



# governmentattic.org

*"Rummaging in the government's attic"*

Description of document: Sixty (60) "Lintgrams" - periodic, informal e-mails from National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) (Acting Administrator) Ambassador Linton F. Brooks to the entire NNSA family, 2002-2017

Requested date: 25-February-2017

Released date: 28-November-2017

Posted date: 29-January-2018

Source of document: FOIA/PA Officer  
NNSA/Office of the General Counsel  
P.O. Box 5400  
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400  
Fax: 505-284-7512  
Email: [FOIOfficer@nnsa.doe.gov](mailto:FOIOfficer@nnsa.doe.gov)

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



Department of Energy  
National Nuclear Security Administration  
Office of the General Counsel  
P. O. Box 5400  
Albuquerque, NM 87185



NOV 28 2017

**CERTIFIED MAIL - RETRUN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

This letter is the final response to your February 25, 2017 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. You requested:

“A copy of each Lintgram that was posted on the NNSA internal website.”

Your request was received in this office on March 2, 2017. We contacted the NNSA Administrator's Office (NA-1) and the Office of Information Technology Services (NA-IM), about your request. NA-1 and NA-IM searched and found the following, which are fully releasable and provided in their entirety.

- Lintgram Numbers 3-7
- Lintgram Numbers 10-61
- Lintgram 7/7
- Lintgram NNSA #1
- Lintgram Final

There are no fees chargeable to you for processing this request. If you have questions concerning the processing of this request, please email Ms. Delilah Perez at [Delilah.Perez@nnsa.doe.gov](mailto:Delilah.Perez@nnsa.doe.gov) or write to the address above. Please reference Control Number FOIA 17-00076-M.

Sincerely,

Jane Summerson  
Authorizing & Denying Official

Enclosure

### Lintgram #3

Since my last update to you, I have been doing a fair amount of traveling. I went to Moscow for almost a week to help with our continuing efforts to eliminate more Russian weapons grade materials. I accompanied the Secretary to Vienna for the 46<sup>th</sup> General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency. While there, I met with officials from a number of specific countries where we are cooperating in nonproliferation. I went to Livermore to represent the Secretary and NNSA at the celebration of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. This last trip, once again, reminded me just how valuable the national laboratories are. Their accomplishments are really quite spectacular. They are one of the important things that we bring to the national security table and I think we need to continue to find ways to nurture them, while always working to carry out our own particular Federal role.

In early September, I had an opportunity to look at another kind of national treasure. I joined Secretary Abraham in a belated, but sincere, formal recognition of the members of the Senior Executive Service who had achieved a rank of Meritorious or Distinguished Executive during 2001. There was no high drama or surprise, of course, since the President had already recognized these individuals several months before. But the ceremony allowed us at the Department to add our congratulations as well. There were five NNSA awardees, all honored with the rank of Meritorious Executive. They included Ken Baker, Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Nonproliferation; Camille Yuan-Soo Hoo, the Manager of Oakland; Jim Hirahara, Oakland's Assistant Manager for Business and Financial Services; Patty Wagner, Assistant Manager for Management and Administration at Albuquerque; and NNSA retiree Martin Domagala, formerly Deputy Manager at Oakland. The Senior Executive Service is intended to be the very top rung of the civil service. These individuals are the very top of the Senior Executive Service. We are extremely fortunate as an Administration, as a Department, and as a country to have people of this caliber serving with us.

**Budget.** Two things have dominated our life in Washington recently: the budget and re-engineering. Regarding the budget, it is clear that we will start the fiscal year under a "continuing resolution," since Congress has not completed work on our appropriation. Typically such a resolution limits our spending to the rate consistent with that in FY '02. For us, operating under a continuing resolution will pose two problems. First, we do not know what level of Federal program direction funds (that's what pays us) will be available in FY '03. As I previously mentioned, the House of Representatives has proposed a significant cut below the President's request in this area, while the Senate mark supports our request. I am hopeful that the continuing resolution will embrace the Senate position and let us continue spending at an acceptable level. The second problem is that new starts - - typically construction projects - - are generally not allowed under a continuing resolution because they weren't included in the prior year's appropriation. I don't know what we're going to do about that yet. We are working to mitigate the effects of the situation, but I'm not terribly optimistic. I don't know when we will get a final bill. There is some prospect that Congress will return after the election and act, but it is equally possible that we will be under some form of continuing resolution until spring.

This is disruptive to planning, both at Headquarters and in the field, but is a fact of life of our current system. I'll keep you informed as conditions develop.

**Re-engineering.** We spent two days last week in a meeting of the Leadership Coalition (essentially all the senior managers from throughout the complex) trying to come to closure on various aspects of re-engineering. I'm hugely impressed with the work that people have done. We are now nearing the stage where I need to make some decisions. The biggest (and most difficult) is the question of how many Service Centers there will be and where they will be located. As you know, some of the functions performed at Albuquerque, Oakland, and Nevada will migrate to site offices, but many will be consolidated in new "Service Centers" along with selected functions from Headquarters. We are looking at several options ranging from one to three centers located in one, two, or all three of our present locations. I haven't reached any conclusions; there's no secret decision squirreled away at Headquarters just waiting for the right time to spring on you. If we're going to stand up this organization by the beginning of the new calendar year, however, we're going to need to make some decisions soon. I want to phase in the new organization as rapidly as I can, consistent with treating people fairly and with the availability of funding. (To make sure there is no confusion, the new structure will stand up as a "virtual" organization, with people sitting in their current offices, but reporting in new ways, often to senior leadership at another location. Over the next couple of years we will move people at a pace governed by funding. So while you won't see a fleet of moving trucks roll up to your door in December, you should recognize that reassignments will be likely over the next few years.)

I know this is a period of great uncertainty and I wish I could make it easier. Unfortunately, my ability to do so is somewhat limited. This is a hard decision, and while I want to make it soon, I have to make it right. Thus, I think we are a few weeks away from any announcements. Whatever decisions we make, we will try to make sure that people get some help in dealing with change and transition (some of the operations offices have already begun efforts in the area). In addition, I'll try to keep you informed on what is happening and what isn't. As part of that effort, I will try to get around to each site in the next couple of months to talk to you personally about what I have decided and how it will affect you.

