

**Statement of Jessie H. Roberson**  
**Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management**  
**U. S. Department of Energy**  
**before the**  
**Subcommittee on Strategic Forces**  
**Committee on Armed Services**  
**U.S. Senate**  
**April 2, 2003**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to discuss the reform of the Department of Energy's Environmental Management (EM) program, our progress in implementing cleanup reform, and the importance of sustaining the momentum for the benefit of the many generations to come. I appreciate the opportunity to sit before you and share our actions of this past year and the opportunities that lie before us.

In 1996, Congress took a bold step that fundamentally altered the course of the cleanup program in the Department of Energy when it supported the accelerated closure of Rocky Flats. This was at a time when there was little reason and no demonstrated track record to believe that the Department could deliver on a challenge of this magnitude. Congress took further steps in 1999 when it created the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account and challenged the Department of Energy to close three of its nuclear sites by 2006. While it has taken significant effort and dedication, today all three of those sites, Rocky Flats, Mound, and Fernald, will close on or ahead of schedule. The vision and support that Congress provided planted the seeds of success in the cleanup program and we have already begun harvesting those fruits.

Nonetheless, success at other sites in the EM program remained elusive. Year after year, it continued to take longer and cost more to complete the cleanup and we slowly devolved into a program that promised little and delivered even less. By the end of fiscal year 2001, the environmental cleanup program stood as one of the largest liabilities of the Federal government.

Last year, as ordered by Secretary Abraham, the Department completed a Top-to-Bottom Review of its cleanup program and concluded that significant change was required in how the Department attacked risk reduction and cleanup for the rest of its sites. Two years ago, as costs continued to increase, we estimated that it could take over \$300 billion and nearly 70 more years to complete cleanup -- 20 years longer than the actual operations of our oldest facilities and 25 times longer than the actual construction of our most complex facilities. We concluded that a fundamental change to how we approached, managed, and performed the entire cleanup program was required. Last year I started the effort to reform this massive program, and while our most daunting challenges still lie in front of us, we are now focused, moving in the right direction. The accelerated cleanup program has started to build momentum.

Today the EM program is still very much a defense liability, responsible for many tons of special nuclear material in the form of plutonium and enriched uranium, which would make it one of the world's largest nuclear super-powers. In addition, the EM program is responsible for safely

disposing of 88 million gallons of radioactive liquid waste, 2,500 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel, 135,000 cubic meters of transuranic waste, and well over 1 million cubic meters of low level waste. I ask the Committee to stay with us as we continue our quest to eliminate risks posed by these materials at a pace few of us could have ever imagined.

Since the completion of Secretary Abraham's Review, the estimated cost to complete the cleanup program has decreased by over \$30 billion and the time to complete will be shortened by 35 years. This means that the risks to our workers, our communities, and the environment will be eliminated a generation earlier than the previous plan. But I am not satisfied and neither should you. My goal is to accelerate risk reduction and cleanup and shorten this program even further while decreasing costs by more than \$50 billion.

In fiscal year 2004, President Bush is requesting a record \$7.24 billion for the accelerated cleanup program. The Administration's funding request continues the great progress we made last year with our regulators and communities. The Administration believes that this investment, which we expect to peak in fiscal year 2005, is crucial to the success of accelerated risk reduction and cleanup completion. We anticipate funding will then decline significantly to about \$5 billion in 2008.

The EM portion of the fiscal year 2004 Congressional budget contains some creative and innovative changes that are greatly needed to support our accelerated risk reduction and closure initiative. The first of these is a new budget and project baseline summary structure that focuses on completion, accountability, and visibility; institutionalizes our values; and integrates performance and budget. Requested funding can clearly be associated with direct cleanup activities versus other indirect EM activities. Second, where appropriate, we have limited the inclusion of line-item construction projects as activities for separate authorization and funding controls to facilitate timely and sensible tradeoff decisions that otherwise may not be possible. We solicit your support for this flexibility as we implement our accelerated cleanup strategies, with the understanding that improving project management remains a significant challenge for the Department. Third, this budget reflects the transfer of multiple activities that are not core to the accelerated cleanup mission to other Department elements. They include the transfer of INEEL landlord responsibilities to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, transfer of the long-term stewardship program to the new Office of Legacy Management, and several others.

The Administration considers this program vitally important. We stand at an important crossroads in the cleanup program today -- success is clearly within our reach, but so is failure. I believe the cleanup of the former nuclear weapons complex is far too important a matter to be left to chance. With your past assistance, we laid a solid foundation that is already showing signs of early success. Moving forward, we need your continued support to achieve success.

