

Intergovernmental Meeting with the U.S. Department of Energy

October 16 – 18, 2007

Summary

On October 16-18, 2007, representatives of five Intergovernmental Groups—the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices' (NGA) Federal Facilities Task Force, the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA), the State & Tribal Government Working Group (STGWG), the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), and the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS)—convened for their fifth annual joint meeting with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) at the Snowbird Conference Center in Snowbird, Utah. The joint meeting was designed to help DOE officials communicate with all of its key intergovernmental groups at once as well as an opportunity for the individual groups to communicate collectively with DOE and among each other. Key topics for this meeting included communication, waste disposition, DOE's budget/budget process, integration of existing and future missions and cleanup, and Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA). As noted below, some presentations and materials are available online.

October 17, 2007 Plenary Session

Dr. Inès Triay, EM Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary

[*Dr. Triay's PowerPoint slides are available here.*](#)

Dr. Triay commented that in her new role as EM-2 she will have a greater opportunity to work with the intergovernmental groups on a day-to-day basis. Dr. Triay recognized all of the intergovernmental groups – ECOS, NGA, NAAG, ECA, NCSL, and STGWG – for their commitment, energy, and intellectual prowess to cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War. She also thanked NGA's Federal Facility Task Force (FFTF), which has had the longest-lived stakeholder relationship with DOE. Dr. Triay also thanked the representatives from the EM Advisory Board (EMAB) and EM Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs). Dr. Triay emphasized the importance of taking a moment to appreciate the fact that DOE and the stakeholder groups are cleaning up the environment to give it back to the communities. The partnership between DOE and the stakeholder groups improves the EM program through a give and take of advice and recommendations, and Dr. Triay remarked on how impressed she was by the groups' commitment and rationale for suggestions. Dr. Triay offered a special welcome to the elected state representatives and tribal leaders.

Key presentation points:

- Dr. Triay stated EM is committed to work on four core areas during the final fifteen months of the Bush administration:
- **Safety.**

- Technical sophistication allows DOE to keep its workers safe while protecting the environment. EM's safety statistics are better than those of comparable industries (e.g. waste disposal and construction).
- Assistant Secretary Rispoli firmly believes that all workers deserve to go home as healthy as when they arrived.
- EM has recently explored fully implementing programs on improving human performance, and its goal is zero accidents in the workplace.
- **Project Management.**
 - EM is pushing to complete independent validation of near term baselines and out-year estimate ranges (at the 80% confidence level).
 - Past assumptions underpinning some project baselines did not come to pass, and programmatic issues combined with budget shortfalls did not allow for desired completion percentages.
 - EM hopes to go to Congress in early 2008 and clearly delineate how long and how much it will cost to clean up the nuclear weapons complex. EM is also attempting to put forth initiatives to shorten the cleanup time frame and reduce costs.
 - EM wants meeting participants to propose new ideas with respect to cleanup. It is essential to envision a strategy for EM that takes into account having a substantial amount of projects completed as quickly as possible at a level of funding that is acceptable to the taxpayer.
 - Signs of progress: EM received a prestigious award from the Project Management Institute (PMI) two years in a row, in 2006 for Rocky Flats and in 2007 for Fernald.
 - EM has approximately 80 projects. Assistant Secretary Rispoli believes it is imperative for these projects to be on time and on budget. Four of these projects are currently not on time or on budget.
 - EM occasionally must re-baseline, as is the case with the Waste Treatment Plant in Washington State. EM has an operating project at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and a DUF-6 project (Lexington), and is on the verge of making certain that the DUF-6 project is re-baselined. LANL is in the midst of a re-baselining exercise to make sure EM is in compliance, and EM is almost ready to share what it would take for a fence-to-fence cleanup of the site.
- **Acquisition.**
 - EM's acquisition center is almost ready. The goal of the center is to improve EM's acquisition process by increasing efficiency by 25 percent, more clearly defining rolls and responsibilities across EM headquarters and field offices, and enabling more collaboration with stakeholders.
- **Human capital.**
 - EM's goal is to be the employer of choice for scientists and engineers entering the workforce.
 - EM wants a career-oriented workforce, capable leadership, and relevant competencies and skills. To this end, EM is focusing on enhancing leadership training of its workforce and is engaged in recruitment initiatives and a new internship program.

