

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ADVISORY BOARD
to the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**United States Department of Energy
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D.C. 20585
September 16, 2016**

PROCEEDINGS

Board members present:

Mr. Paul Dabbar, J.P. Morgan Securities, Inc.
Ms. Jane Hedges, Consultant
Dr. Carolyn Huntoon, Consultant
Dr. Kimberlee Kearfott, University of Michigan
Mr. Frazer Lockhart, Stoller Newport News Nuclear
Ms. Tracey Mustin, Consultant
Ms. Karen Patterson, Consultant
Mr. Josiah Pinkham, Nez Perce Tribe
Ms. Lessie Price, Aiken City Council
Mr. Timothy Runyon, Consultant
Mr. David Swindle Jr., Management Services/AECOM
Mr. Robert J. Thompson, Energy Communities Alliance
Adm. (Ret) Lenn Vincent, Consultant
Ms. Shelley Wilson, SC DHEC, ECOS, NGA

Board members not present:

Dr. Beverly Ramsey, Desert Research Institute

Acting EMAB Designated Federal Officer:

Ms. Elizabeth Davison, DOE-EM

Others present for all or part of the meeting:

Dr. Monica Regalbuto, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
Mr. Mark Whitney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
Mr. Frank Marcinowski, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Regulatory and Policy Affairs
Ms. Joceline Nahigian, Deputy Chief of Staff for Environmental Management
Mr. Bart Barnhart, Director, Office of Infrastructure Management and Disposition Policy
Mr. Rob Seifert, Acting Director, Office of Regulatory, Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement
Mr. Andy Szilagyi, Director, Office of Infrastructure and D&D
Mr. Rick Khan Senior Advisor, DOE-EM
Mr. Jeff Barnett, DOE-EM
Mr. David Borak, DOE-EM
Ms. Michelle Hudson, DOE-EM
Ms. Jennifer McCloskey, DOE-EM
Mr. Jared Bierbach, e-Management

OPENING REMARKS

The Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB or Board) semi-annual public meeting was convened at 9:00 a.m. ET on Friday, September 16, 2016, in Washington, D.C. by EMAB Chair David Swindle, Jr. Mr. Swindle reviewed the meeting agenda and reminded EMAB members to recuse themselves from any discussion topic that presented a conflict of interest.

Mr. Swindle introduced the EMAB members and U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) representatives, and welcomed new EMAB member Mr. Josiah Pinkham. He then recognized the work of outgoing EMAB Designated Federal Officer Kristen Ellis. Ms. Ellis recently transitioned to a new role within EM and is no longer working with the board.

The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). More information about EMAB can be found at <http://energy.gov/em/services/communication-engagement/environmental-management-advisory-board-emab>.

EM PROGRAM UPDATE

Dr. Monica Regalbuto, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, welcomed the Board members and the members of the public to the meeting. She thanked the board members for the time and energy they have spent supporting EM's cleanup efforts and for attending the EM Cleanup Workshop on September 14-15.

Accomplishments and Priorities

Dr. Regalbuto outlined major cleanup accomplishments at Oak Ridge, Savannah River Site (SRS), and Hanford, that had occurred since the board last met, and discussed planned FY 2017 activities and her priorities. She noted the importance of workforce development and her focus on retaining EM leadership and staff.

Technology development (TD) was one of the main themes of the Cleanup Workshop and Dr. Regalbuto described how TD plays a large role in providing safe work environments for EM's contractors and workers. EM is working to better leverage technology development to reduce time and life-cycle costs and improve safety. She discussed the Science of Safety initiative and how it is placing an emphasis on accident prevention in the work EM does.

EM Reorganization

Dr. Regalbuto discussed the details of the recent EM reorganization and what the new changes entailed for the program. She said that there were new three main functional offices:

- Corporate Services led by Ms. Candice Trummell
- Field Operations led by Ms. Stacy Charboneau
- Regulatory and Policy Affairs led by Mr. Frank Marcinowski

The Corporate Services Office oversees budget and planning activities, workforce management, communications, and acquisition and project management.