## A YEAR OF TRANSFORMATION

Last year at this time, the Top-to-Bottom Review had been recently released, citing recommendations to quickly improve performance. I wish to take a moment to recap the recommendations and update you on our progress in remedying these weaknesses.

Improve DOE's Acquisition Strategy and Contract Management. A key conclusion of the Top-to-Bottom Review was EM's contracting approach was not focused on accelerating risk reduction and applying innovative cleanup approaches. Processes for contract acquisition, establishment of performance goals, funding allocation, and government oversight were managed as separate, informally related activities rather than as an integrated corporate business process. Contracting strategies and practices made poor use of performance-based contracts to carry out EM's cleanup mission. The Top-to-Bottom Review Team recommended that all current performance-based contracting activities be reviewed and, where necessary, restructured to provide for focused, streamlined, and unambiguous pursuit of risk reduction.

Move EM to an Accelerated, Risk-Based Cleanup Strategy. EM's cleanup strategy was not based on comprehensive, coherent, technically supported risk prioritization--another important observation cited by the Review team. The program was implementing waste management practices and disposition strategies costing millions without providing a proportional reduction in risk to human health and the environment. Cleanup work was not prioritized to achieve the greatest risk reduction at an accelerated rate. Interpretation of DOE Orders and requirements, environmental laws, regulations, and agreements had created obstacles to achieving real cleanup benefiting neither human health nor the environment. Resources were diverted to lower-risk activities. Process, not risk reduction, had become the driving force. The Review recommended that DOE initiate an effort to review DOE Orders and requirements as well as regulatory agreements, and commence discussions with states and other regulators with the goal of accelerating risk reduction.

Align DOE's Internal Processes to Support an Accelerated, Risk-Based Cleanup Approach. The Review found DOE's own internal processes inconsistent with a risk-based cleanup approach. The hazards at the DOE sites and the liability associated with them did not appear to dictate the need for urgency in the cleanup decisions. The Review team emphasized that the EM mission cannot be accomplished by continuing business as usual. Immediate actions in all elements of the EM program would need to be taken to transform DOE's processes and operations to reflect the new accelerated risk-based cleanup paradigm.

Realign the EM program so its scope is consistent with an accelerated, risk-based cleanup and closure mission. The Review team underscored the necessity that EM should redirect, streamline, or cease activities not appropriate for accelerated cleanup and closure. A laser-like focus on the core mission was needed to realize the cleanup of the Cold War legacy in our lifetime. Though many of these non-core activities may be worthy of DOE or federal government support, a reassessment of the relevance of non-related or supporting missions was warranted to focus the EM program. The financial and administrative resources required for EM implementation and oversight of these activities represent a major commitment for EM.

In response to the Review's recommendations we have:

Developed and are implementing a new acquisition strategy. In the area of acquisition strategy and contract management, we have not been idle. We are aggressively using and managing the acquisition process as one tool to drive contract performance. We are evaluating both the performance and design of every contract in this program and as opportunities become clear we are making corrective action. One example of our progress is the December 2002 award of a new contract for the cleanup and closure of the Mound site. The whole process, which required changes in DOE's internal business practices, was accomplished in just 6 months from time of the issuance of the Request for Proposals (RFP) to the awarding of the contract. Another example is at Oak Ridge, where we are transforming the cleanup contract into a closure contract with a one-year demonstration period to further our overall cleanup goals. Changing this contract arrangement will accelerate cleanup work by 5 years and save \$1 billion over the life of the program at the site.

But that is just the tip of the iceberg. I envision a broader overhaul of EM's entire acquisition process, including our methodology for formulating acquisition strategy, developing RFPs, identifying performance-based incentives, and providing oversight of contractor performance. We are pursuing a path to both increase competition by enlarging the pool of potential contractors competing for our work and increase the accountability of our contractors to deliver real, meaningful cleanup. Our acquisition strategy focuses on five areas. First, we are "unbundling" work into smaller packages where it makes sense. Second, we are driving innovation and improved cost performance through the use of small and smaller businesses, complementing the unbundling strategy. Third, we are actively promoting innovation in our cleanup work through the competitive process where improved performance is required. Fourth, we are extending or modifying contracts where excellent performance has been clearly demonstrated. Fifth, we are modifying and changing our acquisition processes to support these strategies in order to allow them to be successfully implemented.

