```
1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
```

- 2 RPTS BROWN
- 3 HIF072.202
- 4 ``DOE MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF ITS NUCLEAR WEAPONS
- 5 COMPLEX: LESSONS OF THE Y-12 SECURITY FAILURE''
- 6 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2013
- 7 House of Representatives,
- 8 Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
- 9 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 10 Washington, D.C.

- 11 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:10 a.m.,
- 12 in Room 2322 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tim
- 13 Murphy [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
- Members present: Representatives Murphy, Burgess,
- 15 Harper, Gardner, Johnson, Barton, Upton (ex officio),
- 16 DeGette, Braley, Lujan, Tonko, Green, and Waxman (ex

```
17
    officio).
18
         Staff present: Carl Anderson, Counsel, Oversight;
    Charlotte Baker, Press Secretary; Mike Bloomquist, General
19
20
    Counsel; Annie Caputo, Professional Staff Member; Karen
21
    Christian, Counsel, Oversight; Andy Duberstein, Deputy Press
    Secretary; Kirby Howard, Legislative Clerk; Peter Kielty,
22
23
    Deputy General Counsel; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff
24
    Member, Oversight; Tiffany Benjamin, Democratic Senior
25
    Counsel; Brian Cohen, Democratic Staff Director, Oversight
26
    and Investigations, and Senior Policy Advisor; Elizabeth
    Letter, Democratic Assistant Press Secretary; and Stephen
27
28
    Salsbury, Democratic Special Assistant.
```

29 Mr. {Murphy.} Good morning. We convene this hearing to 30 continue the committee's examination of energy--Department of 31 Energy's management and oversight of its nuclear weapons 32 complex, three national weapons laboratories and five 33 production and testing facilities. These eight sites are 34 responsible for the stewardship of our Nation's nuclear 35 weapons stockpile. 36 DOE, through its National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, spends billions of dollars each year 37 38 performing hazardous operations to maintain and secure 39 nuclear weapons and weapons materials. This work is 40 performed by contractors at the Department's nuclear weapons 41 sites under the supervision of federal officials and requires 42 strict adherence to strong safety standards. The supremely 43 sensitive nature of the materials and technologies also 44 requires the Department to ensure an extraordinary level of 45 security to safequard these nuclear sites and operations. 46 Our attention today will focus mainly on the lessons for the Department from the security and oversight failures that 47 48 occurred last summer at the Y-12 National Security Complex,

49 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and what DOE is doing to address 50 these lessons. 51 At its hearing this past September, this subcommittee began to examine preliminary information about the failures 52 We learned how these failures allowed three 53 54 protestors at around 4:20 a.m. one morning last July to 55 penetrate security fences and detection systems and deface 56 the walls of the facility storing highly enriched uranium. 57 We learned about inexcusable maintenance problems and compensatory security measures to work around broken 58 equipment and chronic false alarms. We learned about the 59 60 inadequate response by the protective guard force. And most to the point of our hearing today, we learned about the 61 62 failure of contractor governance and federal oversight to 63 identify and correct the multiple early indicators of Y-12's 64 security, maintenance, and communications systems breakdowns. 65 The DOE Inspector General's testimony at that hearing revealed that federal site officials did not do anything to 66 67 address security maintenance backlogs because NNSA's contractor governance system meant ``they could no longer 68 69 intervene.'' This perhaps is the most incomprehensible

```
70
    aspect of this troubling situation. It appears that, due to
71
    a ``hands off'' federal contracting policy, we had
72
    ineffective federal security oversight at Y-12, and
73
    potentially at other sites around the complex.
74
         Information produced since September confirms that a
75
    strong oversight approach to security has not been paramount
76
    at DOE, particularly since the Department instituted certain
77
    reforms to its oversight in 2009 and 2010. The stated
    purpose of these reforms was to give contractors flexibility
78
79
    to tailor and implement safety and security programs
    ``without excessive federal oversight or overly prescriptive
80
81
    departmental requirements.'' Whatever the intent, the
82
    reforms in practice were interpreted by federal site
83
    officials to mean they couldn't intervene when security
84
    problems arose.
85
         We will discuss today the findings of a revealing Task
86
    Force assessment, which was commissioned in response to Y-12
87
    and released to the administrator in November. Led by Air
88
    Force Brigadier General Sandra Finan, who will testify on the
89
    first panel this morning, the Task Force found that issues at
90
    Y-12 were part of a larger pattern of deficiencies in NNSA's
```

```
91
     security-related functions and activities across board.
92
    Notably, the Task Force found no clear lines of
93
     accountability at NNSA, and broken security policy process,
94
     an ``eyes on, hands off'' governance approach that weakened
     federal oversight, and a federal organization ``incapable of
95
96
    performing effective security performance assessment'' of the
97
     contractors operating the sites.
98
          We will hear testimony from GAO on our second panel that
99
    many of these deficiencies are identical to those identified
100
    at NNSA 10 years ago. It appears the Department instituted
    reforms that actually may have exacerbated the deficiencies,
101
102
     turning ``eyes on, hands off'' into eyes closed, hands off.
103
          Deputy Secretary Poneman and acting NNSA Administrator
104
    Miller I trust will explain to us today how and when the
105
    agency will implement the Task Force's recommendations and
     exactly how they will communicate clear and appropriate
106
107
    priorities for safety and security in their governance of the
108
     sites. Let me welcome you both, and General Finan.
109
          Our second panel provides broader perspective on
     security culture at the Department. Along with GAO, we will
110
```

hear from General Donald Alston and former NRC Chairman

111

Richard Meserve, two of three contributors to an analysis 112 113 requested by the Secretary of Energy about the physical 114 security structure at the DOE. 115 The experience and perspective of these witnesses should help us to put the security deficiencies in the broader 116 117 context of the oversight and management challenges 118 confronting DOE. In the end we should identify a path 119 forward for the Department to ensure strong oversight and 120 zero tolerance for failures. The risks to millions of 121 people, and indeed geopolitics are too important for anything 122 less. 123 [The prepared statement of Mr. Murphy follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 124

125 Mr. {Murphy.} I would now like to recognize Ranking 126 Member Diana DeGette for her opening statement. 127 Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as you said, a little over 7 months ago, 128 129 an 82-year-old nun and two middle age men breached the 130 security perimeter surrounding the highly-enriched uranium 131 facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex in Oak Ridge, 132 Tennessee. In the wake of that incident, this committee had a hearing toward exactly how such an absurd and dangerous 133 breach of security could happen. Today, I want to thank you 134 135 for having this follow-up hearing to learn what has happened to address the security breakdowns that resulted in the 136 breach, and to make sure that something like that never 137 138 happens again. 139 I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for continuing our 140 longstanding bipartisan interest in this subcommittee in 141 ensuring that our nuclear facilities are safe and secure. 142 Our past oversight over the nuclear complex has made a significant difference, raising standards for worker safety, 143 ensuring lab safety, ensuring security standards remain 144

145 accountable to those who work within the labs and who live nearby, and forcing NNSA to make significant changes when 146 things go awry. But I got to tell you, as I have told you 147 before, both on and off the record, every few years we go 148 through this same thing. There is an incident, there is an 149 150 aggressive response from NNSA, time passes without an 151 incident, and everybody begins to relax. Labs start to 152 complain about overly burdensome paperwork and oversight. 153 response, expectations and rules are relaxed, and then, of course, without fail, another incident occurs. I am tired of 154 this pattern and we should all be tired of this pattern, 155 156 because it really does affect our national security. 157 Today, I am hoping to hear how NNSA and DOE have responded to last year's call to action, not just at Y-12, 158 159 but across the NNSA complex. But more importantly, I want to 160 hear what they are doing to ensure that we don't have to have 161 any more hearings about security breaches or safety incidents 162 at these sites. I guess my view is, it is time to break this 163 pattern. I want to commend the agencies for acting promptly to 164 address the issues exposed at Y-12 in the wake of the July 28 165

breach. However, I continue to be deeply concerned about 166 167 oversight within NNSA. Last month, GAO again released its 168 high risk list, identifying agencies and program areas that are at high risk due their vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, 169 abuse, and mismanagement. Just as it has been since 1990, 170 171 contract management at NNSA is on this list. Assessments 172 conducted after last year's security breach show that NNSA 173 dubious honor is well-deserved. A February, 2013, DOE 174 Inspector General report described a ``eyes on, hands off'' 175 approach to contractor oversight, meaning federal employees felt they could monitor but not intervene in contractor 176 177 activities, even if they suspected an issue. Recent assessments conducted by DOE's Office of Health, Safety, and 178 179 Security showed contractor communication problems, both 180 between different contractors at the Y-12 site, and between 181 the contractor and federal employees at Y-12, and other 182 independent experts observed a Y-12 culture that completely 183 failed to adequately focus on security. 184 As terror effects become more real, and as our enemies become more sophisticated, we just can't afford to take this 185 ``eyes on, hands off'' approach to security. Tens of 186

```
thousands of people work at these labs and facilities, and we
187
     owe it to them and to the communities around the facilities
188
189
     and the American people to ensure that they are safe and
190
     secure. To do that, we have got to closely examine and
    monitor the nuclear complex, promote transparency when it
191
192
     comes to how DOE and NNSA are using their resources, and
193
    demand accountability from everybody involved. We have to
194
     insist that standards are simply never relaxed because people
195
    don't like filling out paperwork. In short, we have to
196
    demand more.
          There has been no shortage of assessments of what should
197
198
    be done for the complex, and in the coming months, I am sure
    we can expect more of these. As we move forward, we have to
199
     continue to make sure that DOE and NNSA are keeping nuclear
200
201
     safe sites safe and adapting and responding to the ever-
202
     changing security challenges at the nuclear complex.
203
          So Mr. Chairman, I am happy that you are continuing the
204
     grant tradition of this subcommittee in oversight of DOE and
205
    NNSA, and I look forward to working with you as we move along
     in the future. I yield back.
206
          [The prepared statement of Ms. DeGette follows:]
207
```

208 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. {Murphy.} I thank the Congresswoman from Colorado. 209 210 I now recognize the chairman of the full committee, Mr. 211 Upton, for an opening statement. 212 The {Chairman.} Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. 213 Today's hearing represents another important step in 214 this committee's ongoing oversight to ensure that the 215 Department of Energy's management of nuclear security 216 enterprise can successfully protect taxpayer dollars, ensure 217 public health and worker safety, and in fact, safeguard our national security assets. We know from our past work, as 218 219 well as from the recent and very troubling security failures 220 at Y-12, that management reform is necessary to ensure safe 221 and secure operations. The challenge has been learning the 222 right lesson from past failures, and then successfully 223 implementing the right fixes. 224 Time and again over the last 14 years, we have witnessed 225 dramatic failures in safety and security, as well as taxpayer 226 waste across the nuclear complex. Despite that poor track record, in '09 DOE proposed increased economy and less 227 oversight as the appropriate corrective actions. We know, 228

229 though, from past experiences and the Y-12 breach that strong 230 and consistent federal management bolstered by truly 231 independent oversight is, in fact, necessary. DOE leadership must be clear that safety and security come first. They go 232 hand in hand. This is the lesson that we have learned from 233 234 the civilian nuclear industry. As safety improves, so does 235 performance. Absent an imbedded safety culture, there is 236 erosion of safety practices, leading to outages, delays, and 237 other operational impacts. The same is true for security. 238 The Y-12 security breach demonstrated not only a failure at the site, but also a failure of DOE and NNSA management. 239 240 We can trace some of that failure to the initiative launched by DOE leadership 3 to 4 years ago to rely more on 241 contractor's self-assessments and define success as 242 243 productivity gained. Secretary Chu himself wanted DOE to be 244 viewed as a ``partner and asset,'' his words for the 245 contractors, sending the signal that oversight of these 246 contractors would not be a priority. Members on this 247 committee warned the Secretary in 2010 that such initiatives, however well-intentioned, were misinterpreting the lessons 248 and the past and could, in fact, backfire, and that track 249

```
250
    record speaks for itself.
251
         As this committee, with oversight responsibility for
252
    DOE, we must ensure that current and future DOE leadership
253
     learns the right lessons. That starts today when we hear
254
    about the plans to fix and sustain improvements in safety and
    security oversight.
255
256
         I yield the balance of my time to Dr. Burgess.
257
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]
     ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********
258
```

259 Dr. {Burgess.} I thank the chairman of the full committee--chairman of the subcommittee for calling this 260 261 important hearing. This is an important follow-up on the 262 committee's work in the last Congress into the astonishing 263 security lapses that occurred at one of our most important, 264 and purportedly most secure nuclear weapons facilities in the 265 country. 266 You know, you look at the continuum, the range of failure and it goes from totally unacceptable to an abject 267 failure, and this is at one of our country's most important 268 269 facilities that stores highly enriched uranium for our 270 defenses and for our national security. At last September's 271 hearing, I voiced my concern over the lack of accountability. 272 We need to know who at Department of Energy was held 273 accountable. Who lost their job? Who lost their job because 274 of this epic failure of security and oversight? 275 Now, General Finan's task force, I think, has put it 276 very succinctly that there is a pervasive culture of tolerating the intolerable and accepting the unacceptable. I 277 278 fear that statement has really become the operational motto

of the Executive Branch, where failure after failure is met 279 with a shrug and not much more. Had this incident been 280 281 perpetrated by someone with more sinister motives, the break-282 in could have had catastrophic results for that region and for our Nation. So I continue to be concerned that our 283 284 security at our Nation's most critical facilities is not 285 being given the priority that it deserves. 286 Chairman Murphy and I met with General Finan, and I 287 thank you, General, for taking the time for that meeting-this was a month ago--to discuss some of the observations 288 that her task force has made in the security lapses and the 289 290 oversight failures at NNSA. So certainly, we look forward to 291 hearing from you this morning as to where the NNSA stands in its oversight of these facilities. 292 293 This investigation is a prime example of the good work 294 that this committee can do when it works in a bipartisan 295 manner. The security of our Nation's weapons facilities is not an issue that divides or should divide along party lines. 296 297 We are all in favor of safe, secure areas where our nuclear stockpiles can be held, ready to protect our Nation, and safe 298 299 from predators.

```
Mr. {Murphy.} Thank the gentleman. I will now
303
304
     recognize for 5 minutes the ranking member of the full
305
     committee, Mr. Waxman.
          Mr. {Waxman.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for recognizing
306
307
    me and for holding this hearing.
308
          The Y-12 incident was embarrassing for DOE and NNSA, the
309
    National Nuclear Security Administration. It exposed serious
310
     issues within the security organization at NNSA. I
311
     appreciate our witnesses being here today, and I hope they
    will help us identify and address these concerns.
312
313
          The security concerns we will hear about today must be
314
     addressed. We cannot let our nuclear facilities become
315
     targets for our foreign enemies and terrorists. We need to
316
     invest in the safety and security of these facilities, both
317
     financially and by ensuring they have a culture that is
318
     focused on keeping our nuclear legacy materials and the
319
    people who work with them safe and secure.
320
          I appreciate DOE's actions in the wake of the Y-12
     incident. The Department has taken this incident seriously
321
     and developed a thoughtful approach to addressing concerns
322
```

