Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

July 1, 2003

The Honorable John T. Conway
Chairman
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
625 Indiana Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-2091

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The purpose of this letter to report to you on the completion of commitment 3.6 of the Department's Quality Assurance Improvement Plan. This commitment, *Environmental Management establish and implement contract change control process, including establishing performance measures and incentives,* was initiated during the first quarter of fiscal year 2003, as illustrated in the enclosures to this letter. The enclosures contain configuration control elements and requirements, minutes of the December 17, 2002, meeting a charter and procedure for conducting business, and some baseline information.

If you have any questions, please call me at (202) 586-7709 or Mr. Paul Golan, Chief Operating Officer, at (202) 586-0738.

Sincerely,

Jessie Hill Roberson
Assistant Secretary for
Environmental Management

Enclosures

cc: Mark Whitaker, DR-1

SEPARATION

PAGE

DOE F 1325.8
(08-93)

03.1013

United States Government **Department of Energy**

memorandum

DATE: December 19, 2002

REPLY TO ATTN OF: EM-13

SUBJECT: Configuration Control Board

TO: Distribution

The purpose of this memorandum is to communicate configuration control elements and requirements for the Environmental Management (EM) project.

Elements

The following elements, and the program variables they reflect, are under EM Configuration Control

A. Performance Management Plans.....Site strategy document

B. Cleanup end states/end points.....Criteria that define completion

C. EM Corporate Performance Metrics (Gold Chart)...Schedule and life-cycle scope

D. Performance Measures/Performance Incentives.....Incentives to accomplish work

E. Annual baseline cost.....Cost

F. Life-cycle cost.....Cost

G. Project Baseline Summary Structure.....Budget structure

H. WIPP transportation baseline.....Key disposal interface

Requirements

Any changes to these elements require either notification or approval of the EM Configuration Control Board (CCB). Notification is required when the cost goes down, the schedule is accelerated, or when work scope is eliminated and does not appear anywhere else in the EM project. Approval is required for any and all other proposed changes to the baseline.

Schedule

EM-10 will identify the specific Revision 0 versions for the elements that will be placed under configuration control. Elements A-C and F-H are under configuration control immediately for all sites. Element D (cleanup end states/end points) is immediately under configuration control for those sites that submitted PMPs. For those sites that did not submit PMPs, only the end point (i.e., the date for completion) is under configuration control. Element E (annual baseline cost) is immediately under configuration control for Rocky Flats and Fernald. Configuration control for Element E for sites not listed will occur as validated baselines are complete. Sites should notify Mr. Eli Bronstein, the CCB Secretary, immediately upon approval of their validated baselines.

Process

The EM Configuration Control Board will meet monthly to evaluate proposed changes to the EM baseline. Meetings are currently scheduled for the first quarter of 2003 (January 23, February 27, and March 27). A schedule for the balance of the fiscal year will be subsequently provided. Baseline change proposals are required to be submitted to the CCB Secretary (Eli Bronstein) at least 5 working days prior to the meeting. Emergency requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Also attached is a *Baseline Change Proposal* form. More guidance on this process will be forthcoming within the next 45 days.

Jessie Hill Roberson
Assistant Secretary for
Environmental Management

Attachment

Distribution

Warren E. Bergholz, Jr., Acting Manager, Idaho Operations Office (ID)
Jack R. Craig, Deputy Manager, Ohio Field Office (OH)
Keith A. Klein, Manager, Richland Operations Office (RL)
Roy J. Schepens, Manager, Office of River Protection (ORP)
Eugene C. Schmitt, Manager, Rocky Flats Field Office (RF)
Jeffrey M. Allison, Acting Manager, Savannah River Operations Office (SR)
Dr. Inés Triay, Manager, Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO)
William E. Murphie, Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Field Office (PPFO)
Patty Wagner, Acting Manager, Albuquerque Operations Office (AL)
Marvin E. Gunn, Jr., Manager, Chicago Operations Office (CH)
Kathleen Carlson, Manager, Nevada Operations Office (NV)
Camille Yuan-Soo Hoo, Manager, Oakland Operations Office (OAK)
James A. Turi, Acting Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office (OR)
Sandra Johnson, Director, EM-5
Jay Rhoderick, Director, EM-6
Dr. Barbara D. Male, Director, EM-7
Patrice M. Bubar, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-20
Mark Frei, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-30
Mark Frei, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-40
James M. Owendoff, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-50

cc:
Bruce Carnes, ME-1
Robert Card, US-1
Raymond Orbach, SC-1
William Magwood, NE-1
Linton Brooks, NNSA
Jack Tillman, Director, Office of Environment, Science and Technology,
Albuquerque Operations Office (AL)
Anibal Taboas, Assistant Manager, Program and Project Management,
Chicago Operations Office (CH)
Carl Gertz, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management,
Nevada Operations Office (NV)
Roger H. Liddle, Acting Assistant Manager for Environment and Nuclear Energy,
Oakland Operations Office (OAK)
Gerald Boyd, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management,
Oak Ridge Operations Office (OR)
Paul M. Golan, Chief Operating Officer, EM-3
Roger Butler, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-10
Michael Weis, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-40
Eli Bronstein, EM-10

Environmental Management
Baseline Change Proposal (BCP)

1. BCP Title:_____

   Requesting EM Field/HQ Org.:_____

   Requesting Field/HQ Manager:_____ Telephone:_____ Date:_____

2. Baseline Funding Change(s): ($000s)

Organization	Rev. 0 Baseline	Current Baseline Amount	BCP Change Amount	Proposed Baseline Amount	PBS No.	B&R Code

For Sections 3, 4, and 5: If more space is required to adequately describe the change, provide justification or explain the impact, provide a short synopsis below and then provide all details on continuation page(s).

3. Description of Change: Specifically, what was Added, Modified, and/or Deleted?)

4. Justification for Change: (How does this change specifically contribute to furthering accomplishment of site goals and mission and how does it impact life-cycle cost?)

5. Impact of Change: (What are the impacts to accomplishment of site goals and mission if not approved?)

6. Process as: Routine ___ Priority ___

CCB Chairperson:_____ _____
Signature Date

CCB Comments:

SEPARATION

PAGE

Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585
February 6, 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: JESSIE HILL ROBERSON
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: Configuration Control Board Meeting December 17, 2002

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide you with the proceedings of the December 17, 2002, Environmental Management (EM) Configuration Control Board (CCB) meeting. The following is a summary of the decisions and actions from the meeting with materials attached.

EM Program Elements and Documents

During the meeting, the CCB placed the EM program elements and documents listed below under configuration control (referenced in my December 19, 2002, memorandum, subject: Configuration Control Board), and established Revision 0 (Rev. 0) for each of the listed items.

A. **Performance Management Plans (PMPs):** The CCB voted to baseline as Rev. 0 the version of the PMPs provided to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as justification for the fiscal year (FY) 2004 Budget. Although the actual PMPs were available during the meeting, the attached minutes do not include the full documents, but rather include a table listing the PMPs by site, the Rev. 0 version date, and the distinguishing characteristics of each of the PMPs.

B. **Cleanup end states/end points:** For the 18 sites that have submitted PMPs, the CCB baselined as Rev. 0, the end states and end points in the PMPs. For those sites that have not submitted PMPs, the CCB baselined the end points from the Gold Chart Metrics as Rev. 0. The expectation of the CCB is that all EM sites with remaining cleanup missions will develop critical path baselines, and that these will be under configuration control. In the interim, the CCB expects each of the sites to submit a critical path logic diagram to Eli Bronstein, Director, Office of Budget, Office of Environmental Management, the CCB Secretary.

C. **EM Corporate Performance Metrics (Gold Chart):** The CCB baselined Rev. 0 of the metrics and communicated the expectation that in the future, the Gold Chart Metrics should show a schedule of performance on a monthly basis for 48 months, and on a quarterly basis beyond 48 months. I intend to send each of you Rev.0 of the metrics for your sites via individual memoranda.

D. **Performance Measures/Performance Incentives:** Performance Based Incentives (PBIs) were discussed for each site and contract. Rev. 0 was baselined for those sites that are ready for change control. Since Rocky Flats and Fernald are being completed under closure contracts, no action was required by the CCB for those two sites. The attached minutes do not include the PBI information reviewed by the CCB.

E. **Annual baseline cost:** The CCB baselined as Rev. 0, the Rocky Flats ($666,697,000) and Fernald ($343,794,698) FY 2003 annual baseline cost.