To complement these steps, we have launched a Contract Management Review Board to review our contracts from a more corporate perspective. Our goal is to ensure that the lessons learned, both good and bad, from all our endeavors are institutionalized into our contracts and business practices and that we suspend those contract philosophies that do not support accelerated risk reduction and cleanup of our sites.

Established 10 special project teams to carve new innovative paths for accelerated cleanup and risk reduction. The Top-to-Bottom Review identified unfocused and inconsistent work planning processes as the principal contributors to EM's uncontrolled cost and schedule growth. To address this failing, I formed ten special corporate projects, each assigned a specific strategic objective. Each team is formulating corporate level initiatives to accelerate risk reduction in a much improved, more cost-effective manner. Objectives include contracting, high-level waste, and consolidation of Special Nuclear Material. Each of the special projects has a dedicated project manager, supported by an integrated project team, to identify, plan, and execute needed changes in the EM program. These project teams, using project management principles, are key

to correcting our work planning processes and instilling rigor into our internal management decisions.

Meaningful, lasting reform must be the result of leadership and commitment but it must find its way into the very core of the organization to be sustained. Building a high-performing culture requires attracting and retaining talented people who deliver excellence in performance. Improving management efficiencies requires that organizations challenge, hold accountable, and reward top-performing employees. This corporate initiative does just that. These ten teams will herald a new standard of performance, innovation, and greater results for the EM program. Our goal is not just to establish performance-based contracts but to solidify a performance-based program for all who choose to have a role.

Implemented a strict configuration management system. Another reform we have implemented is a strict configuration management system that baselines a number of key, critical program elements. Examples of some of the key elements include the Performance Management Plans, EM corporate performance metrics, contract performance measures/incentives, and life-cycle costs. Strict change control and monitoring of these key elements will facilitate a high confidence level that the goals and direction of the accelerated cleanup initiative are being met.

In October 2002, EM established several new corporate performance measures for the program. EM will continue to track corporate measures such as the number of geographic sites completed, the amount of transuranic waste disposed, and the number of plutonium metal/oxides packaged. However, new corporate measures such as the volume of liquid waste in inventory eliminated, number of liquid waste tanks closed, number of enriched uranium containers packaged, and amount of depleted and other uranium packaged are a key part to the successful execution of EM's accelerated cleanup strategies. In addition, EM is establishing site resource-loaded baselines that will enable the program to comprehensively track progress against its accelerated risk reduction, cost, and schedule objectives. The establishment of these new performance measures and a rigorous configuration management system are resulting in clear lines of accountability for what is expected. With this critical tool, EM is now able to make crucial corporate decisions that will keep the program on track, control cost increases, and minimize schedule growth.

Identified work activities that directly support accelerated cleanup from those that do not.

A key finding of the Top to Bottom Review was that EM was supporting and managing several types of activities that may not be appropriate for an accelerated risk-reduction and cleanup program. In that light, I took a hard look at those activities and, while they may be of importance to the Department and the federal government, they may not be best aligned in the EM program. Based on that assessment, for FY 2004, the following identified program elements were not included in the EM budget but, because of their importance to the Department, have been transferred to other DOE organizations with which they are more appropriately aligned. They represent activities that are not part of the core accelerated risk reduction and closure mission.

- Environmental Management staff at the National Energy Technology Laboratory transferred to the new Office of Legacy Management.

- The Analytical Services Program transferred to the Office of Environment, Safety and Health.
- The Radiological and Environmental Sciences Laboratory transferred to the Office of Environment, Safety and Health.
- Pre-existing liabilities and long-term contractor liabilities transferred to the Office of Legacy Management.
- The Long-term Stewardship Program transferred to the Office of Legacy Management.

In addition, landlord responsibilities for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory were transferred to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to reflect the site's major mission realignment.

Revitalized our human capital strategy. Another key management reform is the human capital revitalization that strongly supports the President's Management Agenda. This reform focuses on building a high-performing culture that attracts and retains talented managers and staff to deliver sustained performance excellence. We have built a more robust performance accountability system that holds each manager and employee accountable for actions and results and rewards them accordingly. Individual performance management is being fully integrated into EM organizational goals; executives are being held accountable for achieving strategic program objectives, fostering innovation, and supporting continuous improvement.

We are implementing an executive mentoring program with our senior executives with the objective of having a cadre of executives who are well-rounded and are prepared to effectively lead irrespective of the position to which they might accrue. We are becoming a flatter and more effective organization with a goal to have an organizational structure that is clearly aligned to deliver on our accelerated risk reduction and closure initiative.