that have been identified, but there is still more work left 323 to be done. DOE needs to ensure that it exercises strong 324 325 oversight over both its contractors and its federal employees at NNSA sites, and as noted by General Finan today, DOE needs 326 to ensure that there is a clear line of authority from the 327 328 Secretary down to the contractor, security guards at every 329 site. 330 Over the years, many people have advocated many 331 different structures for NNSA, but the assessments made after 332 the Y-12 incident show that the problem is not too much DOE efforts oversight, it is too little. The problem is that 333 334 contractors didn't take their responsibilities to the government or their workers seriously. The federal employees 335 336 failed to exercise appropriate authority over the contractor 337 counterparts, and that NNSA's culture didn't adequately focus 338 on security. 339 These problems can be resolved by effective oversight by 340 DOE by requiring that contractors become accountable and 341 transparent, and by ensuring that the federal officials who oversee these contractors take a hands on approach to 342 343 oversight.

```
344
          In the past year, some have suggested that NNSA needs
345
    more autonomy. In fact, last year's House-passed National
346
    Defense Authorization Act included language stripping DOE's
     authority over some NNSA sites. Given what we have seen in
347
348
     the last 7 months, that approach makes absolutely no sense.
349
     The Y-12 breach made it abundantly clear that NNSA is not
350
    doing enough on its own. All the findings and
351
     recommendations that have come from independent evaluators of
352
     the Y-12 breach, including NNSA's own task force, show that
    NNSA needs more oversight, not less. NNSA sites house some
353
354
     of our most dangerous nuclear assets. We need vigorous
355
     oversight by DOE to ensure that these nuclear materials are
356
     appropriately protected.
357
          Mr. Chairman, again, thank you for holding this hearing.
358
     I look forward to more opportunities to check in on NNSA's
359
    progress. I yield back the balance of my time.
360
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]
361
     ******** COMMITTEE INSERT *********
```

Mr. {Murphy.} The vice chairman yields back, and now we 362 will go over our witnesses today. 363 With us today is Brigadier General, United States Air 364 365 Force, Sandra Finan. I hope I am pronouncing that right. I 366 believe I am, right? Thank you for being here. She is the 367 Commander of the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center and former 368 Acting Chief of Defense Nuclear Security, National Nuclear 369 Security Administration. 370 Also joining her is Daniel B. Poneman, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy. Thank you so much for being with 371 372 us today, sir, and also accompanied by Neile Miller, the Acting Administrator of NNSA. I hope I have all the title 373 374 correct. 375 As you know, the testimony you are about to give is 376 subject to Title XVIII, Section 1001 of the United States 377 Code. When holding an investigative hearing, this committee 378 has a practice of taking testimony under oath. Do you have 379 any objections to testifying under oath? The chair then advises you that under the rules of the 380 House and rules of the committee, you are entitled to be 381

advised by counsel, if you desire to be advised by counsel 382 383 during your testimony today. Okay, they all say no. 384 Then in that case, if you would please rise and raise 385 your right hand, and I will swear you in. [Witnesses sworn] 386 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. Noting for the record that 387 all the witnesses responded in the affirmative, I now call 388 389 upon each of them to give a 5-minute summary and their 390 written statement. 391 Starting off with you, General Finan, thank you for

392

being here today.

```
^TESTIMONY OF SANDRA E. FINAN, BRIGADIER GENERAL, USAF,
393
394
     COMMANDER, AIR FORCE NUCLEAR WEAPONS CENTER AN FORMER ACTING
395
    CHAIRMAN OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR SECURITY, NATIONAL NUCLEAR
396
     SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (NNSA); AND DANIEL B. PONEMAN, DEPUTY
397
     SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, ACCOMPANIED BY NEILE L.
398
    MILLER, ACTING UNDERSECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY AND ACTING
399
    ADMINISTRATOR, NNSA
400
     ^TESTIMONY OF SANDRA E. FINAN
401
          General {Finan.} Chairman Murphy, Ranking Member
402
    DeGette, distinguished members of the committee, thank you
403
     for the opportunity to discuss the study I conducted on the
404
    National Nuclear Security Administration's federal security
405
     organization--
406
          Mr. {Murphy.} Could you pull your mike closer to
407
    yourself there, if it is on, too?
408
          General {Finan.} Is that better?
          Mr. {Murphy.} Yes, much better. Thank you.
409
          General {Finan.} Okay.
410
```

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the study I 411 conducted on the National Nuclear Security Administration's 412 413 federal security organization and assessment model. Although I am no longer assigned to the NNSA, I am pleased to share 414 our observations based on our 90-day study. 415 416 In the aftermath of the July 28, 2012, security incident 417 at the National Nuclear Security Administration's Y-12 418 National Security Complex, the leadership of the NNSA and the 419 Department of Energy took action to address the security 420 failures at Y-12. The initial information gathered revealed that the issues at Y-12 were part of a larger pattern of 421 422 security program management deficiencies within NNSA. 423 security issues prompted the NNSA administrator to commission 424 a task force to analyze the current federal NNSA security 425 organizational structure and security oversight model and 426 recommend possible improvements. The NNSA Administrator 427 directed the Task Force to analyze the current NNSA security 428 organizational structure and recommend possible improvements, 429 and to analyze the current NNSA security oversight model and 430 mechanisms to determine what seams existed and what 431 structures could be implemented to better ensure that the

issues are found and fixed before they become problems. 432 While other reviews were aimed at diagnosing the root 433 434 causes of the Y-12 event, the NNSA administrator's direction called for this Task Force to focus on the a path forward 435 within the federal NNSA organization. Under my leadership, 436 437 the task force consisting of NNSA, DOE, and military 438 specialists conducted extensive document reviews and 439 interviewed federal managers and staff as well as a selection 440 of contractor security managers and others across the NNSA 441 security organization. The task force collected and analyzed information, identified issues, and suggested a revised 442 443 organizational structure and assessment model. 444 While we highlighted negative aspects of the NNSA security organization and assessment model, the task force 445 446 found many great people on the NNSA security staffs. They 447 are clearly dedicated, skilled, and hard-working and want to 448 get the security mission done right. Unfortunately, NNSA 449 security personnel have seen themselves thwarted by lack of 450 management support and feel obstructed by some of their 451 peers. Their difficulties were compounded by the absence of 452 a workforce strategy to recruit, retain, and develop a cadre

of talented, knowledgeable and experienced security 453 454 professionals. Thus, it is all the more encouraging that 455 these personnel, almost without exception, genuinely care 456 about doing good work. Their continued strong desire to build a successful security organization is a hopeful sign 457 458 for the future. 459 Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I will submit the 460 remainder of my testimony for the record. It contains the 461 findings of the task force. 462 [The prepared statement of General Finan follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT A \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 463

```
464 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. I appreciate that.
465 Mr. Poneman?
```

466 ^TESTIMONY OF DANIEL B. PONEMAN Mr. {Poneman.} Chairman Murphy, Ranking Member DeGette, 467 and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the invitation 468 469 to appear before you today to provide the subcommittee 470 details on the actions the Department has taken or will take 471 to strengthen the security of the Nuclear Weapons Complex in 472 the wake of the July, 2012, Y-12 incident. We appreciate the interest and engagement of this committee and recognize the 473 474 important oversight role that you fulfill. The Secretary and 475 I recognize the severity of the problem that led us to this point, and we have acted swiftly to identify and address the 476 issues it revealed. 477 Since the Y-12 incursion, several major actions have 478 479 taken place to improve security immediately and for the long 480 term. Let me tell you about a few of them. 481 We restructured the contracts at Y-12 to integrate 482 security into the line of command at the M&O contractor. The protective force contractor was terminated, and a new M&O 483 484 contractor has been selected to manage the Y-12 site,

providing an opportunity for new leadership and to improve 485 the Y-12 security culture. We held accountable both the 486 487 senior federal and contractor management personnel at headquarters and the site, removing them from their 488 positions. The Department's Chief of Health, Safety, and 489 490 Security conducted an independent security inspection of Y-12 security operations, which include rigorous force-on-force 491 492 performance testing, as well as no notice and short notice 493 limited scope performance testing activities as directed by 494 the Secretary. HSS will be conducting a follow-up review in April to examine the status of the implementation of 495 496 corrective actions. The Secretary also directed HSS to 497 conduct immediate extent of condition assessments of all 498 sites in Category I nuclear materials across the DOE complex, 499 to identify any immediate security issues and to follow up 500 with a full security inspection, including force-on-force 501 exercises to assure effective security measures are being 502 implemented at those sites. 503 NNSA conducted an immediate after-action report to identify causes, issues to be addressed and recommended 504 action, and you just heard very eloquently summarized the 505

findings of those reports. 506 507 In order to address these institutional problems that 508 have been revealed, we are continuing to embrace and 509 implement the findings of General Finan's report, which you just heard her describe. 510 511 Because we believe that we need fresh perspectives from 512 disinterested parties to consider broader and long-term 513 responses to this incident, Secretary Chu requested three 514 independent experts in this area to conduct a strategic 515 review of the entire DOE security architecture, with a particular emphasis on Y-12, and I see that you are joined by 516 517 two of the three of these eminent experts here today. Each 518 of them provided thoughtful advice on the DOE's nuclear security structure, specifically, all Category I nuclear 519 520 facilities. We are now reviewing and discussing their advice 521 on how to improve security at Y-12, and across the nuclear 522 enterprise. 523 The series of personnel and management changes I have 524 described today were made to provide effective security at the Y-12 site, and across the DOE complex. We are also 525 526 working to carry out the structural and cultural changes

required to secure all Category I nuclear materials at this 527 and all other DOE and NNSA facilities, and in this respect, I 528 529 welcome the comments of -- in your opening remarks from members 530 of this subcommittee about the need to introduce cultural 531 changes so that we are not back in the same situation again. 532 That is absolutely critical, and I think as we get into the 533 discussion, what you hear in terms of what we are 534 implementing from General Finan's report will put us in the 535 right direction in that respect. 536 Our management principles hold that our mission is vital and urgent. Nowhere is that more true than here. 537 538 security of our Nation's nuclear material and technology is a 539 core responsibility of the Department, in support of the President and in defense of the Nation. The incident at Y-12 540 541 was unacceptable and served as an important wakeup call for our entire complex. The Department is taking aggressive 542 543 actions to ensure the reliability of our nuclear security 544 programs across the entire DOE enterprise and will continue 545 to do so. In that effort, the Department looks forward to working 546 with this subcommittee to ensure the security of the Nation's 547

```
nuclear materials. I would be pleased, of course, to answer
any questions from members of this subcommittee, and request
the balance of my statement be submitted for the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Poneman follows:]
```

```
Mr. {Murphy.} And so will the balance of your statement
554
     will be submitted for the record.
555
556
          We understand, Ms. Miller, you do not have an opening
557
     statement, so we will go right into some questions.
558
     recognize myself for 5 minutes.
559
          First of all, let me just say that I appreciate your
560
     candor. Nothing is better for leaders than to step forward
561
     and say mistakes have been made, taking full responsibility,
     and taking definitive action. I thank you for that. We are
562
     certainly hoping this never happens again, and we hope that
563
564
     the report and recommendations are going to be fully
     implemented and continue to be reviewed.
565
566
          So let me start with you, General Finan. Your task
567
     force identified the serious weaknesses in the federal
568
     capability to evaluate contractor performance at the Nuclear
     Weapons Complex. The NNSA administrator commissioned your
569
570
     report. I am correct in that?
          General {Finan.} Yes, sir.
571
          Mr. {Murphy.} It is also correct that the
572
573
     recommendations are directed at the administrator, not the
```

```
Secretary of Energy, am I correct?
574
575
          General {Finan.} That is correct. It was all NNSA-
576
     focused.
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. I just want to make sure we
577
578
     are following the right chain here.
579
          Mr. Poneman, as Deputy Secretary of Energy, you and the
580
     Secretary set high level policy direction and safety and
581
     security standards for NNSA's mission, but it is the
582
     responsibility of the NNSA to arrange a structure to
     accomplish these goals. That is up to the administrator, am
583
584
     I correct?
585
          Mr. {Poneman.} It is up to the administrator, of
     course, subject to, as you just said, the leadership of the
586
587
     Secretary and the Deputy Secretary.
588
          Mr. {Murphy.} And something you will continue to
589
     monitor as well?
590
          Mr. {Poneman.} Absolutely.
591
          Mr. {Murphy.}
                         Thank you.
592
          Ms. Miller, you are now the NNSA Acting Administrator.
          Ms. {Miller.} That is right.
593
594
          Mr. {Murphy.} Is it correct that you were Principal
```

```
595
     Deputy Administrator at NNSA as it implemented its safety and
596
     security reform efforts in 2010?
597
          Ms. {Miller.} I became the Principal Deputy
     Administrator in August of 2010.
598
          Mr. {Murphy.} Okay. Do you agree with the findings of
599
600
     General Finan's report?
601
          Ms. {Miller.} I completely agree with them.
602
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you.
603
          General Finan states that NNSA must clearly and
     consistently emphasize the importance of security. Do you
604
     agree with her statement?
605
606
          Ms. {Miller.} I absolutely agree with them.
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you.
607
608
          Do you believe that NNSA's leadership has been
609
     inconsistent in the message it sends to the field about
610
     security emphasis?
611
          Ms. {Miller.} I believe it has been inconsistently
     communicated, yes. Absolutely.
612
613
          Mr. {Murphy.} Were you aware of the inconsistent
     messages on security prior to Y-12?
614
          Ms. {Miller.} I would say that I was aware that because
615
```

the chief of Defense Nuclear Security, as well as the chief 616 of Defense Nuclear Safety reported directly to the 617 618 administrator and not to me. I would say I was aware of the difficulty and the inconsistencies in communicating policy 619 and decisions for security and many other areas from the 620 621 headquarters organization to the field offices. 622 Mr. {Murphy.} Well yes, and since part of the purpose 623 of this Committee on Oversight is to make sure that we are 624 understanding lessons learned, but what you don't measure, you can't manage. What you don't admit, you can't act on. 625 Were there some lessons you learned from this, some things 626 627 that you should do differently in terms of the process as we 628 move forward? Ms. {Miller.} Mr. Chairman, I would say two things. 629 630 First of all, there were lessons I had been learning prior to 631 this incident that caused us to announce a few weeks before 632 this incident, the end of July, caused us to announce that we 633 were changing the way we governed our sites. And that is to 634 say, we took the sites from within defense programs, our 635 large weapons program, where they had been reporting for a number of years and had them now directly report to the 636