- There is an imbalance in the age demographics of EM's workforce as less than 2% is under 30. EM believes it is imperative to fill positions with both recent graduates and seasoned veterans.
- Assistant Secretary Rispoli recognizes that an investment in human capital is necessary for EM's survival. EM must also redouble its efforts when it comes to diversity.

Specific Priorities for FY 2008:

- Conduct safe operations.
- Fully establish disposition capability for radioactive liquid tank waste, spent nuclear materials, and spent nuclear fuel.
- Dispose of contact-handled (CH-TRU) and remote-handled transuranic (RH-TRU) and low-level waste.
- Idaho: Tank closure.
- Savannah River Site: In November, EM expects to start processing tank waste through several processes.
- TRU waste: EM began shipments of Idaho RH-TRU waste to WIPP, and over 60 shipments have been made so far. EM's next priority is to send Oak Ridge's RH-TRU waste to WIPP.
- EM will continue to remediate higher risk contaminated soil and groundwater. EM also wants to move forward with decommission and demolition (D&D) activities. D&D reduces the overall footprint, and it is essential to complete as much as possible in a cost-effective manner.
- EM will continue to support post-closure benefits and liability requirements. EM currently has a portfolio based on the Cold War legacy, but there will be many future liabilities from the Office of Science and Nuclear Energy that will have to be addressed..

Dr. Triay made the following additional points:

- The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) review of EM will be issued soon and will concentrate on acquisition, human capital, and project management. The first two reports published by NAPA had 50 recommendations, and EM agreed with all but two of them. EM is currently awaiting the third paper, and plans to accept those recommendations as well.
- **Reorganization.**
 - Reorganization has been underway for fifteen months (the NAPA report stated minor changes are still needed to EM's organization). Necessary changes include:
 - Establishment of an office of communications and external affairs.
 - Renaming the Office of Disposal Operations to the Office of Waste Disposition.
 - Enhancing the Chief Operating Officer's office capabilities.
 - A move towards horizontal integration to support field sites and allow them to deliver projects in a more straightforward manner. EM is currently organized along functional areas and wants to team offices with field sites.
- **Tribal Policy Framework.**

- The Deputy Secretary is expected to sign the Tribal Policy Framework shortly. EM believes this framework is essential, and acknowledges the dedicated efforts of STGWG tribal members involved.

Dr. Triay urged the groups to come up with improvements to the direction of the EM program and to consider EM's strategic efforts in place and how its resources are utilized.

Questions and Answers

- A participant commented that the State of Tennessee signed an accelerated cleanup agreement that DOE is now in the process of re-doing. The participant asked about the role of Tennessee - and states in general - when DOE re-baselines and re-considers the schedule or sequence of cleanup milestones. Dr. Triay responded that DOE believes it is imperative to bring states to the table and not make unilateral decisions. When EM re-baselines a project, it is beneficial to have a third party review how long a project will take and how much it will cost. EM is committed to clearly delineating what is in the baseline, independently validating it through peer review audits, and then coming to a joint vision of how to move things forward. Dr. Triay also repeated her three key points: the need for "strategic completions," the need to make the best use of resources, and the need to build the necessary coalitions.
- A participant asked about EM's future contracting strategies. Dr. Triay responded that EM needs clear federal baselines to delineate the work and ensure clarity of the scope, schedule and risks of unrealized assumptions. In regards to the approach of M&O contracting versus more directed contracting, she observed that projects with a clear, agreed-upon mission and relatively few uncertainties are better suited to directed contracting. M&O (now, mission support) contracting is better for long-term projects with many uncertainties and risks, as it gives DOE more flexibility in managing the contract in response to any new information.
- A participant commented that the Yakama nation hopes to meet with EM on a government to government basis. The Yakamas are cognizant of the challenges that EM faces, especially with the changes in personnel that come with shifts in administrations.

