9 Now, let me ask you, you're going to
10 depend upon Albuquerque, apparently. Now, you have a
11 problem and you don't have the technical competence
12 now. Can you order them at Albuquerque to send you
13 somebody, or do you have to go to Headquarters and say
14 please arrange for somebody from Albuquerque to come
15 help me? How are you going to get this assistance
16 that you're going to be needing?

17 MR. GLENN: As you know, right now we're
18 in the transition of the Service Center. The goal and
19 the vision of that is I am responsible for, again,
20 overseeing all the work activity; specific expertise
21 that I just don't have and ones that need to remain
22 current. Software Quality Assurance is a classic
23 example of that.

24 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Yes.

25 MR. GLENN: That is --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: So, can you order them
2 to come and help you?

3 MR. GLENN: The intent is, yes, I pick up
4 the phone to the Service Center and say I need this
5 technical expertise at the Site. Send them to the Site
6 Office, and then --

7 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Okay. And they tell
8 you, I'm sorry, they're tied up right now on something
9 else. Maybe next month I can send the guy over
10 because he's working on something else. Now, can you
11 say no, I want him right now, and I have to then
12 comply with your request?

13 MR. GLENN: I then go to that person's
14 supervisor up to the Service Center Manager and if I--

15 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: And he tells you the
16 same thing? I mean, we're having problems like that
17 with the Laboratories.

18 MR. GLENN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: You need help from the
20 Laboratory, and you call the Laboratory for
21 assistance. And that's one of the problems we've been
22 trying to solve with, "We're the Laboratory; we'll
23 get around to it sometime." So I see the same problem
24 developing that we've had with the Laboratories giving
25 you the assistance you need in a timely manner.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 You're going to have the same thing, I think, of
2 getting that kind of assistance. The first thing,
3 you're going to have to find the guy who supposedly is
4 at the Service Center, which they don't have right
5 now. So you're already cutting back on your technical
6 competence, in my opinion, and looking to the Service
7 Center that doesn't have them yet. So you're already
8 into a program which has not been put together yet.

9 So I also --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN EGGENBERGER: Yes.
11 Furthermore, on our little example of the roof
12 cracking issue. Evidently for five years, that meant
13 nobody understood at your Site the importance of that
14 issue. So, therefore, you are deficient in the
15 technical capabilities to realize that you have a
16 problem. And, so, if you can't recognize a problem,
17 how can you ask for the people even?

18 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: No. Let's move on.

19 We would like see -- first off, the fact
20 that you are getting all this, in my opinion,
21 additional responsibility at the Site. It seems to me
22 that's where you need more technical competence to
23 help you, not less.

24 You wanted to say something?

25 DR. MANSFIELD: Yes. I'd like to explore

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another Pantex issue in this regard, and that is
2 especially the notion of accepting risk.

3 Current authorization basis limits you to
4 a single weapon operation within a bay or cell --
5 within a bay, anyway. There's a proposal that says a
6 certain weapon that be at stage one while working on
7 another. Okay. We have been -- beg your pardon?
8 Yes, you'll see why.

9 The issue we've been examining is how
10 you're doing the Safety Analysis for that,
11 particularly the risk assessment and controls. The
12 proposal, apparently, is that since the initiating
13 accident is essentially so unlikely as not to be
14 worried about, that no controls are required to
15 protect the second weapon from anything that might
16 happen to the first because the probably of anything
17 happening to the first is very small. We strongly
18 question that, and we think you ought to, also.

19 And so my questions to you are: do you
20 believe that the risk analysis in its current state
21 conforms, for weapon staging in a bay, conforms to the
22 requirements of [DOE Standard] 3009? And the second
23 question is who at Headquarters is aware of the
24 importance of this issue and has given you any
25 direction on it?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: I'd hold off a bit on
2 this. We will discuss this more with you at a later
3 date on the particular problem we're facing right now
4 on that matter. You know what the matter is?

5 MR. GLENN: Yes, sir. Would you like me
6 to respond now?

7 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Well, if you can do it.
8 I don't want to get into classified --

9 DR. MANSFIELD: Oh, no. This is not --

10 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: I understand. But you
11 were getting into areas I would --

12 MR. GLENN: As the Site Manager, I'm very
13 aware of the details of that topic. I have been in
14 conversation with Dr. Beckner and Dave Beck on that
15 continuously for the last several months on that. I
16 have a very clear picture in my mind of what the
17 threat is and how it should be analyzed, and I look
18 forward to presenting that with respect to --

19 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: Yes. We will get
20 together with you on that matter.

21 Dan, let me say before I turn over to Mr.
22 Mallory, I think you're trying to do a good job, and
23 you are doing a good job now -- and with all the
24 responsibilities you have on your shoulders, more help
25 there. And to the extent that we can, we want to be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 helpful to you. But I think, as I said before, you in
2 my mind personify one of the best in the DOE program
3 coming up through the Facility Rep program and
4 assuming the responsibilities that you've taken on
5 down at Pantex. And I'd say this is one of the
6 toughest jobs that DOE has, and you have that job for
7 DOE. So I want to thank you for the effort and what
8 you've been doing today.

9 MR. GLENN: Thank you, sir. We certainly
10 appreciate your insights. And I guarantee you, we are
11 thinking very hard and long about these changes.

12 CHAIRMAN CONWAY: All right. Now we'll
13 turn to Mr. Michael Mallory, who is the General
14 Manager at BWXT Pantex. And also, Mike, we will put
15 in the record a résumé of your background and
16 experience.

17 MR. MALLORY: Okay.

18 Thank you for the opportunity to speak
19 today regarding the Contractor Assurance System at
20 BWXT Pantex. I am Mike Mallory, the President and
21 General Manager of BWXT Pantex, which is the M&O
22 contractor of the Pantex Plant for the Department of
23 Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration.

24 BWXT Pantex is responsible for five core
25 missions at Pantex: (1) We evaluate, retrofit, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701