Aligned tangible, consequential results to resources with this budget request structure. Given all these changes and advances, the budget request before you is one of the most crucial. This budget request structure is the foundation for budget planning and execution of the accelerated risk reduction and closure initiative. This new structure clearly identifies scope and resources that directly support the core accelerated cleanup and risk reduction mission from those that do not. The new structure consolidates risk reduction and completion activities into only two appropriations (defense and non-defense) in addition to the existing Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund. This structure removes barriers to facilitate better resource utilization and segments accelerated completion into three distinct accounts to highlight accountability.

In addition, implementation of this new structure will complement other management reform initiatives by focusing on completion or endpoint, clearly delineating how resources will be utilized (i.e., for direct cleanup activities or for other activities in the program that only indirectly relate to on-the-ground cleanup activities), and communicating the goals and objectives that we value. Last, but not any less important, this new structure will support integration of performance and budget for the EM program.

## THE FY 2004 BUDGET REQUEST

The FY 2003 budget was a transitional budget in which management reforms were developed and significant efforts were put forth to improve performance, accelerate cleanup, and reduce risk. The strategic groundwork has been laid, and the EM program is moving forward with its risk reduction and cleanup strategies. The investment we have requested in our FY 2004 budget will keep EM's new accelerated risk reduction and cleanup strategies on track.

The EM FY 2004 budget request has been tailored to meeting our mission of accelerated risk reduction and completion. This budget fully reflects each site's new accelerated risk reduction and cleanup strategies. The FY 2004 budget request is a major step toward aligning performance with the resources needed to expedite risk reduction and cleanup.

The 2004 budget request for EM activities totals \$7.24 billion to accelerate risk reduction and closure. The request includes five appropriations, three of which fund on-the-ground, core mission work, and two of which serve as support. The five appropriations and associated requested funding are:

- Defense Site Acceleration Completion (\$ 5.8 billion)
- Defense Environmental Services (\$ 995 million)
- Non-Defense Site Acceleration (\$ 171 million)
- Non-Defense Environmental Services (\$ 292 million)
- Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund (\$ 418 million)

Through the implementation of accelerated cleanup strategies, the EM program anticipates that cleanup will be completed by 2035, at least 35 years earlier than originally anticipated, with the potential of life-cycle savings of greater than \$50 billion.

In building the request, the Department applied the following principles and priorities:

*Protect workers, public, and the environment:* The budget request continues to place the highest priority on protecting workers, the public, and the environment. The implementation of new cleanup strategies will allow for an overall improvement in safety and reduction in risk because cleanup will be completed sooner, reducing the extent to which workers, the public, and the environment have the potential to be exposed.

*Ensure the appropriate levels of safeguards and security:* Due to heightened security levels throughout the nation, it is crucial that we maintain vigilance in our domestic security to protect our citizens. The EM program is responsible for many tons of surplus nuclear material. This budget request reflects our increased safeguards and security needs. In particular, the sites with the largest funding needs are Savannah River and Hanford. Savannah River's increase in funding supports protective force staffing for the HB Line Category 1 Process and plutonium stabilization activities, perimeter improvements, maintenance on security systems, vulnerability assessments, and Capital and General Plant Project upgrades. Hanford's increase in funding

supports updates to the Critical Facility Vulnerability Assessment, additional security employees for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant construction, security clearance processing, drug testing, and accelerated movement of special nuclear material to Savannah River and/or the Grout Facility.

*Reduce risk methodically:* Accelerated risk reduction requires a pragmatic approach to cleanup based on real risk reduction. Risk reduction occurs in various stages, which involve the elimination, prevention, or mitigation of risk. Because safe disposal of many materials will take a number of years to complete, our major focus of risk reduction is stabilization of high-risk materials.

The following categories of materials are considered to pose the highest risk:

- High-curie, long-lived isotope liquid waste
- Special nuclear materials
- Liquid transuranic (TRU) waste in tanks
- Sodium bearing liquid waste in high-level waste tanks
- Defective spent nuclear fuel in water basins
- Spent nuclear fuel in leaky or poor water chemistry basins
- High TRU waste content (greater than 100 nanocuries/gram)
- TRU waste stored on the surface
- Remote-handled (RH) TRU waste
- Decontamination & Decommissioning of highly contaminated facilities

Although all of these items are to be considered when setting priorities, their relative ranking may vary from site to site. For example, the following sites have planned activities/milestones for FY 2004 that correspond to their site-specific risk categories.