As we enter this period of change and turbulence, it is important to remember what we are trying to do. We are trying to make NNSA better by eliminating management layers, consolidating functions where appropriate, and improving our processes. The goal is not to disrupt your life or to impose change for change's sake, but to let us do our critical mission better. As I told the Leadership Coalition, five years from now we will look back on this period with pride, knowing we helped to make a better NNSA.

**Other stuff.** I have a couple of other things to pass on:

- **Department of Homeland Security.** As you can tell from the papers, the fight on Homeland Security on Capital Hill continues. I still think that legislation will be passed in the next couple of weeks, although there is always the possibility that the

Congress will have to work this issue after the election. At the moment it appears that only a handful of positions will be transferred from the Department of Energy to the new Department of Homeland Security. In particular, although some of the early publicity out of the White House suggested hundreds of Federal positions in Oakland and Livermore would move to the new Department, I now think that is unlikely.

- **Security.** As most of you know, for the past two weeks we were in security condition (SECON) II, our second highest state of alert. The Secretary set SECON II in response to the declaration of an elevated (orange) state under the Homeland Security alert system. We have now returned to a more "normal" SECON III posture. We learned some things from this experience. SECON II was not initially envisioned as something that would be sustained for more than a few days. We will be looking at what we need to do to adapt in recognition of the fact that extended periods of heightened alert are probably a permanent feature of our future. On the one hand, we must keep performing our mission. On the other hand, we must keep our people and facilities safe. We'll be devoting some attention to how to make sure we strike the right balance between those two objectives. I'll keep you informed of our progress.
- **Combined Federal Campaign.** The annual Combined Federal Campaign will be kicking off shortly. While this is an entirely voluntary effort, I think it is hugely important and urge you to participate. I've contributed through the CFC for 42 straight years, and by sneaking the size of my contribution up each year I'm now able to contribute an amount that would really shock me if I had to sit down and write out a check. It's a painless way to help the less fortunate.

I think that's all I have for now. I'll let you know when I learn more about the ongoing issues.

Linton

The budget and reengineering have dominated my life since I sent out the last Lintgram. In both areas we are making progress, but not as rapidly as I had hoped.

**BUDGET.** As I have told you, the Congress has been unable to reach agreement on either an Authorization bill or an Appropriations bill. As a result, they have gone home for the election after passing a so-called Continuing Resolution to fund the Government through November 22. Under a Continuing Resolution, we can keep spending at last year's level. We have some flexibility (we can spend a little faster in some areas if we spend a little slower in others), but we have less flexibility than we have under a normal Appropriations bill. In particular, we are not allowed to start any new programs or new construction that was not included in last year's bill. I understand that this is at least an annoyance and, in some areas, a significant limitation. We are trying to make the most use of the flexibility we have, but we have little latitude. One of my former colleagues used to say "that a problem that has no solution is not a problem, it's just a fact." I'm afraid these limits are just a fact.

When the Congress comes back in session after the election, they hope to pass a single Appropriations bill covering all of the Government (except for Defense, where the bill has already been passed). This has both its good news and bad news aspects for us. On the plus side, by mid- to late-December we should have our final appropriation for the year and be able to get back to a more normal budgeting process. On the negative side, there is always the risk in a giant Omnibus Appropriations Act for us to get caught up in some kind of extraneous tradeoff.

At the moment, there is nothing we can do about this except worry. I will keep you informed, but I don't think I will have anything more to tell you until December.

**POLYGRAPH.** There are almost 17,000 positions in the DOE/NNSA complex that require incumbents to have a counterintelligence scope polygraph ("lie detector") at periodic intervals. We have just received the results of a 19-month study by the National Research Council that is quite skeptical of the use of the polygraph for this purpose. By law, the Secretary must now review the report and promulgate a revised polygraph policy. Although the law gives the Secretary six months to do this, he has made it clear that he expects the review to happen much sooner.

Both the Secretary and I have submitted to these routine screening polygraph examinations (along with drug testing, financial disclosure, and the other burdens we impose on many of you). I do not find the procedure as degrading as some do, and I respect the views of my counter-intelligence colleagues who see value in our present program. Still, the National Research Council report is quite sobering and we are taking it very seriously. I have heard some calls for a suspension of the program during the review. At present, I do not think that the law gives us that authority. I will keep you informed as the review progresses. We are anxious to get it completed.

**REENGINEERING.** I am continuing to review the issues based on the excellent work done by the Leadership Coalition (the top managers from both the field and Headquarters), all of whom have been working so hard to help forge the NNSA of the future. Right now, I am focusing on the size of the various future components. I will send out tentative decisions shortly, after which we will meet with the leadership to review them. I am also spending a lot of time wrestling with the structure of the new Service Center(s). I know how unsettling it is to have all of these decisions sloshing around; I want to get something out to you as soon as I can but: (a) I want it to be complete; and, (b) I want it to be right. Have patience and I will get something to you as soon as I can. As I have told you, while we want to stand up the new organization in December, it will be almost entirely virtual at first; moves of people, where required, will take place over a period of perhaps 18 months or so.

I promised the Leadership Coalition that I would come out and try to talk to all of you personally. I am starting those trips this week with visits to Los Alamos, Kansas City, and Pantex. The rest of the schedule is still being worked.

**BUYOUTS.** As you know, our vision of the NNSA of the future is of a complex where we have eliminated duplication, shifted some responsibility for how to accomplish the mission back to the contractors, and improved our effectiveness through greater use of modern management techniques. That should be a better, more exciting, and more responsive organization. It will also, inevitably, be a smaller one. I am committed to do everything I can to manage the reductions through the use of the various incentive packages that I have. One of those is buyouts.

The whole question of buyouts is always a very difficult one. While we are looking forward to a vision of a future NNSA, I understand that virtually everybody in the complex right now is doing real and important work and would be missed if they left. I also know that buyout programs often result in the departure of people that we would desperately like to keep. Nonetheless, I want to make sure that everyone understands their options. The Congress will almost certainly remove our authority for buyouts after this fiscal year. As a practical matter, buyouts are most attractive early in the fiscal year. What that means is that when we promulgate the information on potential buyouts in the next few weeks, those of you who are interested need to do some very serious career thinking in a fairly short time frame. I do not want to sound like the business that has been holding its “going out of business sale” every month for the last 30 years, but there is a pretty good chance that we will not be offering buyouts in the future because we won’t have the authority.

**OPPORTUNITIES.** In the next two weeks, we will all have two important opportunities: to contribute to the Combined Federal Campaign; and, to vote. I hope you will take advantage of both.