The Field Operations Office brings together all field execution and oversight functions, including safety, security, and quality assurance programs. Additionally, to further strengthen EM-HQ's ties with the sites, EM created a new set of headquarters-based site liaisons. The new liaisons will have focused responsibility on advocating for Field Offices and working issues on behalf of the field with EM-HQ. Field Operations also includes a new Chief Engineer Office, led by Mr. John Marra, responsible for providing technical engineering support to EM's sites and guidance on major construction and commissioning activities to ensure success.

EM created a new office focused on the pursuit of technologies that have the potential to be "game-changers" across the EM program, to make EM's work even safer, more efficient, and more cost-effective. The office is focusing on Technetium, Mercury, Cesium and Strontium, Tank Closure and Cesium Removal and Worker Safety. Mr. Rod Rimando is leading those efforts as office director. EM has also established a new Savannah River National Laboratory Policy Office, led by Mr. Mark Gilbertson. This office will improve EM's ability to leverage the expertise and experience of its corporate laboratory to provide smart solutions to cleanup challenges not only at Savannah River, but across the whole EM complex.

The new Regulatory and Policy Affairs office will promote complex-wide policy integration and compliance in a number of areas, such as: waste and material disposition; soil and groundwater remediation; D&D activities; and infrastructure planning and investment.

EMAB Current Focus

Dr. Regalbuto discussed changes in focus for EMAB and how she envisions its work going forward. She emphasized the importance of the board's role in supporting the cleanup of EM's sites. She outlined three main focus areas that she requests the board's input: workforce development, critical infrastructure, and excess facilities.

Workforce Development

Dr. Regalbuto said that there is a necessity in being proactive and creative about attracting, training and retaining the next generation cleanup workforce. Many of EM's sites and contractors make contributions to STEM education initiatives in local cleanup communities and help young students gain awareness and interest in science and engineering. She described the program's collaboration with universities and colleges as being a critical priority for EM. She noted the board's last meeting in Aiken, SC, and the visit to the local community college there.

Dr. Regalbuto said that while it is important to look outward to attract new workers, it is equally imperative to look inward at what EM can do to improve the quality of life for EM workers and increase retention. She encouraged the board to work closely with Ms. Junita Turner from the Office of Workforce Management and Ms. Jennifer McCloskey from the Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs. Dr. Regalbuto thanked Ms. Kim Kearfott and Ms. Tracy Mustin for taking the lead on this particular topic.

Critical Infrastructure

Outdated infrastructure and deferred maintenance are major challenges for the Department, and EM needs to address those challenges to ensure smooth operations and to help make cleanup more efficient in the future.

EM's budget plans include investments in facilities and infrastructure to ensure safe, stable environments for our workers, and uninterrupted operations that benefit cleanup and reduce unnecessary workforce fluctuations.

Dr. Regalbuto thanked Mr. Frazer Lockhart and Ms. Kim Kearfott, for spearheading this topic on behalf of the Board.

Excess Facilities

The Department is still in the process of finalizing a report on the list of excess facilities within DOE. Dr. Regalbuto said that she would appreciate the Board's input on how to best prepare for the transfer of these facilities. Under the reorganization, Mr. Bart Barnhart is leading the Office of Infrastructure Management & Disposition Policy. Dr. Regalbuto asked that the Board continue to work with Mr. Barnhart and his team on the topics of Critical Infrastructure and Excess Facilities.

Dr. Regalbuto thanked Ms. Jane Hedges and Mr. Lenn Vincent for championing this topic. She thanked the entire Board again for its service and time and opened the floor to questions.

Discussion

Mr. Swindle asked what changes to the business processes or internal administrative functions will be made under the new reorganization.