#### Hanford

- Close 6 single-shell tanks; the first tanks closed at the site.
- Complete interim stabilization of Hanford single-shell tanks, which completes removing all pumpable liquids from single-shell tanks.
- Complete 30 percent of the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant.
- Complete stabilization of plutonium metals, oxides, and residues.
- Complete removal of all spent fuel from the K Basins and place in dry storage in the Canister Storage Building.

#### Idaho

- Complete the transfer of spent nuclear fuel in the Power Burst Facility canal from wet storage to dry storage at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center.
- Ship off-site a total of 1,819 kg total uranium (leaving a remainder of 825 kg).
- Begin the transfer of EBR-II spent nuclear fuel from the Chemical Processing Plant to the Argonne National Laboratory-West for treatment and disposition as an interim step to removing all EM spent nuclear fuel from wet storage.

- Support treatment of sodium-bearing waste: complete conceptual design activities for the sodium bearing waste treatment project, initiate preliminary design on primary technology, and complete Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Facility Critical Decision 1 documentation; and complete characterization of remaining liquids and solids in the 11 underground tanks.

#### Rocky Flats

- Remove and ship remaining plutonium metals, oxides, and residue.
- Begin stabilization and hazard removal in two TRU waste buildings.

#### Savannah River

- Permanently close tanks 18 and 19, completing the closure of the first tank grouping.
- De-inventory spent nuclear fuel from the Receiving Basin for Off-site Fuels.
- Complete treatment of the aqueous portion of the plutonium-uranium extraction (PUREX) waste at the Saltstone Facility.
- Produce 250 canisters of vitrified high-level waste.

*Accelerate cleanup results:* To accelerate cleanup, 18 sites have developed Performance Management Plans (PMPs), which identify strategies, end states, end dates, key milestones, and commitments that facilitate accelerated cleanup and site closure. These PMPs were developed in collaboration with our state and federal regulators.

For FY 2004, several examples of sites' milestones for accelerated cleanup are:

#### Brookhaven National Laboratory

- Submit Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor Draft Record of Decision to our regulators to determine the final end-state for Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor.
- Complete construction of the Airport/Long Island Power Authority Groundwater Treatment System.

#### Hanford

- Complete cocooning of the H Reactor.
- Complete excavation/removal of 100 B/C Process Effluent Pipeline.
- Dispose of 500,000 tons of remediation waste from waste sites and burial remediations in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility.

#### Idaho

- Begin shipment of RH TRU waste offsite (6-year acceleration) supporting completion of shipments by 2012.
- Complete cleaning and grouting of second pillar and panel vaulted tank, supporting acceleration of tank farm facility closure by 4 years to 2012.

#### Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory-Livermore Site

- Construct, install, and operate a new treatment system to address groundwater contamination.

#### Los Alamos National Laboratory

- Permanently dispose of over 600 cubic meters of legacy TRU waste through an integrated strategy of segregating, decontaminating, and shipping to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).
- Complete shipment of 2,000 drums and initiate retrieval of legacy TRU waste stored below grade.

#### Nevada Test Site

- Complete remediation of 55 release sites.
- Continue to dispose of low-level waste from complex-wide generators in support of closure of other EM sites.
- Continue characterization and shipments of TRU waste to WIPP.

#### Oak Ridge

- Complete East Tennessee Technology Park K 29/31/33 decommissioning for re-use (one-year acceleration), supporting closure of the site 8 years earlier than planned.
- Complete Molten Salt Reactor Experiment flush salt removal, and complete fuel salt removal from the first of two drain tanks.

#### Pantex

- Continue pump and treatment of the perched groundwater and evaluation of more efficient cleanup technologies to mitigate the contaminated plume.
- Complete demolition of Zone 10 ruins and initiate actions for the demolition of Building 12-24 Complex.

#### Savannah River

- Eliminate low-level waste legacy inventory.
- Complete major remediation projects in the testing and experimental areas.

#### WIPP

- Increase carrier capacity from 25 to 34 shipments of TRU waste per week.
- Procure 11 RH trailers for a total of 14.
- Complete TRUPACT-II (a transportation container to safely transport either TRU waste or standard waste boxes) fabrication to obtain fleet of 84 TRUPACTs.