Over the longer term, we will have another set of opportunities. The Secretary has just delivered the Department's electronic government ("e-government") plan to the White House.

E-government is part of the President's management agenda and is an attempt to move the Federal Government to a greater use of modern technology. I think this could have some significant benefits for us. I will have more to say at a later time.

That's all I have for right now. I look forward to talking to most of you face to face in the next few weeks during my "circuit ride" to all the field offices.

Linton



## Lintgram # 5

Due to an administrative error, the Y-12 Site Office with Bill Brumley as the Site Manager and Ted Sherry as the Deputy was omitted from the earlier version of Lintgram #5. My apologies to Bill and Ted and the Y-12 Site Office staff.

Please see the corrected message below:

I have made some important decisions on the field leadership for the NNSA of the future. As you know, under our new organization the Site Office Managers will assume much greater responsibility. I am pleased to announce that those managers will be the following:

Livermore Site Office - - Camille Yuan Soo Hoo with Mike Hooper as her Deputy  
Los Alamos Site Office - - Ralph Erickson, with Dennis Martinez as his Deputy  
Nevada Site Office - - Kathy Carlson, with Maureen Hunemuller as her Deputy  
Sandia Site Office - - Karen Boardman with Patty Wagner as her Deputy  
Kansas City Site Office - - Beth Sellers, with Steve Taylor as her Deputy  
Pantex Site Office - - Dan Glenn, with Don White as his Deputy  
Savannah River Site Office - - Ed Wilmot, with Bruce Wilson as his Deputy  
Y-12 Site Office - - Bill Brumley, with Ted Sherry as his Deputy

I am immensely grateful that these leaders have agreed to help us move to the NNSA of the future. I look forward to working with them in the coming months.

I have also made some decisions about the Service Center. First, let me make it clear that I have NOT decided anything about geography. That is, I have not yet decided whether the Service Center will be physically located in one, two, or three places. The options for the ultimate location of the service center remain: a Service Center located in Albuquerque, Nevada and Oakland, a Service Center located in Albuquerque and Nevada, a Service Center located in Albuquerque and Oakland or, finally, a Service Center located in Albuquerque. What I have decided is that the Service Center will function as a single organization regardless of its physical location. I am pleased to announce that Jim Hirahara has agreed to be the Director of the new Service Center, with Ken Powers as his Deputy.

The Service Center will be organized in three major divisions:

1. A Federal Services Division focusing on support to the Federal staff at the sites in areas such as Human Resources and Information Technology. Larry Kirkman has agreed to head this division.
2. A Business Services Division, focusing on support to the sites in contracting and procurement. This division will also be responsible for those contracts which are not site specific. Frank Baca has agreed to head this division.

3. A Technical Services Division, providing support to the sites in areas such as environment safety and health and security. Ray Corey has agreed to head this division.

Mike Zamorski will round out the Service Center Leadership team for the first few months as a Special Assistant to the Director. He will help ensure that the site perspective is part of the new service center functioning.

I have tasked the Service Center Leadership to begin meeting to define further the structure and operating architecture of the Service Center. They will begin that task immediately.

Dave Marks will serve as the Field Chief Financial Officer for the NNSA. I have tasked Dave to begin the necessary transition activities.

Forty-three years in the National Security business has taught me that the quality of leadership is crucial to the success of any new and challenging endeavor. Both NNSA and the nation are extremely fortunate to have such a strong leadership team to lead us into the future. I look forward to working with all of them and I know all you will give them all the support possible.

We will be providing more information on the new structure in the relatively near future.

Linton Brooks

## Lintgram #6

Some day I'll send one of these that isn't dominated by talk about the budget and our efforts to create the NNSA of the Future. Unfortunately, that day hasn't come yet. Those two issues continue to consume a huge amount of my attention and that of my senior management team. Here's where we stand.

**BUDGET.** The Congress has passed a Continuing Resolution that will last until the middle of January. That means we continue to be limited to the level of spending we had in Fiscal Year 2002. It is very difficult to see how the new Congress, in its first week or two of existence, will be able to do anything other than pass another short-term Continuing Resolution. Thus it looks to me the earliest we can have an Appropriations bill is sometime in mid- to late-February. In the past I've told you about limitations on implementing new starts, but we think the passage of the Defense Authorization Act solves that problem. So the remaining issue is purely a monetary one.

There are repeated rumors that an attempt will be made to extend the Continuing Resolution for the entire year and not pass any appropriations bills. This would avoid the need to resolve a strong difference between the two Houses of Congress on spending totals. There are serious problems for us if this happens; we are trying to work the issue. I will keep you informed, but I don't see much chance of anything new to tell you before the first of the year.

**NNSA OF THE FUTURE (a.k.a. Reengineering).** We have chosen our leadership and my senior managers are now looking at how best to organize based on their responsibilities for Headquarters, Site Offices, and the integrated Service Center organization. I'm still wrestling with the question of how many Service Center locations we will need in the future.

Here's what's going to be happening over the next few weeks and months:

- We have targeted December 16<sup>th</sup> as the day we stand up the new NNSA organization, comprising three units: Headquarters, Site Offices, and the integrated Service Center organization. We will establish eight Site Offices and one integrated Service Center organization. The three Operations Offices will be disestablished. The NNSA Headquarters organization structure was largely established in October 2001.
- Between now and the middle of December, we are finalizing our reorganization plan and making sure that managers have sufficient support to perform their assigned functions. When we stand up, people within each of the three units will be affected by formal functional transfers. You will be informed of these changes before stand up.

- Between the time we stand up and the end of January, NNSA managers will prepare staffing plans for Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004. Once I approve these plans, managers will begin recruiting to support their critical needs.
- Initially (for about the first six months) we will try to meet our staffing needs by concentrating on voluntary moves. I hope that that will take care of most of the moves that are needed.
- After we have made our best effort to staff the new NNSA through a voluntary process, we will then begin directed reassignments as necessary.
- The Office of Diversity and Outreach will work closely with me to ensure the integrity of this process. Specific guidance will be provided to you at each step.
- The pace of all of this will be governed by funding and our goal is to have everything completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2004.
- Organizations will continue to simplify and streamline.

I fully recognize that many aspects of this reengineering process are causing enormous stress and concern throughout the organization. I am very concerned about your well-being and your individual career plans. For this process to work as outlined, we will need to work together closely and to keep the lines of communication open.