EM's Radioactive Waste Management

Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory Compliance, DOE-EM

[*Mr. Marcinowski's PowerPoint slides are available here.*](#)

Key presentation points:

- Mr. Marcinowski explained EM is looking at utilizing disposition assets across the complex, and expanding their assets outside of EM.
- EM has zero tolerance for non-compliance.
- Assistant Secretary Rispoli recently issued a memo to sites that if a package does not meet disposal requirements, it will be sent back to the generator site to resolve the problem. EM has recently had some issues where disposition packages that have not met regulatory requirements have shown up at disposal sites.

- EM makes 8-10,000 shipments per year and only a handful are non-compliant.
- DOE's waste management policy remains unchanged: The first option is on-site disposal, second is disposition at a DOE facility, and third is disposition at a commercial facility.
- On-site disposal continues at most sites but off-site disposal of LLW/MLLW has dropped significantly. EM expects that trend to continue for awhile.
- Any programs at DOE that generate new waste will be responsible for it – EM facilities will be used but the program that generates the waste will have financial responsibility.

Mr. Marcinowski provided a summary of progress in management of high-level waste, transuranic waste, low-level and mixed low-level waste, greater-than-Class-C low-level waste, materials disposition, and other program developments (please see link to the full PowerPoint presentation above).

EM Budget Overview

Cindy Rheume, Director, Office of Budget, DOE-EM

[Ms. Rheume's PowerPoint slides are available here.](#)

Ms. Rheume provided information about recent EM accomplishments, a list of EM's risk-based priorities, near-term scheduled site closures, and the composition of the FY'08 budget request.

Key presentation points:

- EM funding declined from a high point in FY05 to the FY08 request. This reduction, which has put EM in a funding dilemma, was due to planned closures or other events that did not come to fruition.
- FY'07 was the first year EM could not meet its compliance commitments, drastically elevating the significance of prioritization.
- DOE-EM's FY07 operating plan has a budget of \$6.19 billion. The FY'08 budget request is \$5.65 billion. The FY'08 House of Representatives mark is \$6.2 billion and the FY08 Senate mark is \$5.99 billion. Ms. Rheume suspects that EM's final budget will fall somewhere between its request and the House mark (about \$6 billion).
- For FY08, EM is operating under a continuing resolution (CR) currently effective through December 14. Last year there were three short-term CRs before a full-year CR, and a similar situation has developed this year, with the expectation of at least two, possibly three continuing resolutions. This severely constrains EM's ability to enter into any new work scope. Last year under the full-year CR, the restriction on new work scope was removed if a budget request was submitted. EM is hoping for the same thing this year.
- Ms. Rheume showed a graph depicting a large gap between out-year Baseline requirements and out-year Five Year Plan (OMB) targets. The current cumulative gap over five years (FY'08 through FY'12) is \$8 billion.
- Currently, EM management initiatives include:

- Maintaining and demanding the highest safety performance;
- Validating all project costs, schedules, and assumptions;
- Improving project execution;
- Providing additional training with an emphasis on project management;
- Acquisition process improvement;
- Ensuring real-time feedback and application of lessons learned; and
- Ensuring proper organizational alignment of functions, authorities, and people.
- EM will also be placing a heavier emphasis on corporate performance measures in terms of site effectiveness.

**Luncheon Presentation: Overview of DOE’s Global Nuclear Energy Partnership
Debbie Swichkow and Frank Schwartz, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Office of Fuel Cell Management, Office of Nuclear Energy, DOE**

- Frank Schwartz and Debbie Swichkow provided an overview of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership including transmutation fuel recycling, the NEPA process, and waste disposal plans.

The 2008 Intergovernmental Meeting with the U.S. Department of Energy included a number of breakout sessions on issues including the budget, waste disposition, and communication. Breakout groups were comprised of DOE officials and representatives from each intergovernmental group. Groups were encouraged to brainstorm, speak freely, and prioritize/identify their own key issues and concerns. Each individual breakout group provided a report out for all meeting participants.