Maintain closure schedules: Three major sites, Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Mound, have accelerated closure schedules. In addition, two smaller sites, Ashtabula and Battelle-Columbus are scheduled to close in 2006. Funding in the FY 2004 budget will allow these sites to remain on track toward project completion and site closure.

At Rocky Flats, FY 2004 funding provides for:

- Disposing of more than 109,000 cubic meters of low and mixed low level waste.
- Disposing of more than 8,600 cubic meters of TRU waste (70 percent complete).
- Completing the decontamination and decommissioning of 72 work sets in Buildings 371, 717, 771, and 776.
- Cleaning 194 environmental release sites (81 percent complete).

At Fernald, FY 2004 funding provides for:

- Treatment and shipment offsite of 150,000 tons of waste pit material, which cumulatively represents approximately 80 percent of the total.
- Construction completion of Silos 1, 2, and 3 retrieval facilities.
- Completion of D&D of Plant 1 Complex Phase II, Liquid Storage Complex Phase II, and Pilot Plant Complex.

At Mound, FY 2004 funding provides for:

- Continued removal of high concentrations of tritium from Tritium Effluent Reduction Facility to allow for early shutdown.
- Completion of soil excavation phase of Potential Release Site 66 and completion of the total remediation of Potential Release Sites 68 and 267. These three Potential Release Sites represent 38 percent of the total soil remediation remaining.

At Ashtabula, FY 2004 funding provides for:

- Complete disposal of 100 percent of building remediation debris generated in FY 2003.
- Initiation of excavation and shipment of remaining estimated known scope (i.e., 38,000 tons) of contaminated soil to a licensed disposal site.

At Battelle-Columbus, FY 2004 funding provides for:

- Demolition of buildings JN-2 and JN-3.

*Integrate technology development and deployment:* An integrated technology development and deployment program is an essential element for successful completion of the EM cleanup effort and for fulfilling post-closure requirements. The EM Technology Development and Deployment (TDD) program provides technical solutions and alternative technologies to assist with accelerated cleanup of the DOE complex.

Through the FY 2004 budget, EM technology development and deployment investments are focused on high-payoff site closure and remediation problems through a two pronged approach: Closure Projects and Alternative Projects.

Closure Projects: Principal near term closure sites (such as Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Mound) will be provided with technical support and quick response, highly focused technology development and deployment projects. The goal is to ensure that accelerated site closure schedules are achieved.

- At Rocky Flats and the Ohio closure sites, technical assistance teams will assess critical technical issues and provide technology alternatives including the treatment and disposition of orphaned waste streams.
- At Mound, innovative technologies will be developed to determine and enable treatment of radioactive contaminated soil beneath buildings.
- At Fernald, the vacuum thermal desorption demonstration will be completed to provide a technical solution for an orphaned waste stream.

Alternative Projects: Alternative approaches and step improvements to current high-risk/high cost baseline remediation projects are our second focus. The goal is to enable cleanup to be accomplished safely, at less cost, and on an accelerated schedule. EM is focusing funds for FY 2004 on:

- Alternatives For Tank Waste Immobilization;
- Alternatives for Carbon Tetrachloride Source Term Location;
- Alternatives for Remediation of Leaked High-Level Waste below Tanks
- Alternatives for Disposition of High-Level Salt Waste;
- Alternatives for Immobilization of High-Level Sludge Waste;
- Alternatives for Remediation of Chlorinated Ethenes using Monitored Natural Attenuation;
- Alternatives for Deposit Removal at Gaseous Diffusion Plants;
- Alternatives for Cleanup of Trichloroethylene under Buildings (Paducah); and
- Alternatives for Expedited Processing of Scrap Metal/Equipment.

## CONCLUSION

We planted the seedlings of transformation one year ago. We have fostered and guided the reforms. New ideas and breakthroughs have grown from looking beyond the paradigm of risk management to the new focus of accelerated risk reduction and cleanup. New strategies and plans are thriving.

We are experiencing the realization that for the first time, the goal of completing EM's mission is within our grasp. We have set into motion a reformed cleanup program -- one designed and managed to achieve risk reduction not just risk management; to shift focus from process to product; and to instill the kind of urgency necessary to clean up and close down the nuclear legacy of the Cold War and to protect human health and the environment.

We are at a turning point for this program. We must not lessen our resolve. I ask for your support to continue this important work. We must avoid passing this intolerable inheritance to our children. Accelerating cleanup by at least 35 years and saving over \$50 billion is a wise investment for our children's future.

I look forward to working with Congress and others to achieve this goal. I will be happy to answer questions.