As most of you know, I promised the Leadership Coalition that I would visit each Federal site to discuss the creation of the NNSA of the Future with all of you face-to-face. I'm a little over half way through that process. I'll complete it in the next couple of weeks. I have been impressed by the attitude of the people I have talked to and the caliber of the questions. (I know I still owe several answers; they're coming "soon.") One thing I've been talking about a lot is my desire to make the NNSA of the Future what the management literature calls the "employer of choice." By that I mean I want us to be the place where you would advise your children, or your neighbor, or your friend to try to get a job because we not only do exciting and important work, but we also treat the people doing that work with respect and give them flexibility to control their lives wherever possible. I am looking for ideas in this area and will have more to say about it at a later time.

**HIRING FREEZE.** Because of the continued uncertainty over the budget and the lack of certainty about just what our end-strength will be following the reorganization, I have reluctantly imposed a hiring freeze for all Federal positions throughout the complex. I don't want to make our budget problem worse by adding people before I know how much money we're going to have to pay for them. Further, since we are going to be getting smaller and we want to do that through attrition, I also don't want to make the problem more complicated by adding more people. I understand that this policy, while wise overall, can be a local burden. We will try to lift it as soon as possible. (Because they are paid for out of a different pool of money, and because I do not expect a major change in

their functions, I have exempted the Office of Transportation Safeguards from this freeze.)

**HOMELAND SECURITY.** A lot of you have asked about the impact of the Homeland Security Bill on NNSA. I think that impact will be minimal. (I hope I'm right, because I am not focusing on this very heavily.) Here's what I know will happen:

- About a third of the Nonproliferation Research and Development budget will be transferred to the new Department. This will include all our work in chemical and biological defense as well as our nuclear smuggling work. It is probable that a very small number of Headquarters Federal employees may be transferred as well.
- Although we will retain responsibility for organizing, training and equipping the NNSA emergency response capability, if there is an actual incident requiring those capabilities they will be under the command of the Secretary of Homeland Security. Presumably this will mean we'll need to do a little work on training and standards with the new Department.
- The National Labs will support the Secretary of Homeland Security in the same fashion that they support NNSA. We are working out a Memorandum of Understanding that will regulate how this is done. I am helped in this regard by the fact that NNSA's Chief Scientist is playing a senior role on the Homeland Security transition team. As a practical matter, however, the Homeland Security portion of each laboratory's budget will remain quite small compared to the weapons and nonproliferation portions.

The new Department will come into existence 60 days after the President signs the legislation. The President signed the Bill into law today. That looks to me right now like it means there'll be a new Department in late January. Transfers of functions and organizations for the new Department will be phased in on a schedule that I haven't seen yet.

My bottom line: Standing up the Department of Homeland Security is a huge task of immense importance to the country. It will not, however, have very much effect on the way NNSA does its daily business.

**NEW MERITORIOUS EXECUTIVES.** I hope by now you have seen my message announcing that the President has conferred the rank of Meritorious Executive on Thomas Beckett, Kathy Carlson, Steve Goodrum, Tony Lane, Tyler Przybylek, and Ed Wilmot. You should be very proud of them. I certainly am.

**TOYS FOR TOTS.** I am pleased to see that Defense Programs is taking the lead in organizing an NNSA Headquarters "Toys for Tots" drive with the United States Marine Corps. An NNSACAST with details on how to participate went out today.

COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN. In most parts of the country we're just winding up the Combined Federal Campaign. If you've delayed making your contribution, I hope you will act soon. As we approach the holiday season, typically a time of warmth and friendship, I think it's particularly important that we remember those at home and abroad who are less fortunate.

FLEXIBILITY DURING THE HOLIDAYS. I think it is important to give people as much control as possible over their lives. As we enter a holiday period with days of special significance for most of us, it's important to make sure that people who celebrate holidays that fall on days other than Federal holidays not face road blocks. I have, therefore, sent out a memo to all NNSA managers reminding them that the rules give us some flexibility to arrange work schedules so that people can meet religious or other obligations without the necessity of taking annual leave. While this memo is aimed at the upcoming holiday period, it reflects my general view that we should use all the flexibility the law gives us to accommodate the needs of individuals. I hope all of you will take advantage of this flexibility whether for religious, family, or other reasons.

NEW DIVERSITY AND OUTREACH MANAGER. I share many things with John Gordon. One of them is a strong commitment to diversity and equal opportunity in the Federal work force. As you know, we've established a Diversity Council and are promulgating a diversity action plan. To help me manage this I'm delighted to report that Mary Ann Fresco, our new Diversity and Outreach Manager, reported on board in early November. She will be reporting directly to me and will help in one of the important steps that will make the NNSA of the Future the employer of choice for everyone, regardless of race, color, sex, age, national origin, or mental or physical disabilities. If she hasn't already, I know she'll be around to meet you once she gets further into her new duties. I'm delighted to have her here.

That's all I have for now. I'm sorry this was so long. I hope all of you have a very pleasant Thanksgiving and are able to spend it in peace with your families. One of the many things the country should be thankful for is the dedicated work that all of you do. I certainly am thankful for the support you have given me, the Secretary, the President and the country. It is a great privilege to be part of such a dedicated group of professionals.

Happy Thanksgiving.

Linton

**From:** NNSACAST HQ  
**Sent:** Friday, December 20, 2002 11:07 AM  
**To:** NNSAAL; NNSAALCON; NNSACAST (CHICAGO); NNSACAST(SRS); nnsa-concast; nnsa-fedcast; NNSAHQ; allcontrnnsa; allnnsafedemp; Cowan, John H; Harris, Roena (Y-12)  
**Subject:** LINTGRAM # 7

## **LINTGRAM # 7**

Although much of my energy recently has been spent on the NNSA of the Future, there's a good deal more that is happening. I thought I'd take some time to update you on a few other things. I don't have anything new to tell you on the NNSA of the Future; my announcement covered everything that we know.

**Budget.** We have now seen the "pass back" on the FY04 budget from the Office of Management and Budget. As you probably know, our proposed budget gets submitted in the fall and is then reviewed by OMB. They make adjustments both based on the overall economy and on reviews of specific programs. I am extremely pleased with the results of their review of our budget. I attribute this to the hard work of all of you and of our contractors, to the successful development of a meaningful planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluation system allowing OMB to be confident that we are developing better fiscal discipline in the program, and, above all, to a continued recognition of the tremendous importance of the mission we are carrying out. I can't go into specifics until the White House releases the budget in early February (they call it the President's budget for a reason) but I'm quite pleased.