637 administrator through an associate administrator peer level, the senior management, so that we could start to drive 638 accountability and consistency across our sites. So that was 639 a measure that I had come to the conclusion that organization 640 absolutely had to make to address what I said before, which 641 642 was concern about inconsistencies all over the place. 643 With regard to post-Y-12 incident, in particular with 644 security, I was fortunate to be able to draw upon General 645 Finan's recommendations and work with her, as she was part of the organization at the time, and others to change the way we 646 operate security, both at headquarters and in the field. 647 648 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. Last month on February 5 at NNSA, associate 649 650 administrator for management and budget disputed the 651 Inspector General's report that Y-12 oversight was 652 ineffective because of the ``eyes on, hands off'' oversight 653 approach. The officials said that the ``eyes on, hands off'' 654 policy never applied to security matters and that this was a misperception by some federal officials. Ms. Miller, why is 655 an NNSA senior official continuing to dispute the impact of 656 the ``eyes on, hands off'' policy? 657

```
Ms. {Miller.} I think the issue is not to dispute the
658
     impact. I think the point is that we certainly did not set
659
     out--and again, this predates me, but no one set out to say
660
     that oversight should not be conducted, that your proper role
661
     is not to be overseeing all aspects of the contractor's
662
663
    performance. What I would say is that, as you yourself
664
    mentioned, driving that message through a very large
665
     organization from the administrator through every individual
666
     in every layer at every site is the big challenge. It is the
     challenge in security, it is the challenge all over the
667
    place. It is not a new issue. As the ranking member
668
    mentioned, we need to break the pattern, and that is
669
670
    definitely what the organization is about right now.
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. Hopefully you will
671
672
     communicate that through solidly, because of the extreme
673
     concerns about what happened.
674
          I recognize each member for 5 minutes as we go through.
675
    Next is Ms. DeGette.
676
          Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
          Secretary Poneman, I was intrigued when--first of all,
677
     let me say, I am impressed and encouraged by the commitment
678
```

679 the agency has made to not having to come back here next year or the year after with some new crisis. I am, both in these 680 681 hearings and some of our off--our side conversations, I do believe you have that commitment. 682 683 Secretary Poneman, I wanted to ask you, because you just 684 said in your testimony that you are committed to implementing 685 some of the aspects of the General's report to make sure that 686 we are not back here in a year or two. I wonder if you could briefly tell us--if you could give us the highlights of what 687 those things are? 688 Mr. {Poneman.} Gladly, Congresswoman DeGette. 689 690 The critical, I think, finding that General Finan's 691 report showed was that we had a lack of clarity of line of management control and accountability. So what we have done 692 693 is, under her recommendation implemented by Acting 694 Administrator Miller and fortunately, before General Finan 695 left us, she was the acting head of defense nuclear security, 696 to get this started. We have now made sure that under this 697 organization that Ms. Miller just introduced of the operations and infrastructure that the responsibility to 698 direct security at the site flows down from the administrator 699

700 through that office to the site. The other office that had 701 been doing security policy, so-called NA-70, had been 702 actually exercising some apparent line management authority, 703 which was creating confusion. That function has been 704 stripped away. Any line authority has been stripped away 705 from NA-70. 706 Ms. {DeGette.} So you think that is the key, having a 707 clear chain of--that is the number one? What else? 708 Mr. {Poneman.} Number two is the staff function that 709 that new organization -- that NA-70 must perform, they need to promulgate the policies and perform independent evaluations 710 711 so it is not just the site checking itself. Ms. {DeGette.} Okay, independent evaluations. 712 Those 713 are the two key things. 714 Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, oversight and a line management. Ms. {DeGette.} Now, another issue--I don't have--we 715 716 might do another round, but -- so I want to just go into this 717 other issue that I care a lot about, which complaints that 718 the committee has heard about overly burdensome oversight 719 stifling the work being done at NNSA labs and sites. And what we think--I was talking to the chairman about this--is 720

- 721 that federal officials need to conduct strict oversight of
- 722 the contractors, or serious security problems can fall
- 723 through the cracks.
- 724 So what I wanted to ask you, General Finan, in your
- 725 review, did you find that the problems you saw within NNSA
- 726 were caused by overly burdensome congressional oversight?
- General {Finan.} The issues that I found were not
- 728 caused at all by oversight. It was actually caused by lack
- 729 of oversight, and I mean oversight at every level.
- 730 Ms. {DeGette.} Right, right. So what was the--
- General {Finan.} It was impacting everything.
- 732 Ms. {DeGette.} We need to have clear oversight from the
- 733 top down, and as Mr. Poneman says, independent oversight,
- 734 right?
- General {Finan.} The burden was actually--when you--we
- 736 created a system that required a whole bunch of paperwork,
- 737 and the paperwork is burdensome, but what we lost in security
- 738 was the ability to see security performance. It was
- 739 paperwork.
- 740 Ms. {DeGette.} Yeah, there was a bunch of paperwork,
- 741 but it was irrelevant to the core task, right?

```
General {Finan.} Correct.
742
         Ms. {DeGette.} Mr. Poneman, do you want to comment on
743
744
     that?
745
          Mr. {Poneman.} I thought it was a very apt finding, and
     the misinterpretation of that 2010 reform is exactly on this
746
747
    point. We were trying to strip away the excessive paperwork
748
     and get to the performance testing.
749
          Ms. {DeGette.} Right, but did any of the auditor's
750
    assessments conducted in the wake of the Y-12 incident find
751
     that it was caused by too much congressional oversight of the
752
    Y-12 contractors?
753
          Mr. {Poneman.} No, ma'am.
754
          Ms. {DeGette.} Okay. The reason I bring this up is
755
    because some people try to say oh, we have too much
     oversight. It seems to me when we have these problems over
756
757
     and over again, the problem is not too much oversight.
758
    problem is too little effective oversight and accountability.
759
    Ms. Miller, you are nodding your head. Would you agree with
760
     that?
          Ms. {Miller.} Yes, I would definitely agree. It is
761
762
     about effectiveness.
```

```
Ms. {DeGette.} Now, let's see.
763
          General Finan, can you tell us about the findings of the
764
765
     task force with respect to improved oversight of NNSA
766
     security contractors? You touched on it just very briefly.
          General {Finan.} Right. The recommendation we are
767
768
    making is that we create an NNSA oversight function, because
769
     right now, in the system as I looked at it a couple of months
770
     ago, NNSA did not have any oversight capability. They
771
    depended on onsite federal personnel to analyze contractor
772
    performance. But again, they were applying the ``eyes on,
    hands off'' concept and so that was varied from site to site.
773
    And what happened is that you lacked--there was no sense of
774
775
     criticism in this assessment, right?
776
          Ms. {DeGette.} Right.
777
          General {Finan.} You had onsite people who were your
778
     really only federal ability to look at contractor
779
    performance. Well, those folks onsite grew up there, they
780
     lived there, you know, they spent their whole time.
781
     identified with the mission and they were really not a very
     good source of independent oversight as to contractor
782
783
    performance.
```

```
Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you.
784
785
          Mr. Poneman and Ms. Miller, do you agree with that?
          Mr. {Poneman.} Absolutely--
786
          Ms. {Miller.} Yes.
787
          Mr. {Poneman.} --and the reforms we described I think
788
789
     reflect that finding.
790
          Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you.
791
          Ms. Miller, do you agree with that?
792
          Ms. {Miller.} I do.
793
          Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you.
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. Gentlelady yields back.
794
795
          I now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson,
796
     for 5 minutes.
797
                          Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
          Mr. {Johnson.}
798
          Mr. Poneman, in her testimony, General Finan states that
799
     NNSA must clearly and consistently emphasize the importance
     of security. Unfortunately, here is the consistent message
800
801
     that the DOE, NNSA organizations, and contractors were
802
              In March of 2010, Secretary Chu stated his vision
803
     that he wanted DOE to be viewed as a valued partner and asset
804
     to contractors. He went on to suggest that safety could be
```

805 ensured with a skeleton crew of health and safety experts. 806 Also in March of 2010, Mr. Poneman, you wrote in the 807 Department's safety and security reform plan that success 808 will be measured through near-term relief from specific lowvalue burdensome requirements, as well as longer term 809 810 streamlining of requirements that will lead to measurable 811 productivity improvements. I note that safety and security 812 did not factor into this definition of success. Would you 813 agree that statements like these send mixed signals about the 814 Department's commitment to safety? Mr. {Poneman.} Congressman, the portion of the document 815 816 read from my document, the genesis of that was to set out a 817 set of safety and security objectives, so in fact, that particular sentence is out of documents that are precisely 818 819 intended to maximize safety and security. What is 820 unfortunate, what has happened is the misinterpretation of 821 that. What we were trying to do, sir, is to get rid of the 822 checkbox mentality, just looking at paperwork and creating 823 paperwork, get back to performance testing, so we could be better, safer, and more secure. That is absolutely our 824 825 objective.

Mr. {Johnson.} What are you doing today to ensure 826 consistent and clear emphasis on safety importance from the 827 828 headquarters on down? Mr. {Poneman.} Number one, we are, on both safety and 829 security, assimilating all of the learnings from reports such 830 831 as General Finan's. Number two, because we have found safety 832 culture issues as well as security culture issues, we have 833 regular meetings where we assemble the top leadership in the 834 Department to check on a continuing basis that this is being 835 messaged consistently throughout the complex. One of the 836 major challenges, Congressman, that we have found is -- as you 837 heard with this talk about ``eyes on, hands off''--is the misinterpretation, like a kid's game of Telephone, is a 838 839 terrible problem. So it is not enough to promulgate a good 840 policy. You have got to continually stay on it, message it, 841 and work with your leadership and work with the people in the 842 field. 843 Mr. {Johnson.} Okay, thank you. 844 Ms. Miller, a week or so before the Y-12 incident in July of 2012, Mr. Don Cook, NNSA Deputy Administrator for 845 Defense Programs, made the following remarks, and I quote, 846

``With regard to the relationship that we have and where we 847 are between NNSA and its labs and plants--I didn't say my 848 849 labs and plants, but you can tell I feel that way--getting to the point where we have oversight on these, which is eyes on, 850 hands off oversight, has been my aspiration for several years 851 852 and it remains so. It was my aspiration when I worked on the 853 lab side for many years. General Finan completed that 854 ensuring that the right leadership is in the right position 855 is absolutely critical to success.'' What are you going to do to make that happen, ensure that leadership is sending the 856 right message about the importance of safety and security? 857 858 Ms. {Miller.} Mr. Johnson, sending the right message, in my view and after many years of looking at the NNSA mostly 859 from outside of it, is a challenge that is not achieved just 860 861 by making sure that people at the top level know what the message means. But it is difficult to make sure that every 862 863 single person in the 10,000 people at a given lab or 30,000 864 throughout our complex understand what we are talking about. If we--what we are doing at NNSA is working to be able to 865 communicate and train and talk to people at every single 866 level to make sure it is not going to be misunderstood. We 867

recently changed all of our M&O contracts. The performance 868 measures in those contracts are all now connected to safety 869 870 and security so that it is not possible to believe that you 871 have performed according to the terms of a contract in an area like nuclear weapons if you have not also met the 872 873 performance plans for safety and security. It just isn't 874 going to happen. 875 So this is a step-by-step throughout the organization. 876 It is not just at the top level. 877 Mr. {Johnson.} Okay, good. One final question, General Finan. First of all, as a 878 879 26-1/2 year veteran of the Air Force myself, thank you for 880 your service and what you have done here. 881 A troubling finding in your report is that potentially 882 critical management information is not being reported clearly 883 to the appropriate decision makers. Would you elaborate on 884 what you mean by this? 885 General {Finan.} Yes, sir. As we interviewed people 886 and took a look at what was happening, we found out at the lower levels, there were people who knew what issues existed 887

out there and knew the significance of those issues. But as

888

```
889
     they attempted to rise those issues up to senior levels, they
890
     were being suppressed. Management at mid levels would
891
     suppress it, and so in many cases, critical decision
892
     information was not making its way to the top of the
893
     organization.
894
          Mr. {Johnson.} Okay, thank you for that, and with that,
895
     Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you.
896
          Mr. {Murphy.} Okay, gentleman's time is expired, and I
897
     will now recognize Mr. Tonko for 5 minutes.
898
          Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you, Mr. Chair.
899
          General Finan, you state in your testimony that the
900
     findings of this task force were very similar to those
901
     numerous prior reports by other review teams, so my question
902
     is, what happened to the recommendations of the prior review
     teams? Were they ever implemented? Was the implementation
903
904
     insufficient, or is there a larger problem that still needs
905
     to be identified?
906
          General {Finan.} There is a cultural issue.
     findings, as you look at them, you go back to see what people
907
908
     did, you will find that there are some actions that were put
     in place, but there was a check the box mentality that said
909
```

```
910
    we want to get rid of the findings as fast as we can.
911
     they do whatever they could to say yes, I have responded to
912
     this finding and it is gone. And so the things that they
     changed didn't stick. It was just a matter of taking action,
913
914
     checking the box, closing the finding, and going on to the
915
    next thing. And so what needs to happen is all those things
916
    need to be taken in aggregate, we need to create a roadmap,
917
     and then we need to change the culture so that we
918
     continuously evaluate those things and go back and make sure
919
     that we don't, year after year, make the same mistake and
     that we are not interested in checking the box off, we are
920
921
     interested in changing the way we do business so we do it the
922
    right way.
923
          Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you. There seems to be a theme that
924
     runs through a number of the task force's observations that
925
     cost control was a bigger concern for many of the people
926
    managing the program, the security program, than performance
927
     of the security mission. This implies there is a real or
928
    perceived lack of resources to support the security mission
     fully. Which is it, real or perceived?
929
          General {Finan.} It is a combination of both.
930
```