Mr. Mark Whitney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM, responded that the reorganization resulted in the integration of the EM Consolidated Business Center (EMCBC) with the Office of Acquisition and Project Management in HQ. Mr. Ralph Holland, the new Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management, will also be the EMCBC Director and will be heading this effort. In addition, the new site liaisons will also assist in this effort and provide a necessary line of communication to the field.

Mr. Rob Seifert added that EM leadership has been creating scenarios and developing different processes that capture how senior management and HQ staff work with the field.

Ms. Tracy Mustin asked Mr. Whitney to elaborate on the EM Reorganization and how this fits into any Department-wide changes or reorganizations.

Mr. Whitney described the Secretary's work to reform the Department's project management work by creating a project management team and discussed some of the recommendations of this

team and the work of the Deputy Secretary, who is the Department's project management executive. Mr. Whitney said that Mr. Holland, who is the head of project management for EM, will be representing the program to the Department-wide group dealing with this topic. Mr. Whitney added that the recently revised DOE Order 413 would be distributed to the board.

Ms. Karen Patterson asked which offices within EM were now responsible for spent fuel disposition and high-level waste disposition. Dr. Regalbuto said that Field Operations (EM-3) is responsible for these issues.

Mr. Vincent asked that Dr. Regalbuto discuss any additional training she envisions for the EM workforce.

Dr. Regalbuto outlined the various training endeavors of the program and mentioned the National Training Center and HAMMER.

Mr. Marcinowski added that he has met with all of his individual offices and has started having conversations with them about how to operate within the new organization. He mentioned the upcoming retreat that is being held for all staff with the Regulatory and Policy Affairs Office (EM-4).

Mr. Dabbar mentioned some of his experience in project and cost overruns and wondered about how the program is assigning responsibilities to get work done.

Dr. Regalbuto described the unique nature of the work of the EM cleanup mission and how the office does not get to pick its work and what it decides to clean up. She explained how this impacts the scope and budget of their work. She summarized EM's interactions with state and federal regulators and how EM must also interact with local communities, all of which impacts the work being done of projects. EM must work within a limited budget to get work done and that it is often less than ideal. Dr. Regalbuto then discussed risk within the work of EM and how it is vastly different from risk within private commercial enterprise.

Mr. Bob Thompson asked about how EM deals with the perception of risk, especially as it relates to contractors and award fees.

Mr. Whitney responded that there is reputational and risk to the contractors if the work isn't done well.

Ms. Hedges complimented EM on the steps that the program has taken to participate in a dialogue with EPA.

Mr. Swindle asked if EM is putting enough investment in commissioning and where that falls in the new EM leadership structure. Dr. Regalbuto responded that this responsibility is located with Mr. John Mara the Chief Engineering Officer. She went through some of the lessons learned over the history of the program highlighting the startup of the big plant at Savannah River Site.

Ms. Price asked what EM leadership would do if it could get their ideal funds. She wondered if these funds would be spent on research and development work.

Dr. Regalbuto referred back to the program TD work and said that this would be a focus area that is in need of more funding. She went on to say that the other need areas are site-specific and that each site could benefit from an influx of ideal funding.

Ms. Patterson asked for clarification on the term enterprise risk management and if that is the corporate term that Mr. Whitney was using. He responded that yes that was.

Mr. Vincent asked what EM has done to survey the workforce to understand what it can do better to improve morale and or retention.

Mr. Whitney responded that EM utilizes the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey and that EM has taken these findings and results and integrated the recommendations to improve EM. Mr. Whitney mentioned the work of Ms. McCloskey in this effort. Ms. McCloskey also mentioned the Team of the Month award that is a tool EM uses to boost morale and encourage productivity.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION

Ms. Tracy Mustin introduced the topic of workforce development within EM and began the discussion with the board. She mentioned that the focus of this effort is primarily the federal workforce and not the contractor workforce. Ms. Mustin referenced the discussion at the Cleanup Workshop that focused on different ideas to attract a new and younger workforce. She said that EM has a particular challenge in capturing previous knowledge and transmitting this to the next generation of workers. She added that Dr. Regalbuto also wanted the board's input on the issues of retention and morale within the workforce.