I don't have anything new to tell you about the fiscal year 2003 budget. I continue to believe we're unlikely to know anything until late January. There is now talk of trying to get a final budget in January, which is sooner than I expected. We'll see.

**Buyouts.** You will have noticed that the announcement on our restructuring made no mention of buyouts. I still expect this to be the primary tool for reducing our rolls. There is a legal glitch with the Office of Management and Budget, which we are working to overcome. At an absolute minimum, we will be seeing buyout authority in a month or so based on the new Homeland Security Act. I'll keep you informed.

**New Appointments.** The position of Deputy Secretary of Energy has been vacant for several months since former Deputy Secretary Blake left government. Kyle McSlarrow, formerly the Department's Chief of Staff, was sworn in on November 27, 2002. This is good news for the Department generally and for NNSA specifically. He is both extremely knowledgeable and keenly interested in our area. As Deputy Secretary he is deeply involved in interagency issues just below the Cabinet level, both in Homeland Security and in National Security. We are fortunate to have him.

We are also fortunate in Kyle's replacement as Chief of Staff. The Secretary recently announced Joe McMonigle's appointment. Joe had been serving as Deputy Chief of Staff. He is knowledgeable, competent and a pleasure to deal with.

**What I'm worried about.** In my recent tour of all the Federal sites, I was asked what I was concerned with other than budgets and reorganization. Of course the biggest thing I'm worried about is the effect on our people of the decisions I announced earlier. I'm convinced that the changes we are implementing will help us to better carry out our various missions. But I know it is hard to focus in the face of uncertainty about

your future, whether to relocate, and how your job will change. What I can do to ease this process is continue to make fair and equitable treatment of people my top priority and continue to try to bring you information -- good and bad -- as quickly as I can.

There are other things I'm worried about. I don't keep a "top ten" list (although I think it's an excellent idea), but here, in no particular order, are some things that are on my mind:

- I'm worried over the long-term about the need to replace the experienced people who will be coming to the end of their Federal service over the next few years.
- I'm worried that we're not thinking enough about the stockpile of the future. The stockpile we inherited from the Cold War is probably not ideal for the modern world.
- I'm worried that some day (not, I hope, soon) we may need to consider resuming nuclear testing to fix a stockpile problem. I don't think we've thought through how we would go about making that decision.
- I'm worried that the President and the Secretary's agenda on improving the protection of highly enriched uranium and plutonium worldwide is so daunting. Preventing this material from falling into the wrong hands is the ultimate guarantee against proliferation. We're doing very well in Russia but there's a great deal more to do.
- I'm worried that we won't have the discipline to implement the workload reduction initiatives and to shift responsibilities to the contractors. These steps are crucial if our restructuring is to succeed.

Finally, I'm worried that we're missing something. My experience with Washington jobs such as the one I have now is that it is very easy to be consumed by the urgency of the in-basket and very difficult to think about the future. We have a couple of efforts going on to try to look ahead, but I think we all need to be alert to the danger that we're overlooking something important.

**Homeland Security.** The Homeland Security bill has passed. The new Department will be formally established in late January with the first transfers of agencies taking place in early March. I will be working with the relevant Under Secretaries in the new department to begin the process of forging a good working relationship. I continue to believe that, for the majority of us, the creation of the new Department will not change our day-to-day life. The biggest potential for change has to do with Emergency Operations. Under the new law, NNSA will remain responsible for organizing, training, and equipping emergency response forces. These forces will, however, operate under the direction of the Department of Homeland Security as lead federal agency in an actual emergency. The law envisions the new Department being responsible for establishing standards and for conducting training exercises. The emergency response people who are moving to the new Department, however, have limited nuclear experience. Thus, we'll need to work carefully with the new Department.

A second area in which there is, over time, a potential for change has to do with the national laboratories. Initially, both Defense Programs and Nuclear Nonproliferation spending at the labs will dwarf anything from Homeland Security. Over time, however, the new Department will be working to establish its own unique relationship with the laboratories. While we will remain the primary sponsor of the laboratories, we will need to work to help the new Department gain access to these important national resources.

**NNSA generosity.** I've seen two headquarters examples of the generosity of our people recently. Our Combined Federal Campaign vastly exceeded our goal at a time when overall giving has been reduced. And under Jon Ventura's leadership we collected over \$1000 worth of Toys for Tots. I know that the various field offices had similar successes. It's nice to be part of such a compassionate organization.

**Christmas Eve.** The President has directed that Federal employees be granted a half day on Christmas Eve. I hope you will all take advantage of it to spend time with your families. I certainly plan to.



**What we are about.** Last week I had the honor of attending a meeting with the President, the Cabinet and most of the sub-cabinet officials in Washington. The President spoke of the accomplishments of the first two years and his goals for the future. His remarks were not intended for public distribution and it would be inappropriate to repeat them. But he said three specific things that capture the message I have been trying to send since I took over. First, he opened by reminding us that, while it was the political appointees who were in the room, we represented the career civil servants (and, I would add, the contractors) on whom the government and the country depend. Second, he reminded us all that we must be “in the service of something larger than ourselves.” Finally, he closed by recalling that we were all serving “the greatest Nation in the history of the world.” That is exactly the message I have tried to convey, but the President said it better. Remember it and be proud of who you are and what you do.

I think that’s all I have for you right now. This is a special time of the year for most of us. Whether you are looking backwards to Eid or Chanukkah or forward to Christmas or Kwanza, or to some combination, I hope that the holidays are filled with peace, relaxation, and a chance to be with your families in peace. Striking the right balance between work and our home life is difficult for many of us; this is a good time of year to put that balance in perspective. I hope you all have a happy holiday and a prosperous New Year. I remain intensely proud and humbled at the honor of leading such an outstanding group of professionals.