F. **Life-cycle cost:** Life-cycle costs were baselined as Rev. 0 at the Operations/Field Office level in constant 2002 dollars. The FY 2002 life-cycle cost data baselined are based on the June 17, 2002, Planning Spreadsheets with updated constant dollar profiles for Richland, Rocky Flats, Savannah River, and River Protection.

G. **Project Baseline Summary (PBS) Structure:** The CCB baselined as Rev. 0, the new PBS structure that has been used for the FY 2004 EM Budget. The new PBS structure has been released to the public as part of the President's FY 2004 Budget to Congress.

H. **WIPP transportation baseline:** The CCB established the "Baseline Shipments per Month from July 2002, through FY 2004" as Rev. 0 of the WIPP transportation baseline. The CCB also decided to schedule a special session of the Board prior to the upcoming January 23, 2003, meeting of the CCB. This special session will not be a decision-making meeting, but will focus on information that should lead to future strategies to optimize the transuranic waste transportation schedule. Representatives from the and HQ WIPP program will be expected to brief the CCB either in person or by video-teleconference. Because this meeting is for information exchange only, materials presented to the CCB at this special session will be maintained and distributed, but no minutes will be developed for the meeting.

In addition to the decisions and actions discussed above, the CCB also voted to revise the Standing Operating Policies and Procedures (SOPP) and Charter for the Board. The final version is attached in the back of this package.

Attachments

Distribution

Warren E. Bergholz, Jr., Acting Manager, Idaho Operations Office (ID)
Jack R. Craig, Deputy Manager, Ohio Field Office (OH)
Keith A. Klein, Manager, Richland Operations Office (RL)
Roy J. Schepens, Manager, Office of River Protection (ORP)
Eugene C. Schmitt, Manager, Rocky Flats Field Office (RF)
Jeffrey M. Allison, Acting Manager, Savannah River Operations Office (SR)
Dr. Inés Triay, Manager, Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO)
William E. Murphie, Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Field Office (PPFO)
Sandra Johnson, Director, EM-5
Jay Rhoderick, Director, EM-6
Dr. Barbara D. Male, Director, EM-7
Patrice M. Bubar, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-20
Mark Frei, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-30
Mark Frei, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-40
James M. Owendoff, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-50

cc:
Marvin E. Gunn, Jr., Manager, Chicago Operations Office (CH)
Jack Tillman, Director, Special Advisor, Office of Technical Services, NNSA Service Center (NNSASC)
Anibal Taboas, Assistant Manager, Office of Program and Project Management, Chicago Operations Office (CH)
Carl Gertz, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management, Nevada Site Office (NV)
Roger H. Liddle, Technical Services, NNSA Service Center (NNSASC)
Gerald Boyd, Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office (OR)
Paul M. Golan, Chief Operating Officer, EM-3
Roger Butler, Deputy Assistant Secretary, EM-10
Michael Weis, EM-1
Eli Bronstein, EM-10

ATTACHMENT

Configuration Control Board (CCB) Meeting Documents

Tuesday, December 17, 2002

CONTENTS

- Minutes
- Program Element A - Configuration Control Performance Management Plans (PMPs) Summary Table, Rev 0.
- Program Element B - Configuration Control Cleanup Endpoints Reported in the PMPs, Configuration Control Cleanup Endpoints for Sites that Did Not Submit PMPs (Dates from Gold Chart), and Configuration Control Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints Reported in PMPs, Rev 0.
- Program Element C – Corporate Performance Measures at the Complex and Office Levels, Rev 0. The metrics will be distributed subsequent to the release of the FY 2004 President's Budget.
- Program Element D – Performance Measures/Performance Incentives:documents not attached.
- Program Element E - FY 2003 Annual Cost Baseline for Rocky Flats and Fernald, Rev 0.
- Program Element F - FY 2002 EM Life-Cycle Costs at the Office Level in Thousands of Constant 2002 Dollars, Rev 0.
- Program Element G - Office of Environmental Management Budget Structure, Rev 0. The new budget structure will be distributed subsequent to the release of the FY 2004 President's Budget.
- Program Element H - TRU Waste Baseline Shipments Per Month from July 02 through FY 04, Rev 0.

Configuration Control Board (CCB) Meeting
Tuesday, December 17, 2002

Minutes

Attendees: Roger Butler, Paul Golan, Eli Bronstein, Bill Levitan, Marc Jones
(Mike Weis was absent)

- The meeting was called to order at 9:11 a.m. by CCB Chairman Roger Butler with a quorum present.

- Must have complete records of all CCB agendas, proposed change actions, as well as Board deliberations, actions, and notifications to impacted field or Headquarters organizations. The Board will utilize EM-10 staff as necessary to support this need.

- Must establish formal files that contain a chronology of all CCB actions with supporting documentation beginning with Rev. 0 divided by program element.

- The existing Standard Operating Policies and Procedures (SOPP) document on change control was discussed. It has been rewritten to expand configuration management responsibilities to include the elements added to the Charter. Paul Golan discussed configuration management as one of the four (4) pillars of the EM program which include:
  1. Acquisition and Contracting Strategy
  2. Human Capital Strategy
  3. Configuration Management
  4. Budget Structure and PBS Structure

- **ACTION (Levitan/Jones):** The Board wanted a revision to the SOPP section pertaining to thresholds. The addition would recognize if the field is going to spend a dollar more (cost), work an hour longer (scope), or finish a day later (schedule), then it requires a CCB approval. However, if the field can lower cost, reduce scope, or shorten schedule, it does not require CCB "approval" but rather the field should notify the Board through the BCP form. The CCB will not delay field innovations that save time or money.

- The Corporate Performance Measures document was discussed. The EM CCB will control these with an "iron fist." Bill Levitan explained that we have already begun a dialogue with the field about configuration management, the corporate performance measures, and the new budget structure. The field managers will be held responsible for the performance of the sites.

- **MOTION:** Adopt the draft SOPP with a modification to section 8.d.v. regarding thresholds. Motion seconded; so ordered.

- The Site Performance Management Plans (PMPs) were discussed using the summary of the 18 PMPs delivered to OMB.

- **ACTION (Butler):** Roger Butler will contact OMB to determine if the PMPs may be delivered to the Congress.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the 18 PMPs as delivered to OMB on August 13, 2002, as Rev. 0. Motion seconded; so ordered.

- Discussed End States/End Points. The Board expectation is ultimately for a Primavera critical path schedule by site but must wait until the sites have completed development of resource-loaded baselines.

- **ACTION (Levitan/Jones):** Obtain from field locations a critical path logic diagram for these site PMPs by the next CCB Meeting (January 23). Further, as the schedules are developed/reviewed, each schedule should be monthly for the first four years and then quarterly thereafter.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the End States/End Points documents (3 documents) as Rev. 0. Further, proceed on an expedited time line (by the next CCB Meeting on January 23) to work with the sites to obtain critical path logic diagrams.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- The WIPP shipping schedule was discussed. Paul Golan commented that Envirocare and NTS have virtually unlimited capacity however WIPP does not. 30-33 TRU waste shipments per week is the approximate WIPP capacity. That can vary based on the distance from the site, the weather, etc. There are fixed costs and variable costs for both the shipping and receiving site to consider. The CCB must influence the shipping schedule to seek the optimal shipping rates for each site. Eventually, this will become the responsibility of the EM-20 organization.

- **ACTION (Butler):** Must define the variables associated with the WIPP shipping schedule so that the CCB can make informed recommendations/decisions. Roger Butler will contact Patty Bubar regarding a briefing for late next week (December 26 or 27) to the CCB on the shipping schedule variables.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the current WIPP shipping schedule as Rev. 0 and set up a briefing with EM-20.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- "Gold Chart" Corporate Performance Measures were discussed. EM will baseline (1) the summary level measures and (2) the individual office measures.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the Corporate Performance Measures by summary level and by site level as Rev. 0.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- Life-cycle baselines by site were discussed. It was noted that these baselines are updated twice yearly, spring and fall.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the $167.9B from the life-cycle cost chart presented (page 1). Motion seconded; so ordered.

- The Rocky Flats and Fernald annual baseline cost estimates were discussed. Rocky Flats looked adequate however the Fernald baseline contained over $9M of science and technology funding that most likely will not be available.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the FY 2003 Rocky Flats estimate of $666.697M as Rev. 0. Revise (pen and ink) the Fernald estimate to exclude ~$9.5M of science and technology funding for a new estimate of $343.8M for FY 2003 as Rev. 0.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- **MOTION:** Baseline the new EM Program PBS/Budget structure as Rev. 0.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- The memorandum to the field regarding the Configuration Control Board was discussed. It was noted that any BCPs come directly from the field managers and should not be delayed with long bureaucratic concurrence chains.