Ms. Kim Kearfott noted that there is a strong need for more Ph.D.'s in the safety sciences and that this needs to be assisted by DOE. She said that in the past fellowship programs supported by the Department aided in this effort. She said that there is a need for available jobs in order to attract and retain workers and that EM must transition the knowledge of current and retiring employees to the next generation workforce. She described this process as ART: attract, retain, and transition.

Ms. Jennifer McCloskey reviewed the EM workforce's unique demographics. EM has significantly fewer people under age 40 than the average Federal agency. Approximately 72 percent of the EM workforce is older than 45, with 20 percent eligible to retire this year and an additional 24 percent eligible to retire over the next five years. For three of the ten largest EM occupational series (0340 Program Management, 0840 Nuclear Engineering, and 1301 General Physical Science), more than 50 percent are eligible to retire by FY 2019.

Ms. McCloskey discussed the need for strengthening knowledge transfer and knowledge management in order to ensure proper backup for every employee eligible for retirement. She said that EM may need to consider providing funding for Pathways Program/Recent Graduates and to onboard recent graduates at HQ and the Field. Other strategies include focusing on hiring and backfilling where possible using entry grade levels (or lowering grade structure) for backfills

and utilizing the EM succession plan, which defines EM's human capital priorities and plans for the coming five years.

Concerning knowledge management, Ms. McCloskey said that a more extensive implementation is necessary. She said that EM would require partial and where possible full backup capabilities for all EM positions. Similar to other agencies like NASA, EM would enhance employee career training and development plans. She said that position responsibilities would be better documented, and EM would revisit utilizing the Environmental Management Enterprise Requirements System (EMERS). Ms. McCloskey reviewed several of the other strategies that EM has employed to assist in workforce development, including Knowledge Kafes and DOE and EM mentoring and job shadowing programs.

Discussion

Mr. Swindle asked what EM has done to map the potential impacts these upcoming waves of retirement will have on project management and the work being done across the complex. Ms. McCloskey said that each of the field sites has developed a workforce plan in which they break down their sites' demographics and inform HQ what their needs will be. Mr. Swindle said that the data from these work plans would be helpful to the board in their work to examine the issue of workforce development.

Ms. Mustin said now is a good time to begin forecasting what the program must do to ensure continuity in its workforce and its mission. She noted that many EM employees have been with the office since the inception of the program and that EM doesn't necessarily do a great job of capturing their unique knowledge prior to their retiring or leaving. Ms. Mustin added that the small period of overlap that exists with new employees and departing employees plays a part in the ongoing quest for better knowledge transfer.

Ms. Kearfott brought up the generational aspects that come along with hiring younger workers. She said that younger workers are seeking inspiration at work and are more prone to move about during their careers, instead of staying in one place.

Mr. Runyon brought up the idea of "slow transitioning" into retirement or a phased/partial retirement in order to bring on a new employee on a part-time basis and ensure proper knowledge transfer. Ms. McCloskey said that DOE as an agency has a phased-retirement plan in place but that EM as a program does not.

Mr. Dabbar discussed his experience with a massive recruiting and hiring program at J. P. Morgan and how they struggle with retention. He sees mentoring as a critical piece in helping the junior staff to establish themselves prior to going off on their own. Mentoring is especially useful if its project based. Mr. Dabbar added his company moves junior employees from team to team to expose them to different projects and ideas.

Mr. Dabbar said that a new approach that his company is taking is to profile and understand the characteristics of the top students and junior staff that they employ. This is a new tool they are using to better understand what employees want and need.

Ms. Karen Patterson said that the lack of visible progress at EM sites and continuous projects tends to burn employees out. Ms. McCloskey responded that she understood this to be a problem and that EM was placing a bigger emphasis on Technology Development in order to attract younger workers.