931 happened was that management had overwhelmingly started to 932 figure out--they wanted to reduce the cost of security, and 933 so in doing that, what they did is they lost sight of the 934 requirements of security, and because the two were mixed together, the people who determined requirements and the 935 936 budget were the same people. What happened was that they 937 were no longer looking at the actual requirements for 938 security. They lost sight of what was required in order to 939 adequately secure these materials and these sites, and 940 moreover, they lost visibility on the important aspect of protecting our operational capability and our people. And 941 those items actually got no visibility at all and were 942 943 completely ignored. They thought that if they could do the big war, if they could fight the terrorists, they could do 944 945 all the lesser includeds, therefore, they never needed to 946 look at lesser includeds. Well, lesser included happened to 947 be a protest event, and Y-12 proved that lesser includeds do 948 not--you cannot do lesser includeds just because you can fight the larger issues. So it was a combination of wanting 949 950 to reduce the budget, which is a good thing. We ought to always be efficient, but when you lose sight of the 951

requirements, what happened is senior leaders at NNSA did not 952 953 get to make the decision. Do I want to fund that requirement 954 or do I want to take the risk? The risk was being assumed at 955 lower levels by default rather than being made at the senior decision maker level at NNSA. 956 957 Mr. {Tonko.} Deputy Secretary Poneman--and I thank you 958 for that answer--but Deputy Secretary, how much of DOE's 959 budget is spent on contractors, your area of the budget? 960 Mr. {Poneman.} The vast majority. I think it is well over 80 percent, and we can get you a precise number. I 961 think it is on the order of 85 percent. 962 963 Mr. {Tonko.} With that amount, the agency then, is it fair to say, is relying on private contractors to implement 964 many key security and safety goals? 965 966 Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, Congressman, going back to the 967 origins of the Department, back to shortly after World War II, Atomic Energy Commission, this whole model of the so-968 969 called management and operating contractor, the M&O 970 contractor model puts most of the programmatic and security 971 burdens in the hands of contractors who were exercising that 972 authority under federal oversight.

```
973
          Mr. {Tonko.} So do the contractors then have a
974
     conflicting bid of incentives here when carrying out their
975
     duties?
976
                          There is a risk, Congressman, and in
          Mr. {Poneman.}
     that respect, again, one of the many fine findings of General
977
978
     Finan's report, I think, shows the way we need to address
979
     that is the contractor must own and take responsibility for
980
     security, and in the first instance, must evaluate that under
981
     their own self-analysis, but that then needs to have a double
982
     check, first from the headquarters so there is not the onsite
     cozy relationship, so there is some difference and the
983
984
     federal oversight is effective, and secondly, from an
985
     independent organization, the HSS organization, to
986
     effectively ensure you have a disinterested third party look
987
     to make sure that that security is being well executed and
988
     there are not conflicts of interest, and to hold the
989
     contractor accountable if they do not self-disclose problems
990
     in security that they, in fact, find in their own forces.
991
          Mr. {Tonko.} General Finan, is it possible that
     contractor concerns over cutting costs could have been one of
992
     the causes of the Y-12 incident at Oak Ridge?
993
```

```
994
           General {Finan.} It could have been, and it may have
995
     been that they had cut back some of their maintenance
996
     personnel in order to cut costs, and therefore had
997
     misprioritized actions, so it could be a contributing factor.
           Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you. With that, I yield back.
998
999
          Mr. {Murphy.} Gentleman's--thank you very much.
1000
           The chair recognizes the chairman emeritus of the
1001
      committee from Texas, Mr. Barton, for 5 minutes.
1002
           Mr. {Barton.} Thank you, and I appreciate the courtesy
1003
     of letting me ask questions out of order, since I wasn't here
1004
     at the beginning. I appreciate that of my junior members.
1005
           I want to refresh the subcommittee's memory a little
1006
     bit. We have had repeated security incidences at the weapons
1007
     complexes in the national laboratories over the last 20
1008
     years. We have had tapes lost, we have had materials lost.
1009
     This latest incident, which has been sanitized to call the Y-
      12 incident, three nuns, I think, one fairly elderly,
1010
1011
     penetrated to the deepest security of our weapons complex. A
1012
     nun, okay, nuns. They showed up at one of our hearings and
1013
      they were in the audience, and these were not ninja warrior,
      flat belly, skulking people. These were just ordinary folks
1014
```

```
who wandered in, so to speak. So we have, once again,
1015
1016
     another task force that is going to try to rectify the
1017
     problems.
1018
          Now, I want to get the players straight. General Finan,
1019
     you are not in the normal chain of command at the Department
1020
     of Energy, is that correct?
1021
          General {Finan.} I am no longer assigned to the
1022
     Department of Energy. I am back in the Air Force. I was
1023
     always in the Air Force, but--
1024
          Mr. {Barton.} This report that you have helped to
     prepare was done at the request of DOE, at the request of the
1025
      then administrator, but you were kind of an outside, fresh
1026
1027
      look person, is that correct?
           General {Finan.} Well, I quess I would call myself an
1028
1029
      inside outsider. By that time, I had been assigned to NNSA
1030
      for 18 months, but I was always an Air Force asset. My
1031
     reporting chain runs through the Air Force. I was always an
1032
     Air Force member, but I was assigned to NNSA for 2 years.
          Mr. {Barton.} Okay, now the report that you testified
1033
1034
      on has been presented to the Department of Energy, is that
1035
     correct?
```

```
1036
          General {Finan.} Yes, sir.
1037
          Mr. {Barton.} Now I want to go to Deputy Secretary
1038
     Poneman. It used to be the Deputy Secretary is the number
1039
     two person at DOE. Is that still the case?
1040
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir.
          Mr. {Barton.} Are you the chief operational officer at
1041
1042
     DOE?
1043
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir.
1044
          Mr. {Barton.} Okay. So you have read the report--
1045
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir.
1046
          Mr. {Barton.} --that has been prepared? I have read a
1047
      summary of it. It is fairly damning, but it is pretty clear
     cut in its recommendations. So the bottom line question is
1048
1049
     what are you going to do about it? Are you going to accept
1050
     the recommendations and act on them, or are we going to
1051
     pontificate and fiddle faddle around and not do anything?
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir, it is a fine report. It is
1052
1053
     excellent. It is insightful. We embrace it and not only
1054
     have we already accepted and put into practice the
1055
     recommendations, but while we still had the benefit of
     General Finan's service in the Department, we made her Acting
1056
```

```
Chief of Defense Nuclear Security to oversee the beginnings
1057
1058
     of the implementations.
1059
           Mr. {Barton.} So she gets to implement the
1060
     recommendations?
1061
          Mr. {Poneman.} She had that started, and as she just
1062
      indicated, been reassigned and we are carrying forward from
1063
      that.
1064
          Mr. {Barton.} One of the recommendations is that you
1065
     eliminate this multiple diverse authority. Is that going to
1066
     be done, centralizing the one line of authority? That is one
1067
     of the primary--
          Mr. {Poneman.} That, sir, already has been done and the
1068
     further clarification of the role of the other security
1069
1070
     organizations is also underway. We are, as was indicated,
1071
     also taking into account more widely the recommendations from
1072
     what we call the Three Wise Experts about--from whom you will
1073
     hear directly, but the parts that you have heard from General
1074
     Finan, we are already putting into effect.
1075
          Mr. {Barton.} Okay. Now this concept of ``eyes on,
1076
     hands off'' oversight, there seems to be some
1077
     misunderstanding about that. I don't see how that would work
```

```
1078
     anyway.
1079
          Mr. {Poneman.} I don't either, and I think it is a
1080
      terrible thing that anyone ever thought that that made sense
1081
     or was the policy of the Department. It is absolutely the
1082
     wrong way to think about it.
          Mr. {Barton.} So we can assume, since you are the
1083
1084
     number two person, that whatever that concept was, it is no
1085
      longer in use? It is gone?
1086
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, we have tried and we will continue,
1087
     because you can't repeat these messages often enough, to be
     very, very clear that the federal oversight is critical and
1088
1089
      it needs to be active and performance-based, and it cannot be
      ``eyes on, hands off.'' That would never work.
1090
1091
          Mr. {Barton.} Okay, now my final question, can we be--
1092
      can you assure the committee that the actual security of the
1093
     weapons complex is a first-degree, primary function and it is
1094
     not subject to cost issues? I mean, we want these facilities
1095
     and materials and the people that are operating within those
1096
     facilities to be secure, period, and not secondary to the
1097
      cost of maintaining the security.
1098
          Mr. {Poneman.} Let me be very clear, Congressman.
```

```
1099
     There is nothing more important than the safety and the
1100
     security of the complex. That is our top priority. We will
1101
     always, as you would expect, make sure that we are good
1102
     stewards of the taxpayer resources and not waste money.
1103
     don't think that is the implication of your question, but we
1104
     will always make sure that we never compromise security for
1105
     any other derivative objective, and the security of that
1106
     material is paramount.
1107
          Mr. {Barton.} Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman
1108
     and the other members. I yield back.
1109
           I would love to have a hearing within the next year or
1110
      two where we can pat these people on the back and say you
1111
     have actually done what you said. Things are working. There
1112
     are improvements. Now, I am a skeptic. I doubt we will have
1113
     that hearing, but I certainly hope that we can and I
1114
      especially want to commend Congresswoman DeGette. She has
1115
     been fighting these fights almost as long as I have, and with
1116
      the same degree of fervor and intensity, and I am sure that
1117
     with Dr. Murphy's added vigilance, we might actually get
1118
      something done. Thank you.
1119
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. We all share sentiments.
```

1120 Gentleman yields back. 1121 Now recognize the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Lujan, 1122 for 5 minutes. 1123 Mr. {Lujan.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 1124 Mr. Poneman and Ms. Miller, before I ask some questions 1125 on Y-12, I want to speak about something that is very 1126 important in New Mexico. With the concerns in Washington 1127 State where tanks at Hanford are leaking radioactive and 1128 hazardous waste, I understand the Department is considering 1129 sending millions of gallons of highly radioactive waste to 1130 New Mexico to be stored at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, 1131 or WIPP. I would like to get your commitment here today that 1132 you will work closely with the New Mexico delegation, state 1133 and local officials, and concerned citizens, as you explore 1134 whether such a transfer will take place and under what 1135 conditions? 1136 Mr. {Poneman.} Congressman, I can assure you, A, that 1137 we always take all critical health, safety, environmental 1138 issues into account, certainly with respect to the 54 million 1139 gallons and their disposition at Hanford, and we will gladly continue to work very closely with this committee and with 1140

other members of the Congress to make sure what we do is in 1141 1142 full consultation with you. 1143 Mr. {Lujan.} So Mr. Poneman, that is a commitment to 1144 work with the New Mexico delegation on this issue? 1145 Mr. {Poneman.} We will work with this committee and 1146 with all members of Congress, and any affected state--1147 Mr. {Lujan.} I will interpret that as a yes. I 1148 appreciate that, sir. 1149 Has there been discussions that have begun with the 1150 State of New Mexico on this issue? 1151 Mr. {Poneman.} I will defer to Ms. Miller. 1152 Ms. {Miller.} The acting Assistant Secretary for 1153 Environmental Management, Dave Huizenga, has ongoing 1154 discussions with representatives from the State of New 1155 Mexico. I recently met with a number of representatives from 1156 the State of New Mexico, local representatives as well as the 1157 governor. We did not discuss this issue because this is a 1158 pretty new development, as you know, but we are in good, 1159 close contact with the delegation, both locally and certainly 1160 as Deputy Secretary Poneman said, very willing to work and 1161 look forward to working with you and the other members of the

```
congressional delegation.
1162
1163
          Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that, Ms. Miller. I am one
1164
      of the representatives as well that represents New Mexico,
1165
     and so I would appreciate that very much. I appreciate that.
1166
           And finally, I hope that this will not happen at the
1167
      expense of cleaning up existing sites in New Mexico. I don't
1168
     want to see a slowing down or a decrease in funding in
1169
      environmental management funding. If anything, it should be
1170
      increased to allow more rapid cleanup, especially in Los
1171
     Alamos. And you know, with the true waste issue in New
1172
     Mexico, it is ready to be cleaned up and ready to go, and I
1173
     hope that we can work with you and get a commitment to see
1174
     what we can do to plus up those accounts. I know
1175
      sequestration is hitting us, but it is something that is very
1176
      important to us.
1177
           Mr. {Poneman.} Congressman, sequestration is a huge
1178
      challenge for all of us. We have legal, contractual, and
     moral obligations to the state. We take them very, very
1179
1180
      seriously. I have been there several times myself. We will
1181
      continue to take that seriously.
          Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate your commitment, Mr. Poneman.
1182
```

```
1183
           Mr. Poneman, isn't your head of Health, Safety, and
1184
      Security, or HSS, the person you and the Secretary rely on
1185
      for developing and coordinating security policy and providing
1186
      independent oversight and enforcement?
1187
           Mr. {Poneman.} That is true.
           Mr. {Lujan.} Wasn't this a colossal failure as a part
1188
1189
     of HSS in failing to identify and correct the specific
1190
      security weaknesses that were obviously present at Y-12?
1191
           Mr. {Poneman.} Sir, there were a number of failures.
1192
     There was a January, 2009, report from HSS which, in fact,
1193
      identified some of the deficiencies which you have heard
1194
      later described which, in fact, facilitated this terrible
1195
      episode on July 28. There should have been, as HSS has
1196
      acknowledged, more rigorous, vigorous, and repeated follow-up
1197
     from those findings, and they have -- in the consequences in
1198
      terms of lessons learned from this episode, redoubled their
1199
      commitment under the direction of the Secretary to make sure
1200
      that they follow up on all such findings in future. So when
1201
      they do identify a problem, they stick with it until it is
1202
     resolved.
           Mr. {Lujan.} With that being said, Mr. Poneman, aren't
1203
```

```
those on the second panel, including reviewers like General
1204
1205
     Finan, who are identifying systemic security problems and
1206
     recommending improvements, doing the job that HSS was
1207
     supposed to have done?
1208
           Mr. {Poneman.} Well, it is always good after an episode
1209
      like this to get fresh eyes, and General Finan, because she
1210
     had this unique perspective of being in the system but
1211
      somewhat apart from these specific events, had a unique and
1212
      invaluable perspective. In fact, her own report recommends
1213
      that in this three-layer oversight review, that the HSS is,
1214
      in fact, that third layer of disinterested third party
1215
      oversight. We will hopefully continue to benefit from
1216
      outside expertise of this character, but also make sure we
1217
     maintain some independence within the Department to ensure
1218
     you don't have conflict of interest in overseeing security.
1219
           Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that.
1220
           Mr. Poneman, in your earlier comments made before
1221
      similar hearings, you stated that no federal employees have
1222
     been terminated as a result of the Y-12 breach, that such
1223
      terminations are subject to due process. Since there were
1224
     contract employees that were terminated for cause, the
```

response seems to suggest that contract employees don't have 1225 1226 the same due process protection under the law. Is there any 1227 truth to that? 1228 Mr. {Poneman.} This is--I am glad you asked this 1229 question, Congressman. Let me clarify this. 1230 accountability on both the federal and the contractor's side. 1231 On the federal side--and we had to act swiftly and 1232 effectively to remove anybody who had an involvement in this 1233 episode from the chain of command. On the federal side, the 1234 top three nuclear security officials in headquarters were 1235 removed from those responsibilities. In addition, three members at the site from the federal team were either 1236 1237 reassigned or removed from their positions. And then on the 1238 contractor's side, we held accountable by making clear to the 1239 contractor that they had lost our confidence. The three 1240 senior -- three of the senior people on the protective force 1241 subcontract and three of the senior people on the M&O 1242 contractor, we then folded the subcontract for security under 1243 the M&O contract, made it clear we lost confidence in the 1244 contractor, and that contractor was terminated full stop. Now there are additional actions that can be taken with 1245