- **ACTION (Levitan/Jones):** Prepare an example of a well-written BCP form to attach to the memorandum.

- **MOTION:** When completed, forward memorandum on Configuration Control Board to EM-1 for signature.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- Performance Based Incentives (PBIs) were discussed for each site and contract.
  - -- Carlsbad: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- Bechtel-ID: Still negotiating; not ready for change control.
  - -- Mound: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- West Valley: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- Bechtel Jacobs-OR: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- Paducah/Portsmouth: Not ready for change control.
  - -- CH2MHill-ORP: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- Fernald: Closure scheduled for December 31, 2007 (no action required).
  - -- Rocky Flats: Closure scheduled for December 15, 2006 (no action required).
  - -- Bechtel-Hanford: River Corridor not ready for change control.
  - -- Fluor-Hanford: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.
  - -- Westinghouse-SR: PBIs in contract; Rev. 0.

- **MOTION:** Baseline Rev. 0 as noted above.
  Motion seconded; so ordered.

- **MOTION:** Adjourn this meeting of the CCB.
  Motion seconded; meeting adjourned at 10:39 a.m.
  The CCB is scheduled to reconvene on January 23, 2003.

PROGRAM ELEMENT A

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLANS

Configuration Control
Performance Management Plans (PMPs)

Site or Ops Office	PMP Title	Date	Distinguishing Characteristics
Amchitka	Performance Management Plan for the Amchitka Island Site	August 6, 2002	6 pages total.
Battelle-Columbus	Columbus Environmental Management Project Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup (Predecisional Draft)	July 24, 2002	17 pages total. Page 12 contains Top-to-Bottom Review Initiatives.
Brookhaven National Laboratory	Environmental Management Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup of the Brookhaven National Laboratory	August 2002	41 pages total. Funding profile on page 28.
ETEC	Performance Management Plan for the Energy Technology Engineering Center	August 1, 2002	Budget profile on page 9. Footer on cover page labeled "ETEC PMP Rev.0 8/1/02."
Fernald	Fernald Environmental Management Project. Fernald Closure Project Performance Management Plan. (Predecisional Draft)	July 22, 2002	Fernald project funding comparison on page 8.
Hanford	Performance Management Plan for the Accelerated Cleanup of the Hanford Site	August 2002	Document number DOE-RL-2002-47 Rev.0.
INEEL	Environmental Management Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory	August 2002	Document number DOE/ID-11006, Funding chart on page 48.
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup	July 24, 2002	Current versus Accelerated Baseline chart on page 31
LLNL	Performance Management Plan for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	August 1, 2002	Cost-savings chart on page 13. Footer on cover page labeled "LLNL PMP Rev.0 8/1/02
Miamisburg (Mound)	Miamisburg Environmental Management Project Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup (Predecisional Draft)	July 31, 2002	Cost and schedule comparison chart on page 21.
Nevada Ops	Performance Management Plan U.S. Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada Operations Office	August 2002	Document Number DOE/NV—831. Funding graph in Appendix B.
Oak Ridge Ops	Oak Ridge Performance Management Plan (Pre-Decisional	August 5,	Accelerated Funding Profile on page 47.

Site or Ops Office	PMP Title	Date	Distinguishing Characteristics
	Draft, Rev. 5)	2002	
Pantex	Environmental Management Performance Management Plan for Accelerating Cleanup of the Pantex Plant	July 24, 2002	Pantex Baseline vs. Accelerated Cleanup FY Budget Profile on page 39.
Sandia	Sandia National Laboratories Performance Management Plan	July 23, 2002	Current vs. Accelerated Baseline graph on page 36. Document contains footer "SNL8_5_PMP12.doc"
Savannah River	Savannah River Site Environmental Management Program Performance Management Plan Volumes 1 &2.	August 1, 2002	Contains header on cover page with Document Number WSRC-RP-2002-00245, Revision 3. However, some pages have headers labeled "Revision 4." These pages contain the date 8/7/01 at the bottom of the page.
Separations Process Research Unit	Performance Management Plan for the Separations Process Research Unit	August 1, 2002	SPRU Budget Profile on page 14. Document contains footer " SPRU PMP Rev.0_8/1/02.
West Valley	West Valley Demonstration Project Performance Management Plan (Predecisional Draft)	July 23, 2002	Cost and Schedule Comparison chart on page 20.
WIPP	Transuranic Waste Performance Management Plan	August 2002	Baseline costs as compared to savings listed on page 58.

PROGRAM ELEMENT B

CLEANUP END STATES/END POINTS

Configuration Control
Cleanup Endpoints Reported in the PMPs

Site/Ops Office	Completion Date
Amchitka	FY 2005
Battelle Columbus (West Jefferson North Site)	end of FY 2006
Brookhaven National Laboratory	end of FY 2008
Energy Technology Engineering Center	2007
Fernald	December 2006
Hanford	2035
Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory	2035
Los Alamos National Laboratory	2015
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore Site	FY 2006
Mound	December 2006
Nevada Operations Office	2027
Oak Ridge Reservation	2015
Pantex	end of FY 2008
Sandia	September 2006
Savannah River Site	2025
Separations Process Research Unit	2014
West Valley	FY 2012
WIPP	2035

Configuration Control
Cleanup Endpoints for Sites that Did Not Submit PMPs (Dates from Gold Chart)

Ops Office	Site	Completion Date
ID*	Maxey Flats Disposal Site	2003
NV	Salmon Site	2003
OK	Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research	2005
AL	Kansas City Plant	2006
OH	Ashtabula Environmental Management Project	2006
OK	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	2006
OK	Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	2006
RF	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site	2006
OK	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory - Site 300	2008
CH	Argonne National Laboratory - East	2009
NV	Central Nevada Test Area	2010
NV	Project Shoal Area	2010
NV	Rio Blanco Site	2010
ID	Atlas Site	2011
NV	Rulison Site	2012
NV	Gasbuggy Site	2014
NV	Gnome-Coach Site	2014
OK	General Electric Vallecitos Nuclear Center	2014
PO	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant	2025
NV	Tonopah Test Range Area	2027
PA	Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant	2030

* Although DOE's former Pinellas Plant (now the Young Rainey STAR Center) has been declared complete, a letter of intent was signed in 2002 committing to "accelerating completion of active remedial activities, and implementation of long-term environmental stewardship at the Young Rainey STAR Center by the end of 2010, and possibly as early as the end of 2007, from the currently scheduled date of 2014."

Configuration Control
Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints Reported in Performance Management Plans (PMPs)

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
Amchitka	FY 2003	Completion of subsurface groundwater modeling and risk assessment
	FY 2005	CRESP independent assessment and DOE groundwater model verification completed
Battelle Columbus (West Jefferson North Site)	end of calendar year 2002	Ship TRU waste to RL-Hanford
	end of FY 2006	Site completion including demolition of buildings and remediation of radiological contamination.
Brookhaven National Laboratory	3rd Quarter FY 2005	Completion of groundwater and soil cleanup projects
	4th Quarter FY 2008	D&D of HFBR
	end of FY 2008	Completion of EM Program at Brookhaven
Energy Technology Engineering Center	June 30, 2003	Ship TRU offsite
	September 30, 2005	Complete RMHF D&D
	2007	Complete soil remediation and install groundwater remediation system, completion of cleanup program.
Fernald	September 2004	Complete disposition of remaining low level waste and mixed waste.
	June 2005	Complete waste pits remedial action
	June 2005	Eliminate treatment requirement, and transport waste from Silo 3 to Envirocare
	May 2006	Complete treatment of Silos 1&2 waste and transport via rail to Envirocare
	December 2006	Complete soil excavation and on-site disposal facility construction
	December 2006	Install needed infrastructure for Great Miami Aquifer restoration

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
	December 2006	Complete facility D&D and disposal of D&D debris–site closure
Hanford	2004	Retrieval and closure of 5 tanks
	2005	Complete PFP deinventory
	2006	Complete removal of K Basin SNF, Sludge, Debris, and Water
	2006	Retrieve, assay, and disposition 15,000 drums of buried suspect TRU
	2009	Demolish PFP
	2010	Complete initial tank farm retrieval and closure.
	2012	Complete Columbia River Corridor cleanup
	2012	Complete groundwater remediation of high-risk waste sites
	2015	Disposition all contact-handled legacy TRU
	2021	Complete off-site shipment and disposition of Cs/Sr.
	2028	Complete HLW Tank Treatment
	2033	Complete shipment of IHLW to repository
	2033	All spent nuclear fuel shipped to repository
	2033	Complete DST tank farm closure
	2033	All tank farms closed
	2035	Completion of EM Cleanup Mission
Idaho	December 2002	Complete construction of Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant
	September 2003	Complete cleaning and grouting of first pillar and panel vaulted tank
	2004	Complete Pit 9 retrieval demonstration
	2005	Remediate PBF, CFA, TAN (except groundwater plumes)
	2005	Consolidate SNF from TAN to INTEC