Reports from Budget Group Breakout Sessions

Blue Group

Moderators: Tom Winston, Cindy Rheume, Pam Larson

- The Blue Group discussed four major points:
 - Compliance (specifically how and when it should be applied as a driver).
 - Incorporation of long-term site missions in the budget process.
 - EM goals versus project goals.
 - Maximizing effectiveness of off-site input.
- In response to a significant amount of confusion, Cindy Rheume gave a brief overview of the budget process:
 - DOE begins with a list of approximately 560 projects, with budget submissions from sites totaling approximately \$7.2 billion. These projects are prioritized according to site prioritization schemes sent out by DOE each January. The site prioritization schemes are based upon the risk-based factors identified in Ms. Rheume’s plenary presentation (Link provided above). Exceptions to this prioritization scheme include significant compliance issues or a compelling business case. This does not cover the out-year prioritization scheme. DOE then formulates the Administration’s budget request, after which negotiations take place between the Administration and Congress.
- The Blue Group concluded good, complete information is necessary to constructively discuss the budget and the impacts of any decisions and assumptions.

Recommendations:

- The group developed recommendations on maximizing the effectiveness of off-site input:
 - The intergovernmental groups should identify what information is needed for the best input.
 - Each site should have a timetable and process for input.
 - DOE should provide a clear snapshot of project cost, status, schedule, impediments, and budget constraints for a meaningful dialogue.
 - DOE needs a plan for incorporating the input.

Green Group

Moderators: Shelly Sherritt, Merle Sykes, Jerry Boese

- The Green Group discussed two major points: Baselineing and communication.
- The group discussed the need for stakeholders to have a meaningful role in the baselineing process. This includes:
 - Early participation.
 - A clearly defined process.
 - Education on opportunities for effective engagement. Education would include an understanding of funding impacts to specific projects.
- Stakeholders would like to work with DOE to develop a compelling case to close the current funding gap. For example, DOE and stakeholders could work collectively on a white paper to help arrive at an understanding of the money needed for specific objectives. The gap into future years is unlikely to change if the story is untold.
- With respect to communication, the group raised several issues:
 - Stakeholders need to better understand how the 3-year budget plan works and how they can participate/contribute information.
 - Stakeholders need to better understand where and how they can influence DOE and Congress during the budget process. The Group suggested using the Department of Defense (DOD) model for budget rollout.

Budget Breakouts: Observations, Questions and Answers

Facilitator: Bill Ross, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting

- Alice Murphy (Oak Ridge) commented that along with a communications strategy for Congress, it is important to have a communications strategy for OMB.
- Cindy Rheume (DOE-EM) clarified how various factors and considerations interplay in DOE's budget process. DOE first runs its priority list based on risk, then generates another list based on compliance. Then looking at how the two lists intersect, DOE decides where it can take care of most compliance problems.
- Ms. Rheume (DOE) commented that any additional funding target that EM gets would come at the expense of Science or another DOE initiative. To the extent that EM can make a better business case, then it can be justified.
- In addition to the target request, DOE also submits an over-target request to OMB.
- The most opportune timeframe for stakeholder input is January to April, when sites are putting together their information. (January 2008 is the best time for stakeholders to provide input into the 2010 budget process).

- Pam Larson (WA) praised the Richland field office for committing to provide more information to stakeholders during the 2006 budget process:
 - The Richland office shared documents that clearly delineated where funds were allocated.
 - The Richland office asked stakeholders to share their funding priorities and provide input on where they would be willing to see funding reduced.
 - Summaries of each workshop – including conversations between site managers and regulators - were provided with their budget request to DOE headquarters.
 - Stakeholders felt they were given enough information to have solid input.
- Seth Kirshenberg (ECA) pointed out that in the past the process was very clear and simple to a lot of people. Over the past few years, there has been a lack of communication around the rationale for a \$6 billion budget and why/how this will save taxpayers money in the long-run.
- Ken Niles (OR) was concerned that the re-baselining will be the method for dealing with the expected \$8 billion shortfall. He expressed it would be preferable to hear DOE say they recognize the gap and will go to OMB and Congress to try to explain the situation more clearly. Mr. Niles added that DOE does not adequately share information on the development of baselines. Even though DOE builds its baselines around compliance, the process should be more transparent.
- Steve Stout noted the existence of two baselines: one based on compliance and one based on funding targets, with the latter being the controlling one. If there is more work than money, it appears work is moved to the out-years. It is at this point regulators should have a seat at the table to tell DOE what their priorities are.
- Tom Winston (OH) remarked on the major gap in the dialogue that has occurred. DOE went from a funding profile that went from being in-compliance (under the accelerated cleanup initiative) - to a non-compliant budget.
- Seth Kirshenberg (ECA) noted that one of the lessons learned from Rocky Flats was that several efficiencies developed when DOE did not think certain milestones would be met.
- Doug Weir (INL SSAB) recommended that the Secretary of Energy explain to the American public DOE's mission, because it is currently a mystery to the average citizen.
- Bill Ross summarized the thinking on coalitions: Coalitions can exist across time and space, the key is that OMB is informed and made smarter.