I’ll be talking to you in the New Year.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 2:08 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #10

---

**From:** NNSACast Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, March 21, 2003 8:32 AM  
**To:** DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + KAO) ; DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, KAO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #10

-----Original Message-----

**From:** NNSACAST HQ [<mailto:NNSACAST%nnsa.doe.gov@internet.al.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 21, 2003 7:12 AM  
**To:** NNSAHQ; nnsa-fedcast; nnsa-concast; NNSACast Federal; NNSACAST (CHICAGO); NNSACAST(SRS); allnnsafedemp; allcontrnnsa; Harris, Roena (Y-12); Wright, Judy (Y-12); Harris, Roena (Y-12); Cowan, John H; Goudouros, James (SRS); NNSACAST Contractor; Calvert, O.Lynn; NNSACAST (SANDIACON)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #10

### Lintgram #10

As you all know by now, the first action in the disarmament of Iraq took place on Wednesday night and the United States is now at war there. Also on Wednesday, the United States initiated operation Valiant Strike in Afghanistan, as a continuation of that front in the War on Terrorism. I have sent you an NNSACAST on the specific actions we will be taking. I suspect that, like the country generally, the men and women of NNSA have varied views on what the best U.S. policy toward Iraq should be. I am confident, however, that, once again like the country at large, all of us will be wishing nothing but success for the deployed Armed Forces now that the hostilities have begun.

A year and a half ago, in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks, General Gordon said that we would carry out our mission, protect our people and our facilities, and offer our experience and knowledge to the broader effort. That is exactly what we will be doing in this war. We already have a handful of people from various NNSA components directly involved and we can expect that both they and our emergency management and security people will be called on a good deal over the coming weeks. For most of us, however, our efforts will be focused on continuing to do our job while remaining alert against the possibility of some form of domestic terrorist response. I am confident that all of you will perform superbly as you always have.

Given international developments, I thought about delaying this Lintgram, but I am asking you to continue doing your jobs, so I need to continue to do mine; and it seems to me that part of doing my job is to make sure you know what is going on.

**WASHINGTON FOCUS.** In addition to actions associated with the war, Washington is now fully into the Congressional budget hearing season and I have been consumed with supporting the Secretary's testimony and preparing for my own. Thus far, I have every reason to believe that we will get good support for our programs this year, just as we did last year.

**RDD CONFERENCE.** Last week the Secretary and I took a week away from Congressional hearing preparations and reexamining security and participated in a conference on so-called dirty bombs, or Radiological Dispersal Devices (RDDs). Secretary Abraham presided over the conference and delivered a keynote address, which was well received by the international community. The conference was sponsored by

the Department of Energy in response to a suggestion made by the Secretary last fall and was held in Vienna with the assistance of the International Atomic Energy Agency. A huge amount of work by the Headquarters nonproliferation people went into making the conference a success. We were able to increase the knowledge of 123 countries about the threat of RDDs and crafted some recommendations that will give us an entrée to following up and improving protection in these countries. This is yet another example of how our efforts in one area (nonproliferation) can spill over and have benefits in another (anti-terrorism).

**HOMELAND SECURITY.** As I think most of you know, six NNSA staff members just joined the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We will miss them. They moved because DHS took control of some of our programs on the first of March: Chemical and Biological Nonproliferation R&D, Nuclear Smuggling R&D, and the Nuclear Assessment Program. I want to extend my thanks for all that these staff members contributed to DOE/NNSA and wish them the best of luck. To ensure the transition is smooth, the Secretary has signed a Memorandum of Agreement on relations with the new Department. Thus far, I think all of this is going to go very smoothly and that most of us will not see huge differences.

**TRAVEL CARDS.** Many of you have seen a memorandum from the Deputy Secretary on Misuse of Government Credit Cards. These are the cards that most of us use to pay for travel expenses. I know it might seem to some of you that it's harmless to put a personal purchase on these cards (after all you're going to pay for it), but it's clearly a violation of the rules. Because of some abuses (not involving us), this is all being taken very, very seriously. Thus, I urge you to be scrupulous at using Government issued credit cards only for official purposes.

**TRAINING.** It has always been my belief that people are what matter in an organization. But people function better with good leadership. There is a tendency in any large organization to assume that leadership just happens. Many people believe either that it can't be taught or that it will be learned by osmosis without training. I don't believe that. It is certainly true that some people are better leaders than others, just like some people are better athletes than others. But, just as even the very best athlete trains and learns, so, too, any leader can learn and grow.

We are, therefore, beginning a six-module leadership training series for GS-13s and above. The program, which was put together by Mary Ann Fresco, our Director of Diversity and Outreach, began in Headquarters earlier this week and will begin in the field shortly. It will continue through September. I urge you to take advantage of this opportunity to stretch your mind and develop your own particular style of leadership.

**BUYOUTS.** Apparently a Lintgram can't be complete without an update on our progress toward the NNSA of the Future. I was happy to report in the last Lintgram that the OMB had approved making buyouts available through the end of March. Currently, 84 of you have signed up for the buyout - 15 from Headquarters and 69 in the field. I know we will miss all of the people who are leaving and that we all wish them well in their future endeavors. I also know that some of you were not able to make comfortable and informed decisions about the buyout by the end of March. To give you a bit more time on an important decision, we have asked OPM to extend our buyout authority through April 30. The formal request is now with OPM and I hope to hear very shortly that it is approved. I'll let you know when we hear.

**THINKING ABOUT THE LONG TERM.** One of the most difficult parts of my job is keeping from being consumed by short-term issues. It is very easy to think about the next ten days or the next ten weeks. It's not too hard to think about the next ten months. It gets very difficult to focus on the next ten years. Fortunately, one thing that forces me to focus is periodic interaction with outside advisory groups. I recently met with the Defense Science Board. They asked what I saw as the two or three biggest long-term challenges. After reviewing some things that I thought were not major challenges (budget, nonproliferation, naval reactors), here's what I told them:

- **Stockpile stewardship and the potential for return to testing.** I mentioned our effort to develop the necessary tools to understand the science behind the stockpile. I said that we were improving test readiness, and expressed some concern that we didn't have clarity on how we would approach a testing decision, given the almost certain fact that the technical need for testing would be ambiguous and the subject of some dispute.
- **The future stockpile.** I said that I did not think we had been giving sufficient intellectual attention to the future stockpile, noting that the legacy stockpile was almost certainly not optimal for today's world. I mentioned the importance of the August conference at the U.S. Strategic Command in trying to rectify this situation.
- **Security.** I reviewed in very general terms the steps we had taken since September 11, 2001. I said that, in the long term, we had to move beyond guns, guards, and gates to a greater use of technology, but that I wasn't satisfied that we were moving in that direction fast enough.