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
	December 2006	Complete cleaning and grouting of the remaining pillar and panel vaulted tanks
	September 2008	Complete construction and readiness review of sodium-bearing waste treatment facility.
	2009	Cease on-site low level waste disposal
	2009	Package and ship all EM SNM off-site
	2012	Complete transfer of SNF from wet to dry storage
	September 2012	Close remaining tank farm tanks
	2012	Treat and ship sodium bearing tank farm waste offsite
	2012	Complete remote-handled TRU shipments offsite
	2012	Consolidate EM activities to INTEC and RWMC
	2012	Reduce EM footprint by 51%
	2020	Coordinate and complete soil remediation at tank farms
	2020	Complete construction of HLW calcine retrieval and packaging facility
	2020	Complete site-wide remediation
	January 1, 2035	Complete SNF shipments to repository
	2035	Retrieve, stabilize, package and ship calcine
Los Alamos National Laboratory	2007	Complete all groundwater protection measures and monitoring
	2008	Complete corrective actions at the highest priority Material Disposal Areas (landfills)
	2010	Dispose of all legacy waste
	2015	Complete corrective actions at the 7 remaining watersheds
	2015	Environmental restoration complete–transfer all maintenance and monitoring activities to NNSA

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore Site	FY 2006	Ship TRU waste off-site
	FY 2006	Complete groundwater remediation network
	FY 2006	Complete disposition of mixed and low-level waste currently in inventory
	FY 2006	Transfer program to NNSA
Mound	August 2005	Complete soil remediation of key Potential Release Sites (PRS)
	June 2006	Complete D&D of last 6 buildings
	December 2006	Site Closure
Nevada Operations Office	2006	Complete all Off-sites surface closures
	2007	Complete disposition of all current legacy TRU materials/waste
	2008	Complete closure of all industrial sites
	2010	Complete all soils corrective actions activities
	2014	Complete all Offsites subsurface closures
	2021	NTS disposal capability remains open to other sites
	2027	Complete all Underground Test Area activities (predict contaminant boundaries)
Oak Ridge Reservation	2004	ETTP: Complete K 29/31/33 decommissioning for re-use
	2005	Melton Valley : Ship legacy waste for offsite disposal
	2005	ETTP: Dispose of legacy waste
	2006	Melton Valley :Compete remedial actions, site closure
	2008	ETTP: Complete Zone 1 and Zone 2 cleanup
	2008	ETTP: Dispose of empty DUF6 cylinders, overpack and transport full and heel cylinders offsite.
	2008	Closure of ETTP

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
	2008	Complete cleanup of David Witherspoon 901 and 1630 Sites in Knoxville and the Atomic City Auto Parts site in Oak Ridge.
	2015	Cleanup of Y-12 main plant area (UEFPC watershed) to allow industrial use.
	2015	Clean up the Y-12 waste disposal area (Bear Creek Valley watershed) to abate on-going releases and restrict access to burial ground areas.
	2015	Demolish facilities in the EM Program at Y-12 and Bethel Valley.
	2015	Complete cleanup of the ORNL main plant area (Bethel Valley watershed) for industrial use at the main plant, reactor sites, and all other industrial areas, and for unrestricted use elsewhere.
	2015	Complete entire scope
Pantex	April 2006	Complete interim soil clean up measures
	October 2006	Complete Ogallala Aquifer groundwater remediation
	May 2007	Complete facility D&D and footprint reduction
	September 2007	Complete remediation of Perched Aquifer
	end of FY 2008	Completion of remediation activities
Sandia	April 2004	Regulatory closure process for radioactive waste landfill complete.
	February 2005	CMI complete for chemical waste landfill
	March 2005	CMI complete for mixed waste landfill
	April 2004	Regulatory closure process for classified waste landfill complete.
	August 2006	Complete all closure activities for mixed waste and chemical waste landfills
	August 2006	Complete remaining work for closure of SNL cleanup project–complete all sites

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
	September 2006	Complete all environmental restoration activities related to drains and septic systems
	September 2006	Complete all environmental restoration groundwater activities
Savannah River Site	2006 to 2007	Close F Canyon
	2009	Complete shipment of all Low-Activity TRU waste to WIPP
	2010	Complete closure of CIF
	2012	Close H Canyon
	2013	Complete shipment of all High-Activity TRU waste to WIPP
	2014	Complete operation of existing H-Area facilities
	2016	Complete shipment of TRU waste to WIPP
	2019	Operate new Pu facility
	2019	Complete processing legacy Pu
	2019	Complete HLW processing
	2019	Complete shipments of HLW canisters to federal repository
	2020	Complete disposition of legacy spent nuclear fuel, turn over to NNSA for final disposition
	2020	Cease operation of L Basin
	2020	Close all HLW tanks
	2024	Complete facility disposition
	2025	Complete remediation of all waste sites
	2025	Complete D&D efforts
Separations Process Research Unit	2007	Complete clean up and release of 90% (about 22 acres) of potentially impacted SPRU land areas, return them to Office of Naval Reactors, SNR
	2007	Complete groundwater cleanup

Site/Ops Office	Cleanup Endstates/Endpoints	Criteria that Define Completion
	2011	Ship TRU waste offsite
	2014	Complete characterization, cleanup and demolition of SPRU buildings, remediate remaining 10% land areas. Transfer remaining 10% land area to Office of Naval Reactors, SNR.
	2014	All cleanup activities completed and site returned to Office of Naval Reactors, SNR–Project Completion
West Valley	FY 2004	Complete decontamination activities
	December 2004	Complete construction and operational readiness of Remote Handling Waste Facility
	FY 2005	Begin decommissioning
	FY 2012	Decommissioning complete, project completion
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	April 2003	Increase WIPP capability to receive 100 TRUPACT-IIs and/or HalfPACTs per week.
	Second Quarter, FY 2005	First receipt of RH-TRU waste
	FY 2005	HWFP modifications for TRUPACT-III
	FY 2007	Begin shipments of TRUPACT-III.
	2035	Completion of disposal of newly generated TRU waste

PROGRAM ELEMENT E

ANNUAL BASELINE COST

OMB A-11 Project Status Report
(Tabular dollars in thousands. Narrative material in whole dollars.)

Note: This document has been updated concurrent with the development of the FY 2003 OMB Budget Request for the purpose of providing an update on baseline requirements, technical performance, and fee and performance assessment conditions consistent with the Rocky Flats Closure Contract.

1. Title: Rocky Flats Closure Project — 2.a. Project No.:N/A

Location: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado

		Preliminary	Title I Baseline	Current Baseline
3.a.	Date A-E Work Initiated.: (Title I Design Start Scheduled):	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.b.	A-E Work (Titles I & II) Duration:	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.a.	Date physical construction starts:	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.b.	Date Construction Ends (Site Closure):	2010	N/A	2006

		Previous Baseline	Current Baseline
5.	Total Estimated Cost (TEC):	N/A	N/A
6.	Total Project Cost (TPC):	$6.71B[1]	$6.50B[2]

7.a Financial Schedule (Federal Funds):

Fiscal Year	Baseline Requirements*	Appropriations
Prior Years	$1,977,703	$1,776,684
2000	676,262	664,675
2001	662,882	663,675
2002	663,220	664,000
2003	666,697	664,000
2004	666,897	664,000
2005	665,482	664,000
2006	666,657	664,000
2007	72,377	72,377

* These baseline requirements include both historical baseline requirements (PY and FY 2000), the estimated cost of the Rocky Flats Closure Contract (Kaiser-Hill 2006 Closure Project Baseline, Rev. 5, including target incentive fee) and the revised costs for necessary Rocky Flats Field Office Project Support. If the project schedule is accelerated or delayed, the annual profile of requirements -- and the total project cost -- will change.

8. Project Description:

The Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site occupies approximately 6,200 acres in northern Jefferson County, Colorado. The Site was established by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1951 as one of several production plants in the United States' Weapons Complex, and its mission was to manufacture nuclear weapons components. When production activities were ceased, large amounts of plutonium.

[1] Total project cost reported in prior year Project Status Report (300B from FY 2002 Budget Request).