Dr. Triay summarized several key points emerging from the breakout groups:

- There were a lot of issues with the assumptions that were made.
- The process at Hanford needs to be followed across the complex.
- We (DOE and stakeholders) can agree:
 - 1) Priorities.
 - 2) Story/conveyance of the vision.
 - *What can be completed?*
 - *How do we get there faster?*
 - *What is the return on investment?*
 - *What amount of completion is achievable?*
 - *How do we best utilize our disposition resources?*

**To achieve this, everyone needs to have access to information including scope, cost, timelines, assumptions, and strategies for efficiencies.

Reports from Waste Disposition Breakout Sessions

Red Group

Moderators: Christine Gelles, Brian Hembacher, Ken Niles

The Red Group initially identified ten issues, which were distilled to two core topics: Risk prioritization and integration of DOE programs among DOE sites.

1. Risk based prioritization

- The group found that there is a lack of collective confidence in the risk-based prioritization scheme. **The group's overall recommendation is for EM to initiate a dialogue with the intergovernmental organizations in the true spirit of collaboration and transparency.**
- In addition, the group had several questions related to the risk-based prioritization scheme:
 - What is the basis of the prioritization?
 - What other criteria should be included? (e.g. Science, political elements)
 - Is there sufficient science to support site characterizations?
 - What are the shortcomings of the data estimates?
 - Should prioritization be occurring at the site level or the national level?
 - How are new projects and risks factored into the formulation of the prioritization?
 - What happens after risk is identified? (It is not evident that DOE is doing a good job of mitigating or responding to identified risk)
 - To what extent are past prioritization processes being used?

2. Integration of DOE programs among DOE sites

- The group acknowledged that stovepipes are alive and well and while DOE has made strides, there is still a lack of sufficient integration. Continuous program integration is critical to support the nation's energy policy.
- Sites need to be able to understand interdependencies, specifically how waste streams at one site affect others, and that progress that has been made at sites without future missions cannot be compromised.
- Existing cleanup requirements must be met.
- DOE leadership should be required to meet regularly to discuss the integration of fuel cycle and waste disposition issues. This integration is happening, but is seemingly not evident or effective to this group.
- Perhaps a Nuclear Materials Disposition and Consolidation Coordinating Committee (NMDCC) or similar group should be resurrected to work on waste disposition issues?

Yellow Group

Moderators: Frank Marcinowski, Willie Preacher, Mike Wilson

The Yellow Group looked at six specific topics regarding waste disposition:

1. ***Greater than Class C (GTCC) Scoping.*** LANL technical area four is being remediated and is scheduled to be closed in the next few years, but it is being considered for GTCC. According to Frank Marcinowski, the proposed sites were

selected because NEPA required large, arid sites with near surface disposal and geologic alternatives. The possibility of near-surface disposal is something currently not approved by NRC and is a remote possibility for GTCC waste. The role of NRC depends on the waste characterization. If the waste is commercial only, the disposal facility would be NRC licensed. If there is DOE waste mixed in, DOE might claim responsibility for the entire facility. There will be more clarity when the DEIS comes out.