**CURRENT THREAT LEVEL.** I promised to keep you posted on what we know about the threat and our corresponding security conditions. Following the DHS increasing the country's threat level to Code Orange after the President's speech on Monday night, we elevated our security condition level to SECON 2. This was not in response to any known direct or immediate threats to our complex. I anticipate the SECON will stay elevated for some time, unless there are indications that we need to change.

That's all I have for now. I know this is a somber -- and perhaps frightening -- time for all of us. It is a reminder that it is a dangerous world and that there is a reason why we devote our lives to keeping the United States safe and strong. I promise your safety is uppermost in my mind and I understand that it is uppermost in yours as well. We will do our utmost to make sure we are all safe, so we can all focus on our crucial national security mission.

God bless America and the men and women -- in NNSA and in the military -- who serve and protect her.

Linton

## Lintgram #11

It is spring in Washington, (or at least it is trying to be spring). For tourists that means Cherry Blossoms. For many of us at Headquarters that means Congressional testimony. I have testified several times in the past few weeks and have also helped support the Secretary as he testified. Other NNSA officials have also testified and given briefings. A huge amount of work has been done throughout Headquarters to prepare us for these sessions.

**WASHINGTON FOCUS.** In general I think the testimony has gone well. I have been impressed by the strong support on the Hill for all of our programs. This may seem self-evident to you – after all what we do is crucial to the country. But we haven't always been able to get that support and it's a measure of how hard you have all worked and of how successful you have all been that we're getting support now.

One area of contention has arisen during the Congressional hearing season. Our attempts to improve test readiness, to revitalize advanced concepts work at the laboratories, to study the so-called Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), and to seek the repeal of a ten year old law banning research on weapons with yields below five kilotons, have, in combination, troubled some U.S. Senators and Members of Congress. They fear that these steps signal an attempt to start a new arms race and hurt our nonproliferation efforts. I have been working hard to reassure them that we are not starting a new arms race, not planning an immediate return to nuclear testing, not making any decisions to develop new weapons, not lowering the nuclear threshold, and not lessening our support for nonproliferation (which after all got the biggest increase in this year's proposed budget). We'll know how successful these efforts have been in a few weeks.

**BUYOUTS.** A number of our colleagues (as I write this, nearly a hundred) have elected to take the buyout and either have left or will soon be leaving Federal service. Since our whole approach to creating the NNSA of the Future is to use voluntary reductions rather than coercion, this is, in one sense, very good news. But it also comes with a significant price. We are losing an enormous amount of talent and experience and good friends. All of us will need to work together to fill the gap that these departures leave.

I've heard two reactions to the buyout offer that concerns me a little bit. First, I've heard some people say they like the idea of a buyout but they'll wait and take next year's. Please understand that there is no assurance that there will be a buyout next year. At the moment, the Office of Personnel Management is firm in saying that they will not approve additional authority next year. They can always change their mind, of course, but I don't want anybody to wait under false pretenses. The only buyout I'm absolutely sure I can offer is the one we are offering right now.

I've also heard of people who feel pressured and think that I'm giving them a choice between a buyout now and a Reduction In Force (RIF) later. I don't mean to imply that the choice is that stark. You know my views of RIFs: they are hugely disruptive and need to be avoided at all costs. I'm committed to creating the NNSA of the Future

without RIFS and remain confident that we can do it. You also know, however, that I have steadfastly refused to categorically rule out anything. If I am wrong about voluntary measures and managed attrition, we will be faced with some difficult decisions next year. What all this means for individuals is that we probably shouldn't try to game the future. It sounds trite, but the best advice I can offer is to make the decision that seems best for you, whether to go or to stay.

**RETIREMENT CEREMONIES.** Because we have had several people leaving, we've been holding a number of retirement ceremonies. I have tried to get to as many of those as possible. One of the things that bothers me about some parts of DOE is that there is no formal tradition of recognizing the departure of those who have spent their lives serving their country. I've never been able to understand that and I don't want that to become the practice in NNSA. Retirement ceremonies to me are important for two reasons. First, the person leaving deserves it. He or she has spent decades serving the people of the United States and helping all of us. Simple courtesy seems to demand that we recognize that and show our appreciation. Second, I also think retirement ceremonies are important for those of us who aren't retiring. They are an opportunity to remind ourselves that we are fortunate enough to be allowed to devote our lives to something greater than ourselves. That's why I have been pushing very hard to make sure that we offer appropriate recognition to those who leave Federal service after long careers.

This is short, but I'm going to be gone for the next two weeks on leave and travel and I don't want to take too long between Lintgrams. This might be a good time to remind you of my views on balancing work and life. All of us in NNSA work hard. The work that we do is difficult and important, but it's also important to keep a balance between work and the rest of your life. I'm going to take my own advice on this matter and go enjoy my week of leave. I'll talk to you when I get back from travel.

Linton

## **Lintgram #12**

The last couple of weeks have been quite busy. I had the opportunity to attend some of the ceremonies associated with the 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Los Alamos. We commissioned the second axis of the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test Facility (DARHT) machine and dedicated the new Nonproliferation and International Security Center. The most important thing that happened was that Los Alamos delivered the first certifiable nuclear pit made in the United States since 1989, thus restoring a critical national security capability we have been lacking.

I also spent two days at the U.S. Strategic Command in Omaha. We have always had a close relationship with STRATCOM. Last October the Command was given a number of new responsibilities for space, information operations, and global conventional strike. The result of the new missions will inevitably be a lessening of emphasis on the nuclear mission, although it is clear that the current STRATCOM Commander, Admiral Ellis, remains firmly focused on this mission. I think this will pose particular challenges for us to be somewhat more proactive over the next few years in our dealing with the professional military.

**LOS ALAMOS CONTRACT.** Much of my time these last two weeks has been spent on issues surrounding the relationship between the University of California and the Los Alamos National Laboratory. On April 30, the Secretary announced his approval of recommendations that Deputy Secretary McSlarrow and I made. Under the Secretary's decision, the University will continue to operate Los Alamos through September 2005, but there will be a competition to see who operates the Laboratory thereafter. We are urging the University to take part in that competition in recognition of the great benefits it has brought to Los Alamos and the strong action it has taken to help eliminate the problems discovered there last year.