Mr. Josiah Pinkham noted that the Nez Perce Tribe is facing many of similar issues. He noted that in terms of language and culture, he feels responsibility to transmit his knowledge to the next generation. His approach to education and learning is to spend one-third of his time with older people, another third with people his same age, and a final third with young people. He noted that younger people are only going to be interested in things that they've been exposed to, and that it is incumbent upon older and established people to introduced important topics and concepts to young people early.

Mr. Frazer Lockhart said that young people look at their first job in a completely different way than older generations. They are less concerned with what a corporation is trying to do and who their supervisor might be, but instead are wondering who will be on their team and what peers will they be collaborating with.

Mr. Vincent said that his experience in the military and his overall understanding of where he belonged within an organization helped create a meaningful career. He said that mid-level managers and supervisors are going to have a lot to do with retention and workforce development. He also mentioned frustration some employees might have when they're trained to do something and then get back into the workplace and are not permitted to do what they've been trained to do.

Mr. Bob Thompson observed that there is a conflict within DOE between those people interested in instituting change and those interested in maintaining the status quo. He wondered if the new EM reorganization would do anything to change the current situation or if it was just reinforcing the existing structure that prevents change.

Mr. Rob Seifert discussed his experience being a supervisor and expressed the need for building institutional systems that support knowledge transfer. He also mentioned how some senior-level staff and managers have mentoring requirements in their performance plans.

Ms. Lessie Price told the board about experiences working with DOE interns at the Savannah River Site. She also mentioned how difficult the USAJOBS site is to use.

Mr. Swindle closed out this session by suggesting that the board review the background and briefing materials provided to them. He further suggested that the board should get back to making formal recommendations to EM-1 to adopt.

EXCESS FACILITIES DISCUSSION

Mr. Vincent and Ms. Kearfott, co-champions for the Excess Facilities Subcommittee, offered opening remarks. Mr. Vincent spoke of his experience with military base closures and realignments and how expensive the process can get.

Mr. Bart Barnhart, Director of the Office of Infrastructure Management and Disposition, introduced himself and his staff: Mr. Rick Khan, Senior Advisor, and Mr. Andy Szilagyi, Director of the Office of Infrastructure and D&D.

Mr. Barnhart discussed his history with the topic of excess facilities and critical infrastructure. Mr. Szilagyi went over the history of DOE's excess facilities and EM's involvement. When EM formed in 1989, excess facilities were accepted without major restrictions or criteria. By 1992-1993 significant issues surrounding these excess facilities were starting to be apparent. In 1992 there was a Surplus Facility Inventory and Assessment (SFIA) initiated as the first major DOE look into excess facilities. This assessment identified 6,000 facilities in the EM program and projected that 1,500 non-EM facilities would become excess by FY 2000. EM closed the pipeline for facilities transfer for the first time in 1995.

Mr. Szilagyi summarized several of the major DOE responses to dealing with excess facilities. The Laboratory Operations Board, was previously established to identify critical infrastructure issues, and is looking at excess facilities. Also, coming off the successful efforts by the Infrastructure Working Group, the Secretary set up the Excess Contaminated Facilities Working Group (ECFWG), which was chartered to develop a path forward to address the two GAO and IG recommendations. Data collection and analysis has been completed, and a report has been drafted and is anticipated to be released to OMB in October 2016.

Mr. Barnhart mentioned that risk weighs heavily on the decisions that EM makes regarding excess facilities.

Discussion

Mr. Swindle asked how EM handles dealing with D&D being a relatively low priority in terms of resources, compliance, and responsibility for safety.

Mr. Szilagyi responded that he is confident EM facilities are in compliance. He said that EM does surveillance and maintenance to make sure the facilities are safe.

Ms. Shelly Wilson asked whether EM has done any sort of evaluation of facilities or parcels of property to determine whether they were cleaned up enough for reuse. She cited experience with the base closures in Myrtle Beach, SC, as an example of such a scenario. Ms. Wilson said that many of the facilities that EM has are already set up for waste and water utilities, which would make them more ready for turnover to potential tenants.