[2] This total project costs reflects actual project costs from FY 1997-2000 (consistent with cost data reported in IPABS-IS and the FY 2002 Congressional Budget Request), the FY 2001-2007 baseline requirements identified in EM's Aug 2001 update to the IPABS-IS (comprised of the 2006 Closure Project Baseline costs, including $340 million of target incentive fee as defined by the closure contract; and Rocky Flats Field Office Project Support). It includes funding for safeguards and security activities. It does *not* include Federal program direction costs.

1. Title: Rocky Flats Closure Project 2.a. Project No.:N/A

Location: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado

---

plutonium compounds and metallic residues remained in the production lines and tanks of many of the 690 facilities on Site. In addition, much of the equipment and portions of the Site were contaminated with radioactive and hazardous materials.

The purpose of this project is to manage the materials on Site, clean up the contamination and waste from the Site's past activities, and cleanup, close and convert the site to beneficial use by the end of calendar year 2006. The overall approach to Site cleanup and closure is comprised of three phases: 1) remove the special nuclear material from the Site, including plutonium residues, metals, oxides and holdup; 2) decontaminate, deactivate (D&D) and demolish all facilities on Site, except those needed for long-term environmental monitoring; and 3) conduct environmental remediation and final Site restoration, including placement of at least one engineered cap, followed by long-term environmental monitoring. Within these three phases, there are four major categories of activity: materials stewardship (including management of special nuclear materials and wastes), facility D&D and closure, environmental restoration, and site support. Ensuring the protection and safety of the worker, public and environment and maintaining security of nuclear weapons information and materials are the primary considerations during cleanup efforts.

---

9. Performance Measurement System Description:

The Department has contracted with Kaiser-Hill, through a cost plus incentive fee contract, for the closure of RFETS. The closure contract, which became effective February 1, 2000, identifies a target schedule for closure (December 2006) and target cost ($3.963B, excluding fee). It also identifies target incentive fee ($340 million). Additional incentives can be earned through accelerated closure and enhanced cost performance. The closure contract is supported by a structured earned value methodology. The contract provides for quarterly incentive fee payments adjusted for performance to date, although all payments are conditional upon final performance assessment at the completion of the project/contract. Specific earned value elements have been identified for each quarter throughout the duration of the project. Earned value will be taken (via budgeted cost of work performed) based on 100 percent completion of the established elements or a quantitative ratio of material shipped offsite. Performance against these elements, as well as total project cost variance, will be major considerations in the Contracting Officer's quarterly calculation of the conditional fee payment.

10. Previous Baselines:

In May 1999 Kaiser-Hill submitted the initial 2006 Closure Project Baseline. That baseline was reviewed by DOE and assessed by an independent firm. Kaiser-Hill subsequently submitted a revision to the 2006 Closure Project Baseline in October, 1999. That baseline was the basis of project execution through June 30, 2000, when the revised 2006 Closure Project Baseline, Rev. 5 (updated to reflect the terms and conditions of the closure contract) was submitted and implemented. The 2006 Closure Project Baseline, Rev. 5 was formally reviewed by the Department and comments were transmitted to Kaiser-Hill in September, 2000. The resultant adjustments are tracked through a formal change control process. Additionally, the Department and Kaiser-Hill have worked throughout FY 2001 to develop a fully Integrated Closure Project Baseline, that includes the scope of work (i.e. government-furnished services and items) required to be provided by the Department under the closure contract. In the Spring of 2001, the Rocky Flats Field Office teamed with the Office of Engineering and Construction Management to complete an external independent review of the Rocky Flats Integrated Closure Project Baseline (Burns and Roe, June 2001).

OMB A-11 Project Status Report
(Tabular dollars in thousands. Narrative material in whole dollars.)

1. Title: Rocky Flats Closure Project 2.a. Project No.:N/A

Location: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado

PERFORMANCE REPORTING

11. Project Technical Baseline Goals:
This table provides a summary of FY 2001 project performance against those major scope elements identified and tracked as management commitments.

Program Activity	FY 2001 Planned	FY 2001 Projected Progress [3]
Facilities		
Decommissioned (D&D Worksets)	33	31
Waste Shipped for Disposal (m^3)		
Transuranic	1,000	1,099
Mixed Low-Level Waste	110	323
Low Level Waste	5,600	13,000
Nuclear Material Stabilized		
Plutonium residues (kg bulk)	23,668	19,563
Plutonium metals and oxides packaged (# containers)	900	200

Current Performance

These FY 2001 commitments were formally agreed to in mid FY 2001. They differ slightly from the performance measures included in the FY 2001 Congressional Budget Request, as well as the FY 2001 details of the 2006 Closure Project Baseline. In some cases, the commitments are less aggressive than the baseline goals. Although performance projections are provided here for reporting purposes, these are a subset of the metrics used monthly and quarterly to assess contract performance to date. Additionally, these differ from the earned value elements defined through the contract for use in quarterly fee determinations.

Performance Variance (negatives only):
Materials Stabilized
Residues packaged – The variance is due to: slower than anticipated production rates in the B371 repackaging line and several periods of facility shutdown due to operational/authorization basis issues.

Pu metals and oxides packaged – The start up of the plutonium stabilization and packaging systems (PuSPS) was delayed from a baseline goal of November 2000 to June 14, 2001 due to a number of technical issues (many related to the quality of the weld on the 3013 container). As a result, the total number of 3013 containers packaged is less than planned.

Waste Management
Mixed low-level waste (MLLW) disposed – Currently, the only commercial sites are available for disposal of MLLWe. Because efforts are ongoing to site DOE facilities for receipt of MLLW, MLLW disposal was deliberately deferred to avail resources for other priority closure activities. The deferral to later years in the project should avail more cost effective disposal through the use of DOE facilities.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Given the nature of the Rocky Flats project, the evolution of the closure baselines, and the terms of the closure contract, it is not useful to present full life-cycle performance reporting. Rather, performance reporting is focused on the current contract scope and baseline – spanning the period from February 1, 2000 (contract effective date) through project closure.

[3] Performance projections reflect KH's FY 01 EAC through July 01.

OMB A-11 Project Status Report
(Tabular dollars in thousands. Narrative material in whole dollars.)

1. Title: Rocky Flats Closure Project 2.a. Project No.:N/A

Location: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, Colorado

---

12. Cost Baseline Goals:

With the transition to the closure contract and the revised 2006 Closure Project Baseline, Rev. 5, project variances under the previous baseline were reconciled in mid-FY 2000. Under the current baseline, the project was on cost (0% CV)through August 2001.

---

13. Schedule Baseline Goals:

With the transition to the closure contract and the revised 2006 Closure Project Baseline, Rev. 5, project variances under the previous baseline were reconciled in mid-FY 2000. Under the current baseline, the project was slightly behind schedule (-3% SV) through August 2001.

TOTAL PROJECT C 'C) REPORT
Based on Final M. , Submittal
EW-05 Defense Facilities Closure Plan

		FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	TOTAL FF PMB
PBS01	BCWS	23,587,395	33,264,487	32,600,184	28,999,882	26,027,332	19,293,004	4,808,851	168,581,135
		23,587,396	33,264,487	32,600,184	28,999,882	26,027,332	19,293,004	4,808,851	168,581,135
PBS02	BCWS	11,477,768	20,372,840	17,256,402	39,172,966	9,725,467	16,945,190	12,167,002	127,117,635
		11,477,768	20,372,840	17,256,402	39,172,966	9,725,467	16,945,190	12,167,002	127,117,635
PBS03	BCWS	11,298,210	19,680,675	15,945,488	20,502,613	20,856,763	24,636,586	3,103,455	116,023,790
		11,298,210	19,680,675	15,945,486	20,502,613	20,856,763	24,636,586	3,103,455	116,023,790
PBS04	BCWS	15,401,329	18,138,602	16,904,598	17,315,299	17,009,374	20,243,856	15,120,364	120,133,422
		15,401,329	18,138,602	16,904,598	17,315,299	17,009,374	20,243,856	15,120,364	120,133,422
PBS05	BCWS	44,589,775	51,615,218	53,966,124	57,040,456	34,944,910	0	0	242,156,483
		44,589,775	51,615,218	53,966,124	57,040,456	34,944,910	0	0	242,156,483
PBS06	BCWS	4,753,356	17,231,828	14,390,894	17,510,167	41,890,582	24,642,752	28,430,066	148,849,645
		4,753,366	17,231,828	14,390,894	17,510,167	41,890,582	24,642,752	28,430,066	148,849,645
PBS07	BCWS	19,584,741	56,980,010	73,894,261	61,452,003	88,120,202	46,132,688	342,986	346,506,891
		19,584,741	56,980,010	73,894,261	61,452,003	88,120,202	46,132,688	342,986	346,506,891
PBS08	BCWS	7,836,062	6,415,538	0	0	0	0	0	14,251,600
		7,836,062	6,415,538	0	0	0	0	0	14,251,600
PBS10	BCWS	1,477,246	3,188,582	5,163,979	4,160,147	3,109,322	1,765,084	134,581	18,998,941
		1,477,246	3,188,582	5,163,979	4,160,147	3,109,322	1,765,084	134,581	18,998,941
PBS11	BCWS	17,458,898	20,426,216	26,451,076	11,166,242	7,035,382	3,871,288	223,519	86,632,621
		17,458,898	20,426,216	26,451,076	11,166,242	7,035,382	3,871,288	223,519	86,632,621
PBS12	BCWS	40,647,442	48,422,931	39,248,604	38,711,657	44,038,496	38,337,111	34,821,618	284,227,859
		40,647,442	48,422,931	39,248,604	38,711,657	44,038,496	38,337,111	34,821,618	284,227,859
TOTAL	BCWS	198,112,222	295,736,927	295,821,610	296,031,432	292,757,830	195,867,559	99,152,442	1,673,480,022
TOTAL	EW-05 BASELINE	198,112,222	295,736,927	295,821,610	296,031,432	292,757,830	195,867,559	99,152,442	1,673,480,022
Safeguards and Security	BCWS	3,557,584	4,654,478	4,001,410	3,944,975	4,110,756	4,216,130	1,087,315	25,572,648
TOTAL	FS-40 BCWS	3,557,584	4,654,478	4,001,410	3,944,975	4,110,756	4,216,130	1,087,315	25,572,648
TOTAL	EW-05 AND FS-40	201,669,806	300,391,405	299,823,020	299,976,407	296,868,586	200,083,689	100,239,757	1,699,052,670
Management Reserve									78,303,807
Fluor Fernald Risk Based Contingency @ 50% Confidence Level									511,027,422
[redacted]		[redacted]							

Rev 0 12/17/02

TOTAL PROJECT ...PC) REPORT
Based on Final M... ...le Submittal
EW-05 Defense Facilities Closure Plan

		FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	TOTAL FF PMB
DOE COSTS									
PBS01	Utilities	3,221,000	3,842,500	4,647,000	4,046,000	2,062,000	1,483,000	1,520,000	20,821,500
		3,221,000	3,842,500	4,647,000	4,046,000	2,062,000	1,483,000	1,520,000	20,821,500
PBS02	D&D	0	0	0	0	0	26,528,877	1,057,860	27,586,737
		0	0	0	0	0	26,528,877	1,057,860	27,586,737
PBS04	Aquifer Rest	0	0	0	0	150,144	350,216	325,372	825,732
		0	0	0	0	150,144	350,216	325,372	825,732
PBS05	Waste Pits	11,420,000	12,653,512	14,737,056	15,031,529	8,869,016	0	0	62,711,113
		11,420,000	12,653,512	14,737,056	15,031,529	8,869,016	0	0	62,711,113
PBS06	Soils	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	6,972,791	6,974,791
		2,000	0	0	0	0	0	6,972,791	6,974,791
PBS08	Nuclear Materials	1,496,000	2,772,000	636,000	150,000	0	0	0	5,054,000
		1,496,000	2,772,000	636,000	150,000	0	0	0	5,054,000
PBS10	Mixed Waste	73,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	73,000
		73,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	73,000
PBS11	Waste Mgmt	2,241,000	1,256,000	2,251,622	303,507	0	0	0	6,052,129
		2,241,000	1,256,000	2,251,622	303,507	0	0	0	6,052,129
PBS12	DOE Support	2,229,000	4,329,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	26,558,000
		2,229,000	4,329,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	26,558,000
DOE Costs	Total	20,682,000	24,853,012	26,271,678	23,531,036	15,081,160	32,362,093	13,876,023	156,657,002
Risk Budget on DOE Costs									45,940,099
DOE Risk Based Contingency									188,736,838
FEE		9,917,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	53,299,221	151,716,221
		9,917,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000	53,299,221	151,716,221
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOG		0	395,157	9,462,755	12,115,919	16,370,158	8,291,868	3,710,053	50,345,910
CLOSURE ACTIVITIES									0
		0	395,157	9,462,755	12,115,919	16,370,158	8,291,868	3,710,053	50,345,910
TOTAL PROJECT COST		232,268,806	343,339,674	353,257,453	363,323,362	346,019,904	256,437,650	171,125,054	2,881,779,969

** Fee calculation based on baseline schedule plus two year schedule risk. The fee for the two year schedule risk is included in FY07.

PROGRAM ELEMENT F

LIFE-CYCLE COST

FY 2002 EM Life-Cycle Costs at the Office Level in Thousands of Constant 2002 Dollars

Office	Life Cycle Total	FY 1997 - FY 2002 Actuals Total	FY 2003 - FY 2070 Total
Albuquerque	3,036,211	1,420,588	1,615,624
Carlsbad	6,677,328	1,118,785	5,558,544
Chicago	1,136,175	300,577	835,599
D&D Fund	4,596,655	2,421,812	2,174,843
Headquarters	3,510,431	445,540	3,064,892
Idaho	19,368,691	2,586,350	16,782,341
Nevada	3,449,592	461,565	2,988,027
Ohio	6,928,919	2,973,940	3,954,978
Oakland	1,164,858	513,422	651,436
Oak Ridge	8,380,632	2,793,102	5,587,529
Paducah	1,390,856	359,986	1,030,870
Program Direction	8,724,870	2,161,369	6,563,501
Portsmouth	4,871,841	425,634	4,446,207
Rocky Flats	7,737,415	3,835,672	3,901,743
Richland	22,979,819	4,336,538	18,643,281
River Protection	35,275,226	3,137,576	32,137,650
Savannah River	30,360,522	7,151,498	23,209,024
Science & Technology	3,221,327	1,570,965	1,650,362
Uranium/Thorium	470,854	246,125	224,728
Subtotal	**173,282,223**	**38,261,043**	**135,021,180**
Offsets	**5,380,201**	**2,421,812**	**2,958,389**
Grand Total	**167,902,022**	**35,839,231**	**132,062,791**
Uncertainty	**33,962,389**		
Total Environmental Liability (as reflected in the Department's FY 2002 Financial Statement)	**201,864,411**		

PROGRAM ELEMENT H

WIPP TRANSPORTATION SCHEDULE

BASELINE SHIPMENTS PER MO[illegible] FROM JULY 02 THROUGH FY04 (Rev.0)

09/30/2	CL (RH)	ETEC (RH)	ANL-E	HANF	IN	LANL	LBNL	[illegible]	MURR	NTS	ORNL	RF	SRS	MOUND	Total Ship	[illegible]ekly Ship
Jul-[illegible]					57							39	1		97	25
Aug-02				1	61							28	8		98	25
Sep-02				1	60	1						30	8	1	100	25
Oct-02					77	3			1[a]			38	2		121	31
Nov-02	6		3[b]		39[d]	2						28	12		90	23
Dec-02	3	3	4			2						28	12		52	13
Jan-03			2			3						36	12	1	53	14
Feb-03			2			5				8[f]		28[g]	12	1	55	14
Mar-03	2			1	3[e]	9		2[c]		8		28	12	1	65	17
Apr-03	4			1	55[e]	9		4		8		32	12	1	125	32
May-03	2			1	55[e]	12		4		12		28	12	2	126	32
Jun-03	1			2	55[e]	12				8		30	12		120	30
Jul-03				2	55	12						32	12		113	29
Aug-03				2	55	12						28	12		109	28
Sep-03			3	1	55	12						28	12		111	28
Oct-03				4	75	13		4				34	12		142	36
Nov-03				4	75	14		4				26	12		135	34
Dec-03				4	75	14		4				26	12		135	34
Jan-04				4	75	14						30	12		135	34
Feb-04				8	75	14					9	28	12		146	37
Mar-04				8	75	14					9	28	12		146	37
Apr-04				8	75	14					9	32	12		150	38
May-04				8	75	14					9	28	12		146	37
Jun-04				8	75	14	1				9	30	12		149	38
Jul-04				8	75	14					9	28	12		146	37
Aug-04				8	75	14					10	28	12		147	37
Sep-04				8	75	14					10	28	12		147	37
Total Site Ship	18	3	14	92	1527	261	1	22	1	44	74	807	295	7	3159	

Yellow Boxes indicate intersite shipments. BCL, ETEC, LBNL, LLNL intersite shipments will be shipped to Hanford. LRRI and future SNL shipments will be shipped to LANL. MURR will ship to ANL-E. MOUND is shipping to SRS by rail (no impact on WIPP resources - ie., TRUPACTS, drivers, trucks, trailers).