- respect to individuals that are disciplinary in nature. 1246 1247 first responsibility, as the chairman and ranking member have 1248 emphasized, is to protect the material, so the first thing we 1249 did is get anybody who had anything to do with this out of 1250 the way of possibly protecting material that we now needed to 1251 make sure we had new people and new processes to effectuate. 1252 Other disciplinary processes have been underway. Some are 1253 still continuing, and those are the processes, sir, that I 1254 was referring to where the due process protections apply to 1255 these individuals who, like any American, are entitled to due process when it comes to termination. 1256 1257 Mr. {Lujan.} Thank you. Mr. Chairman, as I yield back, I know time is expired, but I appreciate the concerns and the 1258 statements associated with new culture and leadership and 1259 1260 changes, and what that means coming forward as we look at the 1261 future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1262 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you, Mr. Lujan. I let that go on 1263 because it was a particularly important answer, too. We 1264 thank you for that answer.
- Now recognize the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr.
- 1266 Harper, for 5 minutes.

```
Mr. {Harper.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to
1267
      each of you on what is a very important topic, not only to
1268
1269
     you, but to everyone in Congress. We appreciate the look you
1270
     are taking at this, and of course, how do you convey that
1271
      security is everybody's concern, and always in that situation
1272
     where you are looking, it seems that it was somebody else's
1273
     responsibility, so you have to create that culture that
1274
      everyone is responsible, regardless of their position, and do
1275
     you feel like you are moving things in that direction with
1276
     NNSA?
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir, and your comment, I think,
1277
1278
      ties in well with when the chairman said at the beginning, if
1279
     you don't measure it, you don't manage it. What we have done
1280
      since the Y-12 episode is to make sure that in the
1281
     performance evaluation plans for all contracts that safety
1282
      and security is made a constituent part of every programmatic
1283
     deliverable. So you are not actually performing the job if
1284
     you do it, but you don't do it safely or you don't do it
1285
      securely. So that is how we measure and hold people
      accountable, and so not only are we trying to do this through
1286
1287
     all the cultural teaching that we are telling you about, but
```

we are trying to build into the structure of the contracts. 1288 1289 That is how we hope to avoid keep coming back, as Ms. DeGette 1290 has suggested, by really building it into our system. 1291 Mr. {Harper.} And I guess one of the issues would be how do you make these security changes or improvements, how 1292 1293 do you sustain those? You know, I will go back, DOE did a 1294 major -- a comprehensive study back in 2008, and it looked like 1295 that was great. If those things had perhaps really been 1296 sustained, maybe we wouldn't have had the Y-12 incident. 1297 I guess what confidence should we have and do you have that these changes, as a result of this very extensive 90-day 1298 1299 evaluation and study, will be sustained? 1300 Mr. {Poneman.} Congressman, as General Finan's report 1301 makes clear, even if we have put all the structures in place 1302 to be successful in a way that we have not succeeded so far, 1303 absent leadership, it is not going to succeed. So the first 1304 way to sustain it, sir, is by sustained leadership attention, 1305 and I can commit to you that that is what we are providing. 1306 The second thing I would say is, it is not enough simply 1307 to promulgate this and announce it. We have to continue to work with people in the complex at the sites and have a 1308

continuous flow of information back and forth. 1309 1310 And the third thing is, people have to feel comfortable 1311 throughout the site. If they actually have concerns, they 1312 have to feel free to step forward without any fear of 1313 retribution. 1314 Mr. {Harper.} Thank you. 1315 Do either of the other witnesses have anything that you 1316 care to add? General, anything that you see of how this 1317 study--how you believe it would be sustained in the future? 1318 It looks great today, and we believe we have done that, but do you see anything else, other than what Mr. Poneman has 1319 1320 added, that you believe would show that we could sustain it? 1321 General {Finan.} The key is the leadership, just the Deputy Secretary stated, and a culture. Everyone in the 1322 1323 organization has to understand that each and every one of 1324 them are a part of security, and that security is a part of 1325 the NNSA mission. It is not a support item, it is essential 1326 to the mission. So it is culture and leadership. 1327 Mr. {Harper.} Mr. Poneman, the safety and security reform plan, if I could read this, stated that the 1328 Department's contractors maintain an assurance system that 1329

provides reliable measurement of the effectiveness of their 1330 1331 safety management systems and facilitates timely corrective 1332 actions to systems or performance weaknesses. And the same 1333 direction was given for security systems. The task force 1334 found that NNSA relied overwhelmingly upon contractor-1335 provided data rather than effectively reviewing performance 1336 itself. Given the broken equipment, security cameras, 1337 excessive false alarms at Y-12, clearly the contractor did 1338 not correct performance weaknesses in a timely fashion. 1339 I know you have gone over this, but I want to make sure, you believe that relying on contractors to provide measurements 1340 1341 of their effectiveness is still a sound approach? 1342 Mr. {Poneman.} I think the system must start because 1343 they have the line management responsibility with contractor 1344 reporting and self correcting, but it then needs exactly the oversight that General Finan recommended, number one, from 1345 1346 the nuclear security operation inside NNSA, which is not at 1347 the site and therefore it is not prone to the coziness that 1348 has been a source of some concern, and then secondly, with a 1349 third party independent oversight from the HSS organization. Mr. {Harper.} Each of you, do you believe that today 1350

```
would such a breach at Y-12 that occurred in July of 2012, do
1351
1352
     you believe that would occur today?
1353
           Mr. {Poneman.} No, sir, I do not, and one thing that we
1354
     did immediately, the Secretary directed an extent of
1355
     condition review to be done very quickly to ensure that no
1356
      similar problems existed at any of the other sites that have
1357
     Category I nuclear material in the complex.
1358
           Mr. {Harper.} I yield back.
1359
           Mr. {Murphy.} The gentleman yields back.
1360
           The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.
           Mr. {Green.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1361
1362
           Mr. {Murphy.} The gentleman Mr. Green from Texas is
1363
     recognized.
           Mr. {Green.} Different member from Texas.
1364
1365
           I know there was some contract restructuring in 2007,
1366
      and I guess what got my attention on Y-12 and also the Pantex
1367
     site, since that is in north Texas, was that contract
1368
     restructuring ever completed to have one contractor for both
1369
     sites?
1370
           Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, sir, we have finished the contract
     consolidation. There is another piece that is optional with
1371
```

```
respect to folding the tridium operations at Savannah River,
1372
1373
     but that part has not--
1374
           Mr. {Green.} I know on a regular occasion, Pantex--
1375
     there are protesters up there, but it is a long way to get
1376
      there from most urban areas in north Texas, but there has
1377
     never been any similar incidents like at Y-12 at Pantex, has
1378
      it?
1379
           Mr. {Poneman.} Not that I am aware of, sir, and in
1380
      fact, we were impressed when we looked after the Y-12
1381
      incident at, frankly, the contrast and we brought some
      expertise from Pantex to Y-12 to help instill some best
1382
1383
     practices. For example, the practice of repairing cameras
1384
     very quickly, that was already institutionalized at Pantex,
1385
      and now I am happy to say, all the cameras are fixed and our
1386
     average time to repair cameras now at Y-12 is 6.5 hours.
                                                                 So
1387
      there were some best practices that we ported over from
1388
     Pantex.
1389
           Mr. {Green.} Okay. I worry about impacts on NNSA due
      to the sequester. Deputy Secretary Poneman, can you talk
1390
1391
      about the impacts that sequestration may have on federal and
     contractor personnel at NNSA?
1392
```

```
1393
          Mr. {Poneman.} Yes, I will let Acting Administrator
1394
     Miller offer more detail, but top line is it is a significant
1395
      effect involving personnel and operations as well, but I can
1396
     assure you, Congressman, is that the directive from the
1397
     President is to do everything that we can and must do to
1398
     protect our core functions. But I will ask Ms. Miller if she
1399
     has got elaboration.
1400
          Ms. {Miller.} I would just add to that. It starts with
1401
     of course, we will protect the material, of course, we will
1402
     do things safely. As long as we are allowed to operate, that
1403
      is exactly how we will run things. Having said that, I think
1404
     people have a tendency to look at sequestration in terms of
1405
     numbers of people who might be furloughed or dollar numbers
1406
      that might be missing. It is -- what is a deeper concern at
1407
     this point is the ongoing disruption to activities that will
1408
      take projects and programs and make them difficult, if not
1409
      impossible, to actually execute anywhere near to the plan and
1410
      to the price and the need that has already been described.
1411
      It is that ongoing uncertainty disruption, and then lack of
1412
      ability to plan.
          Mr. {Green.} And I know that is impacting your agency,
1413
```

```
but it also impacting --
1414
1415
           Ms. {Miller.} Everybody.
1416
           Mr. {Green.} --everybody.
1417
           Have you already notified employees or contractors on
1418
      they could face personnel actions?
1419
           Ms. {Miller.} Contractors, their own organizations are
1420
      responsible for talking directly to their employees, because
1421
      they operate in general off of the money they are getting for
1422
          We have, of course, worked with them to try to plan and
1423
     program dollars so that they have some sense of what it is
     going to look like going forward month by month, and they are
1424
1425
     making plans and doing notifications accordingly, and I know
1426
      our contractors have done that.
1427
           As far as the federal workers are concerned, I sent a
1428
     note out to our federal workers 2 weeks ago, almost 2 weeks
1429
      ago, to let them know that we will do everything we can, but
1430
      I cannot guarantee that it is not going to affect them
1431
      either.
1432
           Mr. {Poneman.} And I would only add, Congressman, that
      I have notified all the affected governors, and we will also
1433
     work with the states in the same vein.
1434
```

```
1435
          Mr. {Green.} Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1436
          Mr. {Braley.} Would the Texas gentleman yield?
1437
          Mr. {Green.} Sure.
1438
          Mr. {Braley.} Mr. Chairman, Ms. Miller, a number of
     reports observed a culture within NNSA of prioritizing costs,
1439
1440
      cutting costs above the needs of security. As a follow-up to
1441
      the question Mr. Barton asked, have M&O contractors
1442
      throughout the complex been told to cut their security costs?
1443
           Ms. {Miller.} They certainly have not been told to cut
1444
      their security costs as any means of a policy, but I would
      say there is definitely messages that get communicated that
1445
1446
     when money is tight, people are looking for ways to cut costs
1447
     and within an individual organization, a contractor
1448
      organization are working with federal people, they may, as
1449
     General Finan said, start to make decisions at very low
1450
      levels on what their interpretation is of the need to cut
1451
     costs.
1452
           Mr. {Braley.} So it sounds like they could have been
1453
      cut, so as a follow-up, have security funding allocations
1454
     been reduced in recent years before the incident?
1455
          Ms. {Miller.} Security allocations have come down over
```

the last several years, that is right. 1456 1457 Mr. {Braley.} Mr. Chairman, this is a concern I think 1458 that we had. Mr. Barton asked a similar question, and 1459 hopefully it is something that we can pursue. You know, I would be interested if security funding has been increased 1460 1461 after the incident as well, but I think we will find that out 1462 later. 1463 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1464 Mr. {Gardner.} [Presiding] Thank you. Gentleman 1465 yields back. Gentleman from Texas, Dr. Burgess, is recognized for 5 1466 1467 minutes. 1468 Dr. {Burgess.} Well on the GAO report that was supplied for this hearing, there is a table, table one on page nine of 1469 1470 the report, and you know, it is interesting in light of the 1471 last question that was just asked about the funding levels. I mean, this is a comparison of a GAO study done in May of 1472 1473 2003 and then the security task force in February, 2013, so 1474 essentially a decade worth of NNSA oversight. And you look 1475 at the various things that are listed there, the last one being allocating staff. In 2003, the GAO found NNSA had 1476

```
shortfalls in its site offices in number and expertise of
1477
1478
      staff, which could make it more difficult for site offices to
1479
      effectively oversee security activities. Okay, that sounds
1480
      like a real problem identified by the GAO. So what did
1481
     General Finan find 10 years later? The NNSA security
1482
      function is not properly organized or staffed. It sounds
1483
      like the same problem to me, stated another way.
1484
           So you know, as interesting as this chart is, it really
1485
      shows that the General Accountability Office's review of the
1486
     NNSA security organization, when you look at it and go down
      the list and see the problems with defining clear roles and
1487
1488
     responsibilities, assessing site security activities,
1489
     overseeing contractor activities, allocating staff in each
1490
     and every case.
1491
           So General Finan, you know, it begs the question, it is
1492
      almost every problem that was identified 10 years ago, you
1493
      encountered on your task force 10 years later. So what do
1494
     you think? Are these longstanding cultural problems that are
1495
      ingrained in the organization, or are these things that can
1496
     be corrected?
           General {Finan.} Clearly they are long-term cultural
1497
```

```
basic issues that need to be fixed. And what happens over
1498
1499
     the years, as we looked at each one of those, reports would
1500
      come out and people would check the box and say yes, I took
1501
     care of the findings. What happened was people were nibbling
1502
     around the edges, you know, they would put a body or two--
1503
      okay, you have a shortage, so a body or two would change.
1504
     You know, that would just create a shortage someplace else.
1505
     They didn't ever stop and take a look at the overall system.
1506
     How are we going to fix this long term? So by nibbling
1507
     around the edges, instead of getting at the core issues, they
      just perpetuated the issues for a decade, and probably even
1508
1509
      longer than that, but every report that we looked at had
1510
      striking similarities to what we found.
1511
          Dr. {Burgess.} So let me just ask you this. This is a
1512
     basic question. How is putting more money into a
1513
     structurally deficient system, how is it going to make it
1514
     better? I mean any amount of money--I agree that, you know,
1515
      it is reasonable to look the funding levels, but for crying
1516
     out loud, we have known about this stuff for 10 years and you
1517
     haven't fixed it.
          General {Finan.} And fundamentally, you know, that is
1518
```