Mr. Szilagyi said that the age of the complex and large amount of nuclear contamination at these sites set DOE apart from agencies like the Department of Defense. At Oak Ridge, DOE-EM has transferred a significant amount of land mostly at the East Tennessee Technology Park, which is planned to be transferred in its entirety once cleanup and decommissioning is completed.

Mr. Rick Khan said that he was a part of the Asset Revitalization Initiative beginning in 2014 and that EM has continued to look into land and building reuse and revitalization. He suggested

also that some sort of public-private partnership could be a solution to advancing the process of excess facilities and land reuse.

Ms. Patterson said that EM needs to get the GAO to understand that the program needs funding for this type of work.

Mr. Lockhart discussed what happened at the Rocky Flats site closure and how the community played a large role in getting the site closed and turned into a wildlife refuge. He said that EM needs to do a better job of telling its story and justifying why additional funding is necessary to get buildings taken down to make way for new structures and reuse.

Mr. Thompson brought up the Port of Benton land transfer in the city of Richland. It took ten years for DOE and the local governments to have the 1,341 acres of land finally transferred. He said that local reinvestment organizations, private companies, and local governments are great partners in assisting DOE with this type of land transfer. He stated that time constraints make it difficult for businesses to want to invest in this type of land and transfers. He said that they can't afford to wait ten years to receive the land or facilities. He encouraged the program to reach out to these potential partners and see how they would want to assist EM.

Ms. Kearfott said that many universities and high schools could utilize surplus assets and equipment. She said EM should think about what could be made available, especially in the way of lab space.

Mr. Khan said that it is important for EMAB to understand the terminology correctly when it comes to excess facilities. He said that facilities doesn't necessarily mean only buildings, but also other assets, including land. Mr. Khan went on to say that selling an asset for a dollar won't necessarily create interest if the onus of the cleanup would be on the investor. Investors and businesses aren't interested in doing the cleanup, but would be interested in cost sharing as long as there is a return on the investment.

Mr. Khan also mentioned the Tribal partnerships that are available with DOE and that he has worked closely in engaging tribes in discussions on excess facility opportunities.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Leland Cogliani of Lewisburg Associates said his firm represents 23 large research universities across the country. He said that up until a year ago he was a staffer on the Senate Appropriations Committee which has oversight over all DOE programs.

Mr. Cogliani said that EM's reputation within DOE is its most dysfunctional organization. He explained also that NNSA has a similar problem, but due to the national security mission of the agency and its labs, NNSA is seen as more exciting, and as such attracts more people in terms of employment. Mr. Cogliani added that EM is seen as more about the past instead of about the future. Despite these negative perceptions, EM's recent emphasis on robotics and R&D is an area of potential for EM to attract new workers. However, the overall nature of EM's work and

the fact that one could spend a 30-40 year career on one project and not see it through to completion is a complication when it comes to attracting students and workers to the mission.

Mr. Cogliani spoke then about the excess facilities topic and said that EM needs to get more credit for its work and even a transfer of funding from NNSA to assist in its excess facilities work. He believes there is an opportunity to engage Congress on the topic and how EM can get credit for its work.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE DISCUSSION

Ms. Patterson and Mr. Lockhart, champions for the Critical Infrastructure Subcommittee, offered opening remarks. Ms. Patterson said that the concept of critical infrastructure has mission critical importance. Mr. Lockhart said that the critical infrastructure is a problem shared by almost every major city in the country and all over the world. What is unique for DOE-EM is that the program does not get to choose what gets cleaned up and does not have the option of failing at its mission. EM doesn't have a choice; they need to solve the problems they are faced with.

Mr. Barnhart recalled his experience dealing with critical infrastructure at DoD. He also spoke about the necessity in obtaining sufficient funding for maintaining this infrastructure, which is a problem that EM faces. He said the cleanup mission in EM gets most of the funding and what's left over is allocated to infrastructure, and that it's not enough.