In the weekly shipping column, the green numbers denote shipments that can be supported by WIPP. The red numbers indicate that shipments exceed WIPP current facility capabilities at greater than 100 TRUPACTs through the facility.

All applicable facilities have signed up to this shipping schedule.

Notes:

a. The CCP currently operating at ANL-E must be fully certified for CH TRU debris waste and ANL-E must receive the required Illinois EPA RCRA permit modification prior to MURR shipping to ANL-E.

b. The CCP at ANL-E must receive certification and approval from CBFO prior to ANL-E shipping to WIPP.

c. Assumptions: (1) WM PEIS ROD Amended, (2) Hanford Acceptance (ie., Finalize negotiations w/ Washington State), (3) Schedule shipping based on recent meeting w/ OAK/CBFO/RL (8/27/02)

d. Nov-02 projected shipments include contingent shipments that have no associated volume

e. Assumes AMWTP receives certifcation authority by March '03

f. The current NNSA/NV TRU Project Baseline budget does not support meeting the accelerated schedule

g. Feb-03 decision point on shipping plan dependent on inventory availability

December 17, 2002, REV 0

STANDING OPERATING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT CHANGE CONTROL PROCESS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE)
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (EM)
Standing Operating Policies and Procedures (SOPP)

Title: Resource Management Configuration Management Change Control Process for the Environmental Management (EM) Program

SOPP: RM 1.1	**Revision Number:** 1	**Effective Date:** December 17, 2002	
Author: Roger Butler			**Page:** 1 of 12

1. POLICY:

a. The Environmental Management (EM) program elements and documents defined as essential for monitoring the scope, schedule, and cost of the EM Program at the Headquarters (HQ) level will be managed and controlled through an EM-1 configuration control board.

2. OBJECTIVES:

a. To develop and institutionalize a management system that assures the proper definition, coordination, evaluation, and disposition of all proposed changes to the program elements under HQ configuration control.

b. To develop and institutionalize a process for the planning, execution, and control of the fiscal year ***non-labor*** financial resources provided to EM-HQ organizations.

3. APPLICABILITY:

a. The provisions of this procedure will apply to all EM HQ and Field organizations responsible for the execution of the EM Program.

4. REFERENCES:

a. A Review of the Environmental Management Program, February 4, 2002

b. DOE O 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets, dated October 13, 2000

c. Memorandum from Jessie Hill Roberson, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, to Distribution Regarding Configuration Control Board (CCB), dated December 19, 2002

5. **CONTACT:**

   a. Roger Butler, Office of Policy, Planning and Budget (EM-10), (202) 586-8754, roger.butler@em.doe.gov

6. **DEFINITIONS:**

   a. **Baseline Change Proposal (BCP):** The documentation required to provide a complete description of the proposed change(s) and its resulting impact(s) to the existing baseline information.

   b. **Configuration Control Program Elements:** An organized set of elements and documents, identified by the Configuration Control Board (CCB) and approved by EM-1, to be managed and controlled.

   c. **EM HQ Configuration Control:** A management system designed to identify, control and document changes that affect selected elements and documents.

   d. **Non-labor Dollar Resources:** Any dollar resources not otherwise identified for Federal salaries and benefits.

7. **REQUIREMENTS:**

   a. Monitoring

      i. EM-1 will periodically designate an EM manager to perform a limited review of Board actions (to include observing Board meeting(s)) with the express purpose of assessing Board effectiveness and reporting the assessments to EM-1.

ii. The CCB shall provide EM-1 with a semiannual report that includes a summary of the changes made to the EM Program as a result of actions of the Board, and any recommendations concerning changes to the CCB Charter.

b. Records

i. The Board (through the Board Secretary) and the EM-10 organization will maintain appropriate hard copy and electronic files representing all planning and execution activities of the Board. Files will include, but not be limited to, Board agendas, minutes with CCB decisions and actions, current control copies of the program element documents under configuration control, lists of locations and contacts for all controlled documents, BCPs, organizational cost reports, management reserve reports, etc.

c. Training

i. None at this time.

8. ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. **The Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM-1)**

i. Formulates a Charter.

ii. Gives final approval to the dollar amount to be baselined for EM-HQ organizations for the fiscal year.

iii. Gives final approval for the EM Program elements and documents to be controlled by the CCB.

iv. Renders decisions on appeals to Board actions.

b. **Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Budget (EM-10)**

i. Coordinates any necessary analysis of change proposal prior to the proposal's consideration by the Board.

ii. Facilitates the integration of configuration-related activities of associate organizations and other deliberative bodies.

iii. Coordinates EM-HQ organization fiscal year needs for non-labor related activities. Coordinates input with EM-1 prior to submission to the Board. Develops and maintains a monthly reporting mechanism to monitor cost status relative to the approved baseline.

c. **Configuration Control Board**

i. Identifies and recommends to EM-1 the program elements and documents and their characteristics for configuration control.

ii. Maintains the integrity of controlled program elements and documents by assuring that proposed changes are documented, evaluated, and considered at the proper level for acceptance or rejection.

iii. Maintains the integrity of the established EM-HQ non-labor resource's baseline and facilitates the timely disposition of proposed baseline changes.

d. **Configuration Control Board Secretary**

i. Maintains appropriate hard copy and electronic files representing all planning and execution activities of the Board.

e. **EM-HQ Organizations**

i. Provide detailed information as requested in support of EM-HQ fiscal year resource needs. Prepare necessary documentation to support proposed baseline changes and present/define proposed changes to the Board.

ii. Provide HQ sponsor for HQ change proposal or HQ point of contact (POC) for field requests to change program elements and documents within the scope of the CCB.

iii. Initiate change proposals for activities under HQ responsibility, and assure that adequate documentation for justification of change is developed prior to submittal of request for change to the CCB.

f. **EM-Field Organizations**

i. Initiate change proposals for activities under Field responsibility and assures that adequate documentation for justification of change is developed prior to submittal of request for change to the CCB.

9. PROCEDURES:

a. **The Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM-1):**

i. Formulates a charter to establish an EM Program Configuration Control Board (Board).

(1) The Charter will identify the membership and size of the Board and provide for:

(a) a Board Secretary
(b) the term of appointment of members
(c) provision for appointment by EM-1 of the chair
(d) scope of program elements and documents to be under Board's control
(e) range of cost, schedule, and circumstances to trigger the need for board action (as applicable)
(f) quorum and voting rules
(g) frequency and/or schedule for regular meetings
(h) provisions (as needed) for emergency meetings
(i) specifics on use of a management reserve account and guidelines for use thereof
(j) right of appeal to EM-1 by an EM-HQ organization relative to a Board decision
(k) Board acts as final decision maker on matters presented to the Board except as otherwise provided for in this SOPP.

ii. Gives final approval to program elements that are to be placed under configuration control.

iii. Gives final approval to the dollar amount to be baselined for EM-HQ organizations for the fiscal year.

iv. Acts on Board actions on which an EM organization exercises an appeal of a Board decision.

b. **Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Budget (EM-10):**

i. Solicits from the EM-HQ organizations specific input relative to the fiscal year needs for non-labor related activities.

ii. Subsequent to final approval by EM-1 of total dollar levels, develops for the Boards consideration a proposed baseline of specific activities (by EM-HQ organization) to be executed for the fiscal year in support of the EM mission; the proposal will be developed based on the EM-1 approved final location on non-labor dollar resources for the fiscal year.

iii. Reviews the proposed non-labor resource baseline with EM-1 prior to submitting to the Board for action.

iv. Submits a proposed baseline to the EM-HQ Configuration Control Board for official baselining prior to the start of the fiscal year.

v. Receives configuration control requests from field and provide for analysis of change proposals prior to their submittal for consideration by the Board.

vi. Develops and maintains required monthly reporting mechanism for use by organizations and the Board sufficient to monitor cost status relative to the approved baseline.

vii. Prepares annual report of the Configuration Control Management System.

c. **Configuration Control Board:**

i. Conducts meetings as directed in the Charter.

ii. As necessary, the Board and the Board Secretary will collaborate to develop the applicable, recommended thresholds (i.e., dollars, scope, circumstances, etc.) for EM-1 consideration that will become the basis for an organization to request a baseline change proposal.

iii. As necessary, the Board will present to EM-1 for approval the specific proposed thresholds and circumstance, to be used by the Board prior to being adopted and used by the Board.