why I propose a change in the organization and change in the 1519 1520 assessment model. Now I think that there are minor increases 1521 in budget that might be required, but we are not talking 1522 about, you know, hey, let's add a billion dollars to the 1523 security budget, because the issues that surfaced at Y-12 1524 were structural within the organization and structural within 1525 the assessment model. Now there are other technical aspects 1526 of why the quard didn't respond properly, a whole bunch of 1527 things like that that are training related and things like 1528 that, but we are--when we are talking about the organizational structure, we are talking about some bodies. 1529 1530 Yes, there is a shortage of security professionals, so you 1531 are talking a small number of additional bodies, and with the assessment model, you are talking about beefing up and 1532 1533 changing the assessment model, but you are not talking about 1534 a massive influx of dollars. Dr. {Burgess.} Well, Chairman Upton in his opening 1535 1536 statement said we need to learn the right lessons from past 1537 mistakes. I now certainly thank you for the effort that you 1538 have put into this. I just pray that 10 years from now another Congress is not having another hearing over the same 1539

```
sorts of failures.
1540
1541
           So Secretary Poneman, let me ask you. Back in 2010,
1542
     Chairman Emeritus Barton was ranking member. He and I wrote
1543
      to the Secretary expressing our concerns that the safety and
1544
      security reform initiative would weaken outsource by
1545
      outsourcing safety and security. We requested the General
1546
     Accountability Office to evaluate -- actually Chairman Waxman,
1547
     who was chairman at the time and Ranking Member DeGette did
1548
      join in that letter, so given the troubled history of safety
1549
      and security in the complex, NNSA's problems of implementing
      its own security program, what was the Department's
1550
1551
      justification for embarking on this project?
1552
          Mr. {Poneman.} It was clear at the time, Congressman,
      that we needed to focus, and you know the old saying, ``If
1553
1554
     you don't know where you're going, any road will take you
      there.'' So when I arrived at the Department, there were
1555
1556
     many people saying many different things. We said let's sit
1557
     down and figure out what are we doing to be safe, what are we
1558
     doing to be secure? That was the genesis of that reform.
     Our management principles say we will only succeed by
1559
1560
     continuous improvement. This was part of that process so it
```

```
wouldn't just be mindlessly continuing to check the box, but
1561
1562
     being vigorous and aggressive and saying how do we be safe?
1563
      I couldn't agree more with you, Congressman, in your premise
1564
     that it ain't just throwing dollars at it, it is a deeply
      cultural thing, and that reform, which I know people have had
1565
1566
      some concerns about, was intended to be exactly part of the
1567
     process that you are advocating in terms of a self-vigorous
1568
     analytical process to get safe and to make people wake up,
1569
      think, and be active about it.
1570
          Dr. {Burgess.} Well, Mr. Chairman, I have got
     additional questions. I will submit those in writing.
1571
                                                               Ι
1572
      thank you for the indulgence, and I will yield back.
1573
           Mr. {Gardner.} Thank you. Gentleman yields back and
      the chair recognizes himself now for 5 minutes.
1574
1575
          General Finan, a question to you. In your testimony,
1576
     you write that the NNSA is structurally inadequate to address
1577
      security needs. You have made your recommendations. What
1578
     percentage of those recommendations have either been
1579
      implemented or on their way to implementation? Just give me
1580
      a number, if you could.
           General {Finan.} At the time I left the organization,
1581
```

```
all of the recommendations were in process of being
1582
1583
      implemented.
1584
           Mr. {Gardner.}
                           Thank you.
1585
           Additional questions to Ms. Miller, and this question
     was referenced earlier. The statement that Mr. Don Cook,
1586
1587
     NNSA Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs had made
1588
      earlier, he said with regard to the relationship that we have
1589
     and where we are between NNSA and its labs and plants, the
1590
     statement was made ``eyes on, hands off.'' And I think one
1591
     of the concerns that we have is this isn't just about
     management; this is about leadership, a culture of safety and
1592
1593
      security. And I am very concerned when it comes to the
     approach that NNSA, when they talk about ``eyes on, hands
1594
1595
      off, '' that this is actually a management style that is
1596
     failing to provide the kind of leadership we need in safety
1597
      and security. Would you agree or disagree with that?
1598
           Ms. {Miller.} I think what is failing and what has
1599
      failed is something I spoke a little bit about earlier, and
1600
      that is it is one thing for people at a very senior level to
1601
      talk at a very senior level and come out with phrases that
1602
      they perfectly understand and they may be able to explain to
```

```
the seven or eight people they talk to all the time about it.
1603
1604
     That is a very different thing if you are the person six,
1605
      seven, eight layers down to understand what does that mean
1606
     for the job you do every day?
1607
           Mr. {Gardner.} And so you can see how that kind of
1608
      creates a culture, though, that doesn't focus--that focuses
1609
     more on management and less on leadership of a culture that
1610
      is truly about safety and security.
1611
           Ms. {Miller.} I think what happens is it leads
1612
      everybody to focus whatever way they can to cope with what
1613
      they think the person at the top is trying to tell them.
1614
           Mr. {Gardner.} So what are you going to do to make that
1615
      that is different?
           Ms. {Miller.} So as you know, right now I am acting
1616
1617
     administrator. What we have already begun in NNSA is a
1618
      change in both the way we talk to staff and our contractors
1619
      from the lower levels all the way up through the very top
1620
      levels to be able to allow people to understand how they do--
1621
     how they are meant to do what they do in a safe and secure
     way, and to understand that safety and security is not the
1622
      job of the people--it is not just the job of the people in
1623
```

```
the uniforms or the guys who can discuss criticality safety
1624
1625
      in depth, it is everybody's job. It is what you do every day
1626
     as part of what else you do every day.
1627
          Mr. {Gardner.} Recognize it is about the leadership,
1628
     not just management.
1629
          Ms. {Miller.} Absolutely.
1630
          Mr. {Gardner.} General Finan, in your testimony, you
1631
      talked about tension between security and the conduct of
      operations, stating that the events at Y-12 illustrate how
1632
1633
      far the pendulum has swung too far in the wrong direction,
     and that NNSA must clearly and consistently emphasize the
1634
1635
      importance of security. Do you believe the tension between
1636
      security and operations is inescapable, or do you think that
1637
      strong safety and security culture can facilitate improved
1638
      operations performance, given committed leadership?
1639
           General {Finan.} I absolutely believe that safety and
1640
      security can make operations better, and depending on how
1641
      they are integrated, you will have a better operation. But
1642
      it is a cultural change and it is a difficult cultural
1643
      change.
          Mr. {Gardner.} Is the agency right now on the way to
1644
```

```
that cultural change?
1645
1646
          General {Finan.} They are trying to make that cultural
1647
      change. Again, it is a long term. It will take years and
1648
     constant pressure, constant attention.
1649
          Mr. {Gardner.} Adequate progress, in your mind?
           General {Finan.} They are making early steps. Early
1650
1651
     steps. It is going to take a long time.
1652
          Mr. {Gardner.} But adequate process not quite ready to
1653
     say that?
1654
          General {Finan.} I am not quite ready to say that.
          Mr. {Gardner.} Ms. Miller, do you agree with General
1655
     Finan that there has been a culture of compromise at NNSA?
1656
          Ms. {Miller.} Yes.
1657
           Mr. {Gardner.} And what are you doing to eliminate that
1658
1659
     culture?
1660
           Ms. {Miller.} That is a culture that I think not
1661
      intentionally, but definitely effectively, has permeated both
1662
      the contractor and the federal side of it, and that is a
1663
     question of leadership making clear what the expectations are
      for all concerned.
1664
          Mr. {Gardner.} And you believe you have taken the
1665
```

```
sufficient steps so that your senior managers understand that
1666
1667
     there must be consistent messaging on security?
1668
           Ms. {Miller.} I think through a number of actions that
1669
     have been taken, including the shakeup in management of
1670
     security, that message has been very clearly communicated as
1671
      to what is expected of everyone.
1672
           Mr. {Gardner.} And can you tell the committee today,
1673
     all of us on the committee, that the head of defense
1674
     programs, the head of the budget, the federal site managers,
1675
     your managers, all are now singing from the same hymnal, so
     to speak?
1676
           Ms. {Miller.} I can tell you that they know they better
1677
1678
     be. I can't swear for another person, but I believe it to be
1679
     the case.
1680
           Mr. {Gardner.} And have you committed--this information
1681
      that you are talking about now, you have communicated it
1682
      simply--supply the committee with memoranda or other
1683
      communications instituting your policy for emphasizing that
1684
     security?
           Ms. {Miller.} Yes.
1685
           Mr. {Gardner.} Thank you. I appreciate your time, and
1686
```

```
with that, I don't see any other witnesses, so I will give
1687
1688
      the gavel back to the chairman.
1689
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you.
1690
           We are going to dismiss this panel and move on to the
1691
     next one. I do want to thank you all for your candid and
1692
      thorough response, and this is extremely important to see
1693
      leadership being honest with us. So we look forward to
1694
     working with you more and talking with you more, and General,
1695
     a special thanks to you for your report. Good luck over
1696
     there, keep that Air Force in line. Thank you, ma'am.
1697
           We will wait for the next panel to come forward.
           Ms. {DeGette.} Chairman, maybe we can just put her in
1698
1699
     charge of everything.
1700
           Mr. {Murphy.} Well ma'am, I am Navy so we will have to
1701
     discuss that.
1702
           Well, while this next panel is getting ready, I will
1703
     start off by introducing them in the interest of time as we
1704
     move forward. We have with us Mr. C. Donald Alston, Major
1705
     General, United States Air Force (retired), and former
1706
      commander of the 20th Air Force Global Strike Command, and
1707
     Commander Task Force 214 U.S. Strategic Command, Francis E.
```

1708 Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming. We also have Mr. Richard 1709 Meserve--am I pronouncing that right, sir? 1710 Mr. {Meserve.} Meserve. 1711 Mr. {Murphy.} Meserve, thank you, President of the 1712 Carnegie Institution for Science, and former Chairman of the 1713 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission from 1999 to 2003. also have Mr. David Trimble, the Director of Natural 1714 1715 Resources and Environment Team, Government Accountability 1716 Office. Welcome here today. 1717 As you know, the testimony you are about to give is subject to Title XVIII Section 1001 of the United States 1718 1719 Code. When holding an investigative hearing, this committee 1720 has a practice of taking testimony under oath. Do you have 1721 any objection to testifying under oath? 1722 They all agree to testify. The chair then advises you 1723 that under the rules of the House and rules of the committee, 1724 you are entitled to be advised by counsel. Do you desire to 1725 be advised by counsel during your testimony today? 1726 They all decline counsel. In that case, if you would please rise, raise your right 1727

hand, and I will swear you in.

1728

```
[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. I note for the record all the witnesses have answered in the affirmative.

You can now give a 5-minute summary of your written statement. We will start with you, Dr. Meserve.
```

```
1734
      ^TESTIMONY OF RICHARD A. MESERVE, PRESIDENT, CARNEGIE
1735
      INSTITUTION FOR SCIENCE; C. DONALD ALSTON, MAJOR GENERAL,
1736
     USAF (RETIRED); AND DAVID C. TRIMBLE, DIRECTOR, NATURAL
     RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT TEAM, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY
1737
1738
     OFFICE
1739
      ^TESTIMONY OF RICHARD A. MESERVE
1740
          Mr. {Meserve.} Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member DeGette,
     and members of the subcommittee, I am very pleased to appear
1741
1742
     before you this morning to testify of the security at DOE
1743
     complex.
1744
           My involvement with this issue, and I believe General
1745
     Alston's as well, arose as the result of a request that was
1746
     made by Secretary Chu that we, as well as Dr. Norm Augustine,
1747
     undertake an evaluation of basically the structure for the
1748
     management of security at DOE. We undertook a study that
1749
      involved visiting sites, reviewing documents, interviewing
1750
     people, and as a result of all of that effort, we submitted
      three separate letters to the Secretary on December 6 of
1751
```

2012, and we have submitted copies of those letters for the 1752 1753 record as our testimony. 1754 We did not purport to investigate the factual 1755 circumstances surrounding the Y-12 institute. Our reports focused on management-related issues, and I hasten to add 1756 1757 that our report was a snapshot in time. I was learning a lot 1758 about what has happened at DOE since we conducted our 1759 interview from the very informative testimony that we have 1760 all benefitted from earlier this morning. 1761 There are a couple of points from my letter that I think I would like to emphasize that I see as clear issues that DOE 1762 1763 should confront. I believed that on December 6, and I 1764 believe they are confronting them. One, and I think a 1765 critical one, is to make sure you have a management structure 1766 in place that assigns clear authority and responsibility for 1767 security. One of the underlying factors at the Y-12 incident 1768 is there was a division of responsibility and without anyone 1769 being truly in charge until you had a situation with a 1770 contractor responsible for the guards and a different 1771 contractor responsible for the security-related equipment and the cameras, and they weren't communicating well and a lot of 1772

the equipment was out of service and each could point at the 1773 1774 other. 1775 I also came to the conclusion -- and I will let General 1776 Alston speak for himself--that the federal oversight needed to be improved. It was -- serious security issues existed 1777 1778 before this episode and no one at DOE that we saw was really 1779 on top of detecting them and correcting them. 1780 There was issues associated with the protective force, 1781 ensuring appropriate training. There was an issue associated 1782 with the, obviously, the behavior of the first responder. 1783 There were many issues associated with the protective force 1784 that need to be addressed. We need to find a clear 1785 trajectory for these people. We need to make sure that they 1786 have a sense that they are an important part of the team and 1787 integrated with the team. 1788 I think that all of us came to the view--and this has 1789 been emphasized this morning--that one of the things needs to 1790 change is the culture. There has to be a security culture 1791 that places both safety and security as highest priorities, 1792 and that management by its word and deed reinforces that, and that everyone at the site realizes that it is their 1793

```
1794
      individual responsibility to assure security, and that
1795
     clearly is something that has been failing.
1796
           And finally, I think what I would add is a need for
1797
     balance. Clearly, this episode reflected issues associated
1798
     with physical security, but there are other security issues
1799
     that confront the Department, and in order to recognize, you
1800
     need a balance. There are cybersecurity issues, there are
1801
     personnel security issues, all of which need to be
1802
     functioning, and one ought to not, because it was an episode
1803
     of physical security, focus solely on that.
1804
          My views are explained more fully in the letter that was
1805
      submitted as part of the record, and I welcome the
1806
      opportunity to talk to you this morning.
1807
           [The prepared statement of Mr. Meserve follows:]
      ********** TNSERT C *********
1808
```

1809 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. General, I promised you I
1810 would have you go first. I apologize for the confusion
1811 there, but you are recognized now for your opening statement.