Mr. Barnhart said one of the ways EM has dealt with this issue is through utilities privatization or where a third party finances the various water, waste or electricity utilities.

Mr. Swindle said that insurance companies are driving changes to policies in the commercial world due to the exposure to risk if something fails. He discussed how risk management affects decisions in the business world and how this same sentiment carries over into the cleanup process. Mr. Swindle said that one thing the Board could look at is EM's actual definition of critical infrastructure and what are the program's priorities with regards to critical infrastructure. He spoke about the NNSA's list of key infrastructure and how it guides NNSA's allocation process.

Mr. Barnhart said it is important to educate leadership to understand what critical infrastructure is and what the risks that are associated with it are. He said that EM's work affects many aspects of the national security mission and if things go wrong, it would not reflect well on DOE.

Mr. Swindle brought up the work being doing at tech firms like Google and at NSA at Ft. Meade in terms of shoring up critical infrastructure and building in redundancies. He said now there are many natural partnerships being formed between tech companies that rely on critical network infrastructure and the defense world which protects it.

Mr. Lockhart said that since he's gone into the private sector he recognizes major differences at work being done at contractor-owned sites versus at government-owned sites and facilities. Contractor-owned sites are able to make the changes they need and drive innovation in decision

processes more efficiently. Contractors at EM and NNSA landlord sites come in with a more narrow scope of work and do what it is they are tasked with, and everything else is the government's job. Mr. Lockhart cited the Richland site and its procurement of a mission support contract in order to maintain several of the key infrastructure systems on the large Hanford site.

Mr. Barnhart agreed with Mr. Lockhart and said that he had similar situations in the Air Force, especially when they started doing privatization of utilities.

Mr. Khan said that maintaining infrastructure often has a low-priority status. EM does not have a very clear definition of critical infrastructure. For this reason, EM doesn't have a very good handle on the state of its infrastructure. Mr. Khan said that EM needs to assess where they are in terms of the condition of its critical infrastructure.

Ms. Mustin noted that EM's concept of critical infrastructure is impacted by DOE as a whole. The issue comes from the various landlords that the different sites have and what NNSA or NE might consider critical infrastructure and how that might be different from EM's definition. She said that EM needs to work in partnership with other offices in the agency to address this problem instead of going off on its own.

Mr. Szilagyi brought up the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS) database that the Office of Management (MA) manages. He said that all information on facilities and infrastructure gets fed into this database. MA collects the data and publishes reports on the state of DOE's facilities and infrastructure.

Mr. Khan said that the problem with this database has to do with the quality of the data that's being fed into it. He said that the reports aren't detailed enough and don't have the necessary information to be able to identify which pieces of a site or infrastructure are critical.

Mr. Barnhart said that it might be difficult to define a clear idea of what critical infrastructure is upfront. He said that perhaps EM should work with an evolving definition of what critical infrastructure is.

Mr. Szilagyi said that each site is defining what its critical infrastructure is. He brought up the work EM is doing in defining infrastructure that is supporting its high-level waste mission.

Mr. Jeff Barnett said that the supplemental guidance that's gone out in 2014 and 2015 is compelling different program offices at sites to actually identify all of their critical infrastructure needs. He said that varying definitions of what is critical make the situation more difficult. Mr. Barnett said that the sites are providing this information from their perspectives, but HQ is doing the prioritizing.

Mr. Vincent said that there is a need to get the word out about defining what critical infrastructure is.

Mr. Lockhart said that there is a difficulty in some of the EM Site Managers arguing for their positions against the Nuclear Energy (NE) office in Idaho or the NNSA office at Los Alamos.

He said that coming at this from a programmatic level approach might help the situation. A programmatic approach would better engage constituencies and allow those that best understand the infrastructure to provide their input.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Swindle provided some closing remarks and the meeting was adjourned at 2:47 pm.