2. ***DOE's Plans for remote-handled transuranic waste (RH TRU).*** Hanford is a number of years out from having the capacity to process RH TRU waste. DOE has studied this and, based on how WIPP is currently operated, DOE believes there will be enough room for the RH TRU waste.
3. ***Status of MLLW capacity at the Nevada Test Site (NTS).*** NTS is closing in 2010, and there is uncertainty of available capacity. This is an interim status facility, as the state of NV has not received a part B final status permit. Nevada needs to close out the facility.
4. ***Possibility of Commercial spent nuclear fuel (SNF) interim storage.*** At this point, DOE does not have the legal authority to store SNF on an interim basis; it would take an act of Congress.
5. ***What will be the GNEP protocols for SNF recycling?*** It is not clear whether the GNEP program will reprocess any of the current volume destined for Yucca Mountain.
6. ***Disposition Issues from John Owsley (TN).***
Three recommendations:
 - DOE should communicate early and often with respect to waste disposition decisions. Sometimes a conservative disposal decision is made, but it may be more cost effective to spend additional money on waste characterization up front.
 - Tennessee supports using commercial disposal capacity as a front line option since it is externally regulated.
 - DOE should recommend better use of salt dome capacity for waste disposal to Congress (no consensus was reached on this point).

Waste Disposition Breakouts: Observations, Questions and Answers

Facilitator: Bill Ross, Ross & Associates Environmental Consulting

- Christine Gelles (DOE) commented on GTCC: The Office of Waste Disposition was responsible for the EIS. The selection of locations was based on two factors: There had to be ongoing LLW disposal operations at the DOE site and there had to be sufficient infrastructure for continued operations. It is possible that the EIS will show that a number of the sites are unfavorable. Carlsbad is the only community that is supportive of GTCC. Regarding near-surface disposal, the LLW Act of 1995 gave DOE responsibility to develop a disposal facility; the NRC will have to promulgate rule requirements for a disposal facility for GTCC. Near-surface disposal is more than a remote possibility, and it must be assumed that any of the disposal options are reasonable. The Office of Waste Disposition will analyze each method at each location for each type of GTCC waste.
- Dr. Triay commented on the importance of involving stakeholders in the establishment of priorities. The priorities list came about when DOE stacked up all of

the needs of the different sites in order to meet compliance milestones and found it was over budget. DOE then prioritized in order to maintain a safe operation. If DOE could re-examine its resources based of what can truly be completed, there could be more money to reinvest in other parts of the portfolio.

- In the context of developing and maintaining coalitions, Dr. Triay observed the need for DOE to be a good guest when its disposition facilities are hosted by a state. She said DOE may need to re-think its D&D plans in this regard.
- Dr. Triay commented that another way to consider counterbalancing part of the budget shortfall would be to look at assets such as DOE's uranium and nickel.
- Russell Jim posed the question: When a project cannot be finished and there are unexpended funds, who has authority to redistribute those funds? Ms. Rheaume responded that DOE can use the unexpended funds for other uses. DOE receives funds to spend money on certain projects and cannot reprogram funding without involving Congress. If the funds are un-obligated DOE can put a request through OMB to Congress, and if the request is approved it rescinds the authority of the project from which it is taken. If the money has been obligated to a contract it is more difficult to take back. Prior to FY07, site managers had a \$5 million reprogramming limitation at the site level. In FY07, with the continuing resolution, DOE was unable to move around money within the \$5 million reprogramming limit. In order to move money around, it is important to have a proven, established need for reprogramming of funds.
- Ms. Gelles noted that in order to avoid the stovepipes there should be discussion across programs and agencies. If a committee were established to foster cross-site integration, the minutes should be shared.
- Mr. Kirshenberg noted the importance of highlighting the inter-relatedness of different sites and the impacts of budget at one site on others, as well as developing an understanding of DOE's contracting process and how that plays into EM.
- Ms. Gelles reported on the Office of Waste Disposition's efforts at characterizing inter-site dependencies through systems such as WIMS. Once the inventory for TRU waste is updated it will be added to the WIMS system.
- Ms. Gelles remarked on the improvement in integrating projects among the different programs in EM. In most cases, the Deputy Secretary has to approve a project and will not do so unless the other Secretaries are in agreement. (Note: There are smaller projects that don't receive that level of scrutiny.)