^TESTIMONY OF C. DONALD ALSTON 1812 1813 General {Alston.} Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member DeGette, 1814 members of the subcommittee, I would only briefly amplify what my colleague has so well described as Mr. Augustine's, 1815 1816 Dr. Meserve's, and my efforts on behalf of Dr. Chu and the 1817 Department of Energy. I would only amplify one particular 1818 point, and that would be the culture piece. 1819 We have talked this morning--the first panel engaged you in conversation using some of the expressions that we found 1820 to be of concern, ``eyes on, hands off'' for example, and 1821 1822 that expression is something that came out of just the last couple years of policy changes. But as has been reinforced 1823 1824 over and over again, the recurring challenges, the similar 1825 recurring challenges, go beyond the ``eyes on, hands off'' 1826 policy emphasis that had occurred over the last years, and I 1827 think that at the center of the challenge for the Department 1828 is the cultural change. And one aspect of the cultural 1829 change that is -- that feeds the cultural challenges is the distributed management, the way the Department distributes 1830

its management across its labs, and the labs prefer and are 1831 1832 very successful in their pursuit of the distance between the 1833 headquarters and the labs themselves, and the freedom of 1834 movement that they have, and this has great value, I would 1835 concede, on the science piece, but I think that that 1836 contributes -- the security, in fact, needs to have more 1837 central--management central emphasis, common standards, and 1838 what I have observed is that you see people talk about 1839 mission, which I read as science. People talk about safety, 1840 and there is more of a pervasive safety culture, if you will. But security is not everybody's responsibility, and it is as 1841 1842 if mission, safety, and security are in a trade space where 1843 when there is an emphasis on security because of an episodic 1844 failure, the other elements of mission and safety see the 1845 focus on safety as to be marginally at the expense of the 1846 other parts of the mission, as opposed to looking at it as an enterprise challenge, and that, in fact, they don't share 1847 1848 trade space with each other, but in fact, are all essential 1849 every day to mission success. 1850 And with that, I thank the committee for the opportunity 1851 to have dialogue this morning.

1852	[The prepar	red statem	ment of	General	Alston	follows:]
1853 ****	*****		TNODDE	. +++++		<b>-</b> ↓

```
1854 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you very much.

1855 Mr. Trimble, you have a chance for an opening statement.
```

1856 ^TESTIMONY OF DAVID C. TRIMBLE 1857 Mr. {Trimble.} Thank you, Chairman Murphy, Ranking Member DeGette, members of the subcommittee. My testimony 1858 1859 today discusses DOE's and NNSA's management of the nuclear 1860 security enterprise, and will focus on security, safety, and 1861 project and contract management. 1862 Multiple investigations into the security breach at Y-12 1863 identified significant deficiencies in NNSA's security organization, oversight, and culture. In response to the Y-1864 1865 12 security incident and the findings of these reports, DOE 1866 and NNSA have taken a number of actions, including repairing 1867 security equipment, reassigning key security personnel, and 1868 firing the Y-12 protective force contractor. More recently, 1869 DOE and NNSA's leadership committed to additional actions, 1870 such as revamping the security oversight model. We have not evaluated these recent actions but will examine them as part 1871 1872 of our ongoing review on security reform for this committee. 1873 The key question underlying this work will be whether DOE's actions to address the security breakdowns at Y-12 will 1874

produce sustained improvements in security across the nuclear 1875 1876 security enterprise. 1877 DOE has a long history of security breakdowns and an 1878 equally long history of instituting responses and remedies to fix these problems. The recent testimony the leader of the 1879 1880 NNSA security task force examining the Y-12 incident 1881 identified problems at NNSA's federal security organization, 1882 including poorly defined roles and responsibilities for its 1883 headquarters and field staff, inadequate oversight and 1884 assessments of secured activities, problems ensuring that security improvements are implemented, and failing to ensure 1885 1886 adequate staffing. Notably, in 2003, we reported on these 1887 same problems, problems which have persisted or resurfaced, 1888 notwithstanding numerous DOE initiatives to fix or address 1889 them. 1890 In examining the security incident at Y-12, it is also 1891 important to remember that NNSA's security problems have not 1892 been limited to Y-12. In March of 2009, we reported on 1893 numerous and wide-ranging security deficiencies at Livermore, 1894 particularly in the ability of Livermore's protective forces to ensure the protection of special nuclear material and the 1895

laboratory's protection control of classified material. 1896 1897 also identified Livermore's physical security systems, such 1898 as alarms and sensors, and its security assurance activities 1899 as areas needing improvement. Weaknesses in Livermore's 1900 contractor self-assessment program and the Livermore site 1901 office's oversight of the contractor contributed to these 1902 security deficiencies at the laboratory. 1903 Los Alamos experienced a number of high profile security 1904 incidents in the '90s that were subject to numerous 1905 congressional hearings, including some held by this 1906 committee. Subsequently, security evaluations through 2007 1907 identified other persistent systemic security problems, 1908 including weaknesses in controlling protecting classified 1909 resources, inadequate controls over special nuclear matter, 1910 inadequate self-assessment activities, and weaknesses in the 1911 process Los Alamos uses to ensure that corrects identified 1912 security deficiencies. In October of 2009, we found 1913 weaknesses at Los Alamos in protecting the confidentiality, 1914 integrity, and availability of information stored on and 1915 transmitted over its classified computer network. 1916 Regarding safety, in September of 2012, we testified

before this subcommittee, noting that DOE's recent safety 1917 1918 reforms may have actually weakened independent oversight. 1919 Notably, since this recent testimony, reports by DOE and the 1920 safety board have continued to identify safety concerns at Y-1921 12, Pantex, and Los Alamos. 1922 Regarding project management, DOE has made progress in 1923 managing the costs and scheduled non-major projects, those 1924 costing less than \$750 million, and in recognition of this 1925 progress, GAO has narrowed the focus of our high risk 1926 designation to major contracts and projects. Major projects, however, continue to pose a challenge for DOE and NNSA. 1927 1928 December of 2012, we reported that the estimated cost to 1929 construct the waste treatment and immobilization plant in 1930 Hanford, Washington, had tripled to \$12.3 billion since its 1931 inception in 2000, and the scheduled completion date had 1932 slipped nearly a decade to 2019. Moreover, we found that DOE 1933 had prematurely rewarded the contractor for resolving 1934 technical issues and completing work. We have reported on 1935 similar problems with the CMR facility at Los Alamos, the EPF 1936 project at Y-12, and the MOX project at Savannah River. In conclusion, over a decade after NNSA was created to 1937

```
address security issues, the Y-12 security incident has
1938
1939
     raised concern that NNSA has still not embraced security as
1940
     an essential element of its mission. The numerous actions
1941
     that DOE and NNSA are taking to address its security problems
1942
     will require effective implementation across the complex.
1943
     Without this and strong and sustained leadership, these
1944
     recent reforms, like past efforts, may not have a lasting
1945
      impact on the security, performance, or culture of the
1946
     agency.
1947
          Thank you. I would be pleased to answer any questions
     you may have.
1948
1949
           [The prepared statement of Mr. Trimble follows:]
      ********** INSERT E *********
1950
```

```
1951
          Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. We will go through these
1952
     quickly.
1953
           I want to start off. Dr. Meserve, one of the messages
1954
     from your work and General Alston's work is the lack of an
1955
      embedded security culture from DOE headquarters on down
1956
      through the various nuclear weapons complex facilities. As a
1957
     former chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, you
1958
     have experience with embedded safety culture. Am I correct
1959
     on that?
1960
          Mr. {Meserve.} That is correct.
           Mr. {Murphy.} And the lessons--what lessons, from your
1961
1962
      experience of NRC regulation of the civilian nuclear industry
1963
      can apply to establishing strong security culture at DOE's
1964
     facilities and operations? Can you give us an example?
           Mr. {Meserve.} Well, let me say that I think that
1965
1966
     perspective of the NRC has been that a safety culture is the
1967
      critical foundation for ensuring the safe operations of the
1968
               That without that commitment, you have a problem
1969
      that in regardless of how detailed the requirements are,
1970
     ultimately you have to demand the people fulfill their
```

1971 obligations and take responsibility, and the safety culture, 1972 which is something that affects everyone in the plant, is the 1973 foundation. 1974 So I came to this project with that perspective, and I think that, as has been mentioned, and General Alston 1975 1976 emphasized this in his remarks, is that culture is the 1977 critical ingredient, and that is something that has to change 1978 to have something that will be sustained over time. People 1979 see this as responsible as their clear responsibility at 1980 every level at the facility and at headquarters. 1981 Mr. {Murphy.} And that is the same as sustained training for security personnel, I am assuming? 1982 1983 Mr. {Meserve.} It means sustained training. It means a responsibility of everyone in the plant, when they see a 1984 1985 problem, to raise that issue up. If their immediate 1986 supervisor doesn't take it up, it means going above that 1987 person. It means having a system in place so that no one is-1988 -faces any discipline or discrimination as a result of the 1989 fact that they have raised an issue like that. It is people 1990 to be rewarded if they take initiative to respond. And that is the sort of thing you need in the security area as well. 1991

1992 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. 1993 General Alston, you stated in your report that nuclear 1994 weapons sites leverage their unique missions and geography to 1995 justify a preferred, what you called ``alone and unafraid'' mantra, and that DOE and NNSA headquarters has employed a 1996 1997 largely hands off response. What do you mean by ``alone and 1998 unafraid?'' 1999 General {Alston.} Mr. Chairman, at Y-12 specifically, 2000 earlier in the year, earlier in calendar year 2012, the site 2001 security apparatus had upgraded their security system, and 2002 they--there was a multi-\$100 million option, and this was still a very expensive option of, I can't remember, \$60 to 2003 2004 \$70 million. And so they went forward with this \$60 to \$70 2005 million modification to their overall security capability at 2006 the site, but when they deployed that capability early in the 2007 year, it had flaws that needed to be worked out, and that was 2008 widely known, but they operated anyway, generated hundreds of 2009 alarms, false alarms or nuisance alarms a month, conditioned 2010 the force, I would argue, to not respond with urgency because 2011 they were being conditioned that the alarms are systemic 2012 shortcomings. There was -- they moved towards the accounting

```
for the alarms and less running to the sounds of the guns,
2013
2014
     which I think was manifested on the morning of July 28,
2015
     because of the delayed response, because it was another false
2016
     or nuisance alarm, if you will. And in that whole effort,
2017
      though, was--from my perspective--was Y-12 saw a way to
      improve its security, and in my view, I saw evidence they
2018
2019
      conceived, designed, developed, and deployed this capability
2020
      at Y-12, defending their unique geographical challenges to
2021
      secure that facility, and in making their, if you will, one
2022
      off approach to this, to be dominant between the relationship
2023
     between Y-12 and the headquarters. And so there was not
2024
      evidence of a strong, disciplined, central management of
2025
      security modifications so that the field can, soup to nuts,
2026
      take a look at what they determined to be shortcomings, and
2027
     then worked the solution set on their own without what I
2028
      think is more appropriate, a good operational test evaluation
2029
     program where someone is accountable in the headquarters for
2030
      the next gate you go, and that nobody lives with a sub-
2031
      optimized system that is not operating perfectly on day one.
2032
           Mr. {Murphy.} Is this systemic across NNSA?
           General {Alston.} Well, we found a different approach
2033
```

2034 They--everyone is trying to--and I can't tell you at Pantex. 2035 the current state of this, so maybe Dr. Meserve can amplify 2036 this, but the ARGOS system, and I can't tell you what the 2037 acronym stands for, but it is a comprehensive security 2038 approach that is present at all of their sites. 2039 depending on how you manipulate part of the overall ARGOS 2040 architecture at your particular site, they may not be 2041 precisely identical at each one of the facilities. So as 2042 these folks were trying to integrate the changes to their 2043 security apparatus and blend in to this ARGOS concept, there 2044 is so much freedom of movement at each one of the sites that 2045 I think there is great opportunity being missed trying to 2046 centralize common standards and force a common approach and 2047 making the sites defend being different than the common 2048 approach, as apposed to right now, which is give them the 2049 benefit of the doubt that they need to support the one off 2050 approach and that the common standards get subordinated to 2051 the unique approach. I don't know if I said that right. 2052 Mr. {Murphy.} Thank you. That helps a lot, but as this 2053 goes through, I can't help, as I am hearing these stories about security issues, too, of the people watching the radar 2054

```
2055
     on Pearl Harbor on December 7 said oh, pay no attention to
2056
     those blips, that is just probably our planes coming over, or
2057
     on 9/11. These things continue on, and hope that the
2058
     security force is not going to just look past these things.
2059
      I mean, to recognize a situation like this, as Mr. Meserve,
2060
     you put in your letter that sometimes training of terrorists
2061
     is to look nonthreatening, and you have to be ready for
2062
     deadly force, and this could have ended up in a deadly
2063
     situation, and we are hoping these things are avoided in the
2064
     future.
2065
           I am out of time. I am going to go Ms. DeGette now from
2066
     Colorado.
2067
           Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
2068
           Mr. Trimble, when you were reciting the whole litany of
2069
     problems that we have had with the various labs, it was like
2070
      I was reliving my congressional career. So I want to ask
2071
     you, have you read General Finan's report?
2072
           Mr. {Trimble.} Yes, I have.
2073
           Ms. {DeGette.} And what is your opinion of her
2074
     recommendations?
2075
           Mr. {Trimble.} You know, all the recommendations sound
```

```
sound. We have not done a full evaluation or anything of
2076
2077
     that nature. I think our reaction to the reports, as well as
2078
     the actions DOE has already taken is sort of the proof is in
2079
     the pudding.
2080
           Ms. {DeGette.} Yes, so you think it is a good
2081
     direction, but you want to make sure it gets implemented?
          Mr. {Trimble.} Yes, and I think even more than that, it
2082
2083
     would be where is the implementation plan?
2084
          Ms. {DeGette.} Right.
2085
          Mr. {Trimble.} So we have got a lot of okay, we are
     going to do this, we are going to do that, but where is the
2086
2087
     DOE summary of all of these efforts saying hey, this is our
2088
     assessment of all this good work these people have done, and
     here is our plan with metrics and dates and who is
2089
2090
     accountable going forward.
2091
           Ms. {DeGette.} Okay. And General, have you read
2092
     General Finan's report?
2093
           General {Alston.} No, ma'am, I have not.
2094
          Ms. {DeGette.} Okay.
2095
           General {Alston.} Her report was in draft while we were
      essentially commissioned by Secretary Chu.
2096
```

```
2097
           Ms. {DeGette.} Are you familiar with her
2098
     recommendations?
2099
           General {Alston.} I am familiar with a lot of them. I
2100
      couldn't recite them for you.
2101
           Ms. {DeGette.} I am not asking you to. Good news, I
2102
      only have 5 minutes.
2103
           So my question, though, is do you think she is going in
2104
      the right direction with her recommendations, based on your
2105
     assessments?
2106
           General {Alston.} I do. Where I was encouraged
     particularly by her approach was trying to certainly
2107
     recognize the field shortcomings, but the headquarters chain-
2108
2109
           Ms. {DeGette.} Right.
2110
2111
           General {Alston.} --needs to be fixed, and it needs a
2112
      solid focus on it.
2113
           Ms. {DeGette.} It needs to be clarified, right?
2114
           General {Alston.} Absolutely.
2115
           Ms. {DeGette.} Yes, what about you, Dr. Meserve?
           Mr. {Meserve.} My response would be the same.
2116
          Ms. {DeGette.} Okay. Now every few years--I alluded to
2117
```