iv. Clearly articulates to the EM-HQ organizations how the Reserve account is to be established and how resources emanating from Board actions will flow into/out of the Management Reserve account.

v. Periodically (i.e., quarterly or at some other time interval to be determined by the Board) conducts a review of the resources managed by each EM-HQ organization to determine trends and obligation/cost patterns to ascertain whether, given the point in time and other circumstances, excess dollars exist that could or should be re-baselined to the Management Reserve account for use on other priority needs.

vi. The Board Chair will officially annotate approval or disapproval of each BCP package on which the Board acts and will timely notify the affected organization.

vii. Documents a process for use by any organization that opts to pursue appeal to EM-1 of a Board Decision. The process will provide for balance and the presentation of salient points.

viii. Carries out other duties not described herein as required for the timely and effective management of EM-HQ allocated dollar resources.

d. **Board Secretary:**

i. Consults with the Board Chair on setting a specific Board schedule for the entire fiscal year and communicates that schedule to each Board member and the EM organizations.

ii. Makes timely notification to EM organizations of the date/times for any emergency or any other ad hoc meeting deemed necessary by the Board.

iii. In conjunction with the Board Chair, develops the necessary, standard documentation for organizations to use in proposing change actions for the Board's consideration.

iv. Coordinates with the various EM-HQ and Field organizations to ensure timely receipt of proposed baseline change proposals (BCP) and accompanying materials and ensure timely distribution of materials to Board members in advance of Board meetings.

v. As necessary, the Board and the Board Secretary will collaborate to develop the applicable, recommended thresholds (i.e., dollars, scope, circumstances, etc.) for EM-1 consideration that will become the basis for an organization to request a baseline change proposal.

vi. Prepares an agenda for each Board meeting and obtains Board Chair approval prior to meeting. The Board Secretary will distribute agenda to Board members along with baseline change proposal documents to be considered at the next Board meeting. The agenda will also be provided to EM-HQ and Field organizations.

vii. Maintains an accounting for all records that relate to the Management Reserve account; the Board Secretary will provide a documented Management Reserve account status to the Board prior to each meeting.

viii. Prepares and distributes timely minutes of the pertinent actions from each Board meeting to the Board and the EM organizations.

ix. Carries out other duties not described herein as required for the timely and effective management of EM-HQ configuration management control system.

e. **EM HQ and Field Organizations:**

i. At the request of EM-10, provide additional information including analysis of proposed changes to program elements.

ii. At the direction of EM-10, provide detail on requested non-labor dollar resources for the coming fiscal year and be prepared to defend the request.

iii. Provide to the Board Secretary required baseline change documentation required by the Board.

iv. Present to the Board, as required, the detail justification for change control actions requested. At the Board's discretion, required justification may be orally presented to supplement narrative justification.

v. Comply with the decision(s) of the Board with regard to actions taken on applicable change control requests.

vi. Exercise Charter provision to appeal Board decision to EM-1 if compelling reason exists.

10. APPENDICES:

a. EM Headquarters Configuration Control Board Charter

Approving Official: Jessie Hill Roberson

Jessie Hill Roberson
Assistant Secretary
Office of Environmental Management

Date: February 3, 2003

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT – HEADQUARTERS CONFIGURATION CONTROL BOARD CHARTER

December 17, 2002

I. Purpose/Scope

The purpose of this Charter is to establish the Office of Environmental Management (EM) Headquarters (HQ) Configuration Control Board (CCB) management system for the EM Program. The CCB is designated and chartered by the Assistant Secretary for EM to ensure the proper definition, coordination, evaluation, and disposition of all proposed changes to the program elements under HQ configuration control. This system also documents all requests for changes, justification for changes, and final decisions concerning changes.

The scope of this Charter applies to all program elements and documents that are essential for monitoring the scope, schedule, and cost at the EM Headquarters level. The elements listed below, and the program variables they reflect, are included within the scope of this Charter.

A.	Performance Management Plans	Site strategy document
B.	Cleanup end states/end points	Criteria that define completion
C.	EM Corporate Performance Metrics (Gold Chart)	Schedule and life-cycle scope
D.	Performance Measures/Performance Incentives	Incentives to accomplish work
E.	Annual baseline cost	Cost
F.	Life-cycle cost	Cost
G.	Project Baseline Summary Structure	Budget Structure
H.	WIPP transportation baseline	Key Disposal Interface

The EM site end states, baselines, performance measures and performance objective/incentives must all be aligned and linked to the EM Performance Management Plans and must reflect those expectations and outcomes that are critical to the successful accomplishment of the EM mission.

II. Authority

The Board is constituted by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM-1) as a decision-making entity. Decisions rendered by the Board are final except as set forth in the Standing Operating Policies and Procedures (SOPP) document (RM 1.1) entitled "Configuration Management Change Control Process for the Environmental Management Program". This exception provides for the appeal of any Board decision to EM-1 by an EM-HQ or Field organization when there is a compelling reason to do so.

A. **Authority and Responsibility**

The beginning values for the program elements (Rev 0) shall be approved by the CCB. Any subsequent changes to these elements require either concurrence or approval of the CCB. A designated sponsor must represent all proposed changes from the requesting organization. The Secretary will notify the change request sponsor within one business day after the decision by the CCB on the proposed change.

Except as set forth in the SOPP document (RM 1.1) entitled "Configuration Management Change Control Process for the Environmental Management Program," the Operations Office/Field Office responsibilities are defined by the Operations Office/Field Office and are not covered in this Charter.

B. **Traceability**

Traceability of all EM HQ CCB actions and decisions will be maintained by the CCB Secretary and recorded on the EM Baseline Change Proposal (BCP) Form.

III. Membership

The Change Control Board (Board) membership will consist of three EM-HQ members appointed by EM-1 to a one-year term coinciding with the fiscal year. Any member may, at the discretion of EM-1, be reappointed for an additional one-year term(s). Board members will be selected from the EM-HQ organizations and will be a Deputy Assistant Secretary, an Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, an Office Director (EM-5, EM-6, EM-7), or the Chief Operating Officer.

The Board Secretary (Secretary) will be appointed by EM-1 to a one-year term coinciding with the fiscal year. The Secretary may, at the discretion of EM-1, be reappointed for an additional one-year term(s). The Secretary may be either an EM-HQ organization or an individual and will be at the discretion of EM-1.

The Board Chair (Chair) will be named by EM-1 from the three member Board appointed by EM-1. The Chair will serve a one-year term coinciding with the fiscal year and may, at the discretion of EM-1, be named to serve as the Chair for an additional one-year term(s).

IV. Procedures

Board meetings may take place provided a minimum of two members are present. Decisions of the Board require a majority vote of the members present. In the event of a tie vote when only two members are present, the proposed action must be reconsidered at a Board meeting when the full complement of members are in attendance.

The Board will schedule 12 meetings each fiscal year – one each calendar month, the specific date of each to be determined and published by the Board. As required by special circumstances, the Board may schedule emergency meetings ensuring that proper notification of such emergency meetings is provided to both Board members and the EM-HQ and Field organizations. Emergency meetings will not take the place of a scheduled monthly meeting.

As necessary, the Board will articulate, in writing for EM-1 approval, a process for establishing and managing a management reserve account. Once approval is granted, the process will be in effect until such time as either the Board proposes a change to the process or EM-1 directs a change to the established process. The approved process will be provided to Board members and the EM-HQ organizations.

The Board will articulate in writing for EM-1 approval, the proposed dollar thresholds and/or circumstances to be used by both the Board and the EM-HQ organizations to trigger or cause baseline change proposals to be prepared by the organizations and submitted to the Secretary for Board consideration. The thresholds and circumstances approved by EM-1 will remain in effect until such time as either the Board proposes a change or EM-1 directs a change to the thresholds and circumstances.

The Board, Secretary, and the EM-HQ organizations will operate within the parameters set forth in the SOPP (RM 1.1) entitled "Configuration Management Change Control Process for EM Program".

V. Thresholds

Any changes to the program elements and documents under configuration control require either concurrence or approval of the EM CCB. Concurrence is required when the cost goes down, the schedule is accelerated, or when work scope is eliminated and does not appear anywhere else in the EM project. Approval is required for any and all other proposed changes to the baseline.

VI. Reports

The Board, Secretary and EM-10 will provide an annual report to EM-1 that includes a summary of the changes made to the EM Program as a result of actions of the Board, and any recommendations concerning changes to the CCB Charter. Other reports will be developed from time to time as necessary.

VII. Termination

The Board will remain in existence until terminated by the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Environmental Management.