Reports from Day 2 Breakout Sessions (October 18, 2007)

Blue Group

Moderators: Tom Winston, Doug Frost, Nithin Akuthota

The Blue Group discussed several issues, including the continual reorganization within DOE, lack of planning for certain waste, the value of an Office of Communications, the poor case made to Congress by DOE, and the lack of follow-through on accelerated cleanup. The group focused on three key issues:

1. EM's mission has become more convoluted. It was clear at the closure sites, but is less so at sites with ongoing missions and multiple landlords.
2. DOE should maximize substantive interaction with the groups. Stakeholder groups possess institutional memory, and external input to DOE at all levels is vital. We need more accountability and institutionalization.
3. Increased stakeholder involvement in baselining and budgeting is important, and DOE and the intergovernmental groups should work together collectively throughout the year.

Recommendation: *The Blue Group suggested creating a subcommittee with two members from each intergovernmental group to work with DOE between Intergovernmental meetings. DOE should name specific personnel to work with the new committee.*

Green Group

Moderators: Cynthia Rheame, Willie Preacher, Jane Hedges

The Green Group discussed communication both generally and in regards to project management systems. Several specific issues were raised:

- Project management workshops are needed to help explain how project management relates to local projects.
- It is important to educate stakeholders on DOE's decision-making process, especially addressing opportunities for stakeholder input.
- Telling the story of the importance of EM's mission is critical. ECA volunteered to draft a 1-2 page overview.

Recommendations:

- *EM should establish communications performance measures for site managers with outside evaluation. This includes better use of SSABs as peer review/expert panels. The new communications office can oversee this effort.*
- *To the extent possible, DOE-HQ should share quarterly reports with stakeholders to encourage transparency.*

Red Group

Moderators: Christine Gelles, Brian Hembacher, Ken Niles

The Red Group discussed the quality of – and confidence in – final and planned cleanup decisions. Near-term decisions appear to be cost based, and it is unclear if long-term

considerations are accounted for at all levels. Cost is valued over other CERCLA criteria, and characterization information is not good enough. It is also unclear if future natural resource damages (NRD) are being considered.

Recommendations:

- *Decisions should limit future NRD liabilities and have early consultation/collaboration.*
- *If characterization is not enough, capping should not be an option for long-lived or mobile waste.*
- *EM should develop a plan or appoint a person to ensure long-term decisions feed into short-term decision-making and to better ensure information is not lost.*
- *EM should ensure an effective communications component in future missions to avoid future liabilities.*

Yellow Group

Moderators: Merle Sykes, Shelly Sherritt, Jerry Boese

The Yellow Group discussed three topics:

- *Baselining.* Specifically, the difference of opinion over whether the work shapes the budget or the budget shapes the work.
- *Natural Resource Damages.* EM makes cleanup decisions that shape long-term stewardship without early integration of NRD. EM is not responsible for long-term stewardship, other offices are not consistent, and there is potential for future lost use and cost.
- *Integration.* There is a tension between cleanup and ongoing missions, and the cleanup process does not lend itself to a dynamic situation. Various missions and entities impact cleanup and affect ongoing missions, and stakeholders have difficulty putting together an overall picture from DOE.

Recommendations:

- *DOE should work with stakeholders to develop an unconstrained scope, schedule, and cost tool on a complex-wide basis.*
- *EM should take the lead on making cleanup decisions informed by NRD injury assessment, including working with the trustee councils.*
- *If any new mission will be added to a site, DOE must first address how cleanup will be affected.*
- *EM should be designated as the hub of an information wheel for the various entities (NNSA, Science, etc) and their associated projects.*

Breakout Observations and Q&A Session

Facilitator: Kara Colton, Kaco Group

- Dr. Triay commented on the turmoil that is created when stakeholders lose confidence in EM's ability to deliver results. EM's focus is to stand up its project management capability to restore credibility, and then to improve the clarity of its strategic vision. In addition, more discussion regarding the communications office is invited from the stakeholder groups. Holding project management workshops will

help develop a common language, and Melissa Nielson's organization is ready to work with the groups on long-range planning.

- Dr. Triay challenged the intergovernmental groups to think about their own missions in order to develop a shared vision with DOE. Marrying new missions with ongoing and accelerated cleanup must be reconciled.