this in my previous questioning. Every few years, some in 2118 2119 Congress suggest that NNSA should be autonomous. From 2120 oversight last year, the House passed the National Defense 2121 Authorization Act that included a provision providing 2122 additional autonomy from oversight by this committee, for 2123 example, for NNSA. Luckily, this language was not in the 2124 final law and part of our job is to make sure that we have 2125 adequate oversight, so we are glad it wasn't in the final 2126 I think, and all of us on this committee think, the Y-2127 12 security breach shows that the NNSA is simply not ready for that level of autonomy that the National Defense 2128 2129 Authorization Act contemplated. 2130 So General, I want to ask you and Mr. Meserve, were any of the issues you identified caused by a lack of autonomy for 2131 2132 contractors and those who worked for Y-12? Were they caused 2133 by a lack of autonomy? 2134 General {Alston.} I would say that the consequence of 2135 the relationship between the semi-autonomous nature of NNSA 2136 and the Department of Energy did cause a conflict in 2137 ambiguity for policy, and so, the NNSA was dependent upon Department of Energy apparatus for independent inspection by 2138

```
HSS and the Inspector General properly so.
2139
2140
           Ms. {DeGette.} So what you are saying is the autonomy
2141
      that they had actually caused some of the problems?
2142
           General {Alston.} That they didn't have sufficient
     autonomy for them to be exclusively accountable for the
2143
2144
     failure.
2145
           Ms. {DeGette.} Okay, and that was because they were
2146
     partially reporting to DOE?
2147
           General {Alston.} Because the field would look up the
2148
     chain of command, and there were limits to what their--how
2149
     beholding they were to the NNSA because certain policy
2150
     elements were the purview and domain of organizations in the
     headquarters that were outside the--
2151
2152
           Ms. {DeGette.} So it was because they were semi--it
2153
     wasn't fish or fowl, they were semi-autonomous, right?
2154
           General {Alston.} Yes, ma'am, and Dr. Meserve may have
2155
     a better way to say this from our perspective.
2156
           Ms. {DeGette.} Dr. Meserve?
           Mr. {Meserve.} I think that part of the problem was not
2157
      the autonomy of NNSA but the fact that there is a very
2158
     confusing structure.
2159
```

```
2160
           Ms. {DeGette.} Within the agency.
2161
           Mr. {Meserve.} If something was simplified and then
2162
      clear lines of authority and responsibility is what is
2163
     necessary.
2164
           Ms. {DeGette.} Right.
2165
           Mr. {Meserve.}
                           That could be done with an autonomous
2166
     NNSA. It could be done with the current structure, but
2167
     having clear guidelines of who is in charge of what.
2168
           Ms. {DeGette.} The problem wasn't--yes, I got you.
                                                                 The
2169
     problem wasn't whether it was autonomous or not, the problem
2170
     was there wasn't a chain of command.
2171
           I want to ask you very quickly, Mr. Trimble, do you
      think that -- does the GAO believe that NNSA's issues can be
2172
2173
      solved through a simple structural change?
2174
           Mr. {Trimble.} We have previously testified that we do
2175
     not. We think the issues that need to be addressed can be
2176
     done with the current structure, and again, it is cultural
      changes, sustained effort.
2177
2178
           Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you.
           Mr. {Murphy.} The gentlelady yields back.
2179
           Now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for
2180
```

```
2181
      5 minutes.
2182
           Mr. {Johnson.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen,
2183
      thank you for being with us today.
2184
           Dr. Meserve, if the Department of Energy office
     responsible for independent oversight is subjected to
2185
2186
     political retaliation for conducting that oversight, how
2187
     would that impact their ability to remain objective and
2188
      independent, in your view?
2189
           Mr. {Meserve.} Well I mean, the obvious danger is that
2190
      if they are being criticized for doing their job that they
2191
     will then back off doing what they are supposed to be doing.
2192
     And so I think that that would be unfortunate, that if they
2193
     didn't have a clear view of what their obligations were and
2194
      their mission is.
2195
           Mr. {Johnson.} Okay. General Alston, what is your view
2196
      of the importance of independent oversight?
2197
           General {Alston.} I think that it is appropriately
2198
      integrated in a mosaic of sensors and indicators to tell you
     how sturdy your readiness, or in this case, the quality of
2199
2200
      the security. I think that if you move too much towards
     depending on independent inspection and evaluation, you are
2201
```

missing great opportunity to have--to defend yourself against 2202 2203 crisis. You are focused on defending against crisis and 2204 ultimate failure, but you are not taking advantage of 2205 building routine relationships and seeing whether or not your 2206 organization has the capacity to recognize failure when the 2207 conditions begin to present themselves. If you need someone 2208 outside to tell you how ready you are, you may not have the 2209 skill yourself to know yourself. So I believe it needs to be 2210 a mosaic of inputs that are converging at the right level to 2211 give the leadership at the local, intermediate, and the 2212 higher levels the competency and the confidence in just what 2213 the quality of the performance of the unit is. 2214 Mr. {Johnson.} I couldn't agree with you more, and it 2215 is analogous to--I know in my 26-1/2 year career in the Air 2216 Force, you have your unit mission, you have standards and 2217 evaluation who are the internal looks, eyes, and ears to make 2218 sure that you are following those rules, but you also have 2219 the Inspector General who takes a look from the outside, and 2220 both are very, very important. 2221 Back to the issue, though, of political retaliation. To both of you, what impact would political retaliation have on 2222

safety and security, the culture of safety and security? 2223 2224 mentioned, Dr. Meserve, that people would just stop. 2225 Mr. {Meserve.} Well, you need to have a system that reinforces the priority that is to be given for safety and 2226 2227 security, and that anything that interferes with the capacity 2228 for people to have a willingness to confront those issues 2229 honestly and to address them thoroughly is a detriment to 2230 achievement of safety and security. And that could be 2231 through political process, through fear of retaliation by a 2232 superior, there is any number of things that could affect it, but the point here is to keep your eye on the ball and 2233 2234 anything that distracts you from that is a negative factor. 2235 Mr. {Johnson.} Sure. Mr. {Meserve.} And I couldn't agree more with General 2236 2237 Alston is that one ought not to anticipate that you are 2238 counting on oversight function as your primary means to 2239 prevent shortfalls. That responsibility has to be in the 2240 line organization that is responsible for the job, and they 2241 should be held accountable for it. The oversight is a 2242 protective mechanism to make sure that they are fulfilling 2243 their function adequately and appropriately.

```
2244
           Mr. {Johnson.} Absolutely.
2245
           General {Alston.} And sir, I would add just one point,
2246
     and that is if you don't have at a grass roots level the kind
2247
     of environment where the folks will come forward to expose
2248
     weakness and challenge, you are not going to get to the self-
      critical culture--the level of self-critical culture that you
2249
2250
     really need in this business where the stakes are so high.
2251
           Mr. {Johnson.} Yes, I couldn't agree with you more.
2252
           General, given the site's, I quote, ``alone and
2253
     unafraid'' posture, how important, in your opinion, are
     standardization, benchmarking, and best practices to
2254
2255
     achieving and sustaining high security levels?
2256
           General {Alston.} Sir, clearly they feed every day.
     When you can, on a routine level, have the lines of
2257
2258
      communication sufficiently open where there is collaborative
2259
     process, you know, and standards don't have to be issued from
2260
     above, there can be collaboration. It builds trust, it
2261
     builds flow of information up and down the chain. Myself and
2262
     Mr. Augustine came to the conclusion that the federalization
     of the correct protective force should be given serious
2263
2264
     consideration, and the reason -- I am a unity of command guy,
```

```
and that creates a seam with the operator, who is enriching
2265
     uranium or whatever the other part of the mission would be,
2266
2267
     and so it is a little odd for me to have come down on this
2268
     side. But for precisely the reasons of standardization and
     more centralized control and impact that I felt that that
2269
2270
     would be one means by which that could be achieved.
          Mr. {Johnson.} Well thank you. Mr. Chairman, I
2271
2272
     actually do have one more question, if it would please the
2273
      chair that I could ask it, otherwise I will yield back.
2274
          Mr. {Murphy.} We will give you an additional minute.
          Mr. {Johnson.} Okay.
2275
           General Alston, one final question. General Finan's
2276
2277
      task force noted a distinct bias against finding and stating
     performance criticisms. You stated your belief that one of
2278
2279
     the attributes of a security organization is, and I quote,
2280
      ``an absolute intolerance for shortfalls, deficiencies,
2281
      outages 1 minute longer than necessary.'' What must happen
      for NNSA to transition from General Finan's assessment to the
2282
2283
     attribute that you describe?
2284
           General {Alston.} I played an active role as the Air
     Force was recovering from its epic failures. I was required
2285
```

```
to produce a road map, and there were a lot--obviously we
2286
2287
     were on fire, and there were a lot of activities that had to
2288
     go on there. But one of the things that we instituted was to
2289
     find structural mechanisms to prove leadership commitment,
2290
     and so the Chief and Secretary created a nuclear oversight
2291
     board that met quarterly, and it was a forum where everyone
     with nuclear equities at the senior level would meet. But it
2292
2293
     was a forum where you could expose whatever level of detail
2294
      that you wanted to expose, and in the case of the failure
2295
      that we saw at Y-12, it wouldn't require so much the senior
      levels at NNSA, but there needs to be a process where the
2296
2297
      connection is reinforced so that you are tracking outages to
2298
      the right level, and for example -- or equipment shortages, and
2299
      that there is a recurring forum so that routine interaction
2300
      can fortify commitment to the security part of the
2301
      enterprise.
2302
           Mr. {Johnson.} Thank you, General.
2303
           Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
           Mr. {Murphy.} All right, now recognize the gentleman
2304
2305
      from New York, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.
           Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2306
```

2307 The obvious major part of NNSA's work is security, but 2308 equally important is providing their employees with a safe 2309 working environment. The consequences of safety failures are 2310 serious and for example, in October of '07, GAO reported that 2311 nearly 60 serious accidents or near-misses had occurred at NNSA's national labs since 2000. Just to give one example, 2312 2313 GAO described a 2004 accident where a student working at the 2314 NNSA facility at Los Alamos was blinded in a laser accident. 2315 Mr. Trimble, you had indicated in your testimony that 2316 GAO has been conducting assessments of safety at NNSA for quite some time, and while I heard some of the results being 2317 2318 mentioned here, I am more--I would like to know, more 2319 importantly, how the agency is fairing. Are they getting 2320 better at addressing safety concerns? 2321 Mr. {Trimble.} I would like to say yes, but as of now, 2322 I can't say that our work is showing that. I think one of 2323 the things that is relevant to the discussion today that ties 2324 into the safety and security reform initiatives from 2010 is 2325 we have previously reported that those initiatives did not 2326 address our concerns previously expressed regarding the safety culture at NNSA and specifically, we noted that some 2327

```
of those reforms we viewed weakened federal independent
2328
2329
     oversight by making HSS's role sort of more of a ``Mother,
2330
     may I'' in terms of being able to come in and inspect
2331
     facilities. And I think in our testimony as well, we note
2332
      since our last testimony on these matters in the fall, there
2333
     have been numerous other safety incidents that have been
2334
     reported. So our concerns necessarily continue.
2335
          Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you. You also made mention, and I
2336
     will quote, that ``they have not demonstrated sustained
2337
      improvements in terms of their safety reforms.'' Can you
      tell us about NNSA's recent efforts to reform those measures
2338
2339
      in terms of safety protocols?
2340
          Mr. {Trimble.} I don't know about protocols, per se. I
     think the 2010 safety initiative, the reform initiative, you
2341
2342
     did a lot to--there is a lot of good in there in terms of
2343
      consolidating or rationalizing directives, et cetera. Again,
2344
     as I noted, we saw problems with it, but as with security,
2345
      the issue is one of sustainment. You go through these same
     periods of an accident happens, it gets attention, you have
2346
2347
     remedial measures, and then attention wanes and you go
2348
      through the same cycle once again.
```

```
2349
          Mr. {Tonko.} So then what should the agency do or be
2350
     doing to promote or improve worker's safety?
2351
           Mr. {Trimble.} Well, I think again it is--one, it is a
2352
      continued and sustained effort in addressing sort of a
2353
      cultural issues that have crept in. I think you see, just as
2354
      in security where you have the divide between headquarters
2355
     and the field units, there is a divide there in terms of the
2356
      importance and differing perceptions, perhaps, of the level
2357
     of importance this sort of mission holds.
2358
          Mr. {Tonko.} And in terms of any oversight protections?
          Mr. {Trimble.} In terms of oversight? Well,
2359
2360
      independent -- clearly, we haven't been on the record in terms
2361
     of having robust independent oversight, much like in the
2362
      security realm, so bolstering the role of HSS in that regard
2363
     I think is essential.
2364
           Mr. {Tonko.} Okay. I will yield back, Mr. Chair.
           Mr. {Murphy.} Thank the gentleman, and I want to say
2365
2366
      that for all the panelists, I thank you today, both panels.
2367
      I also want to note that certainly at times like this when we
     have hearings about security issues, security breaches, there
2368
2369
     are those who want to see where weaknesses are. They
```

```
certainly take note of the comments made, and we recognize a
2370
2371
      lot of the things are being done for security remain
      certainly in the classified levels. But in a situation like
2372
2373
      this, I think it gives the ranking member and I and members
2374
      of both sides of the Aisle confidence to know that actions
2375
     are being taken, because in a world where terrorists on any
2376
      level may take action against our interests at site such as
2377
      this or other ones, that our Nation will be strong and stand
2378
     up and prevent problems in the future with this. And so we
2379
      thank you for your comments and good Americans to help us
2380
     with that security.
           I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the
2381
2382
     document binder and all the Majority memos be introduced into
2383
      the record, and authorize staff to make appropriate any
2384
     redactions. Without objection, the documents will be entered
2385
      into the record with any redactions the staff determines
2386
     appropriate.
2387
           [The information follows:]
2388
      ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *********
```

```
Mr. {Murphy.} And in conclusion, again, thank you to all the witnesses. I remind members they have 10 business days to submit questions for the record, and I ask all the witnesses agree to respond promptly to the questions.

This committee is now adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]
```