I will be working over the next year on criteria for the competition to ensure that our basic weapons science mission is adequately considered. We also will be ensuring that both the employment rights and the pension benefits of the current employees are preserved. There has been no decision on how this will affect Livermore; the Secretary believes that there is no need to make that decision at the present time. This will be the first time that we have held a competition for management of either of the two physics labs. While that obviously poses some new challenges, I am confident that the process need not be – and will not be – disruptive.

**PEOPLE.** There have been some important developments this week with regard to people. First, as most of you probably know, the President has named General John Gordon, the first NNSA Administrator, to be the Homeland Security Advisor. This is the position Governor Ridge held before the Homeland Security Department was formed. It is a huge responsibility and the President could not have made a better choice. The President also approved Secretary Abraham's and my recommendation and has nominated Paul Longworth to be the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. Paul is now a Senior Advisor to Secretary Abraham. Those of us in Headquarters have been working closely with him since the beginning of the Administration and I am delighted he has agreed to take on these new responsibilities once the Senate has confirmed him, which I am sure it will do quickly.

We also have lost a number of people to retirements this week. Over 120 of our colleagues have taken advantage of the buyout and have departed. This represents an enormous wealth of experience and we will need to work together to fill in the gaps left by their departure. The departure that affected me most directly personally was, of course, the retirement of Tony Lane who was the Associate Administrator for Management and Administration. Tony has been a valued advisor and colleague and I will miss him.

Finally, I am saddened to announce the death of Sandi Robanos, the long-time Administrative Assistant in the Defense Programs front office. Sandi lost her battle with cancer last week. She will be sorely missed. Memorial services will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, May 5 at the Unitarian Universalist Church in Arlington, Virginia.

**BUDGET STATUS.** The Congress has returned from its recess and the committees are beginning to mark up the Fiscal Year 2004 budget. I am hopeful that we will receive the same strong support we have received in the past years, although I am sure there will be a few surprises. The most visible issue right now is a series of steps that we have initiated to help give the President options to transform the stockpile into something more suitable to the needs of the future. These include some very modest funding for advanced weapons concepts, the continuation of the study of the so-called Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (adapting an existing gravity bomb to penetrate hard rock), repeal of the ten-year old prohibition on conducting research that could be used to develop a new weapon with under the yield of five kilotons, and transitioning to an 18-month test readiness posture. None of these steps are intended to suggest a decision to develop new weapons or to resume nuclear testing, but there is some concern on the Hill about them. Unfortunately, that concern is breaking down along party lines. I think this is unfortunate because I don't believe that updating the arsenal for the 21<sup>st</sup> century ought to be a partisan issue. Still, we are where we are. We are working with the Congress on this issue. I will keep you informed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS WEEK.** I was on leave and travel last week and didn't have the chance to say anything in recognition of Administrative Professionals Week. I think it is easy to forget how crucial to our mission our administrative colleagues are. Without them literally nothing would get done. Both the people I work with every day in Headquarters and the ones I meet traveling are hardworking, dedicated, and competent. We are all lucky to have such indispensable colleagues. They deserve our thanks every week.

**LEADERSHIP SKILLS TRAINING.** I told you that our leadership training would continue in April with workshops of approximately 25 employees. We've had some contractual problems that delayed the April start date. Pilot training will occur on May 20, 2003, with training for all beginning on May 28, 2003. The Office of Diversity Programs will provide a tentative training schedule next week. While I regret the delay, I think leadership training is very important to the future of NNSA and that it is better to take more time and have meaningful training than to rush through it, just to say we did something.

**MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH.** May is Military Appreciation Month. As a retired Navy officer and the son of a retired Army officer, I am probably not the most objective commentator on this decision, but I applaud it nonetheless. We have a number of men and



women in uniform working in the NNSA both here at Headquarters and in the field. They are critical to the success of our programs. I have been enormously impressed with the performance of the military in Iraq and in Afghanistan. What I found most impressive was not the brilliant tactical plan nor the awesome military capability, but rather the pride and professionalism of the soldiers and Marines who were interviewed and chronicled in the press. I did not see a single interview that wouldn't have made me proud to have the individual under my command when I was on active duty. We are enormously fortunate to live in a country that produces men and women like this who defend us all. They all deserve our gratitude and I'm delighted there will be a formal recognition of that fact this month. We'll have more to say about that as the month goes on.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:38 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #13

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ [mailto:NNSACAST%nnsa.doe.gov@internet.al.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2003 7:23 AM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Cowan, John H ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACast Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #13

### Lintgram #13

While it wasn't the most important thing that happened these past three weeks, the most exciting thing for me personally was my swearing-in as Administrator. As I said at the time, I'm honored by the trust the President and Secretary Abraham have put in me and delighted to be able to continue working with such an outstanding group of professionals within and outside the NNSA. Other than not having to type "Acting" before my title, I don't think you'll see any differences. As you know, from the beginning I've taken the view that "Acting" meant that I was limited in duration but not in authority. Thus there is no hidden list of things I've been waiting to do.

I've spent relatively little time in Washington these past three weeks. I've visited with the employees of Los Alamos and Livermore and met separately with the Regents of the University of California, all to discuss the implications of our recent decision to open the Los Alamos contract for competition in 2005. I also spoke at both the 2003 National DOE/Contractor EEO and Diversity Training Seminar and the Fourth Annual DOE Small Business Conference. Finally, I've just returned from a week in Russia attempting to push our nonproliferation agenda forward. While I was in Russia, I took part in a ceremony to commission the largest material protection upgrade we've completed to date.

**DOE/Contractor EEO and Diversity Training and Small Business Conference.** It shouldn't be a surprise that I wanted to speak at the EEO and Diversity Training Conference; we're strongly committed to EEO and diversity. It might not be quite as clear why it was so important for me to speak at the Small Business Conference. Increasing the percentage of Federal funding that goes to small businesses is a major goal of the President's and of Secretary Abraham. We'll be pushing this hard over the coming year.

**Budget and Congress.** We now have the bills as passed from both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees. In both cases, we did quite well, with the President's budget surviving essentially intact. The Senate placed some restrictions on the Facilities and Infrastructure Re-capitalization Program (FIRP), mandating that the program conclude by 2011. This is based on their view that FIRP is designed to be a limited-duration effort to work off the backlog, and that our normal Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) efforts are what should maintain the complex. They were apparently concerned that we didn't have the same intention; which we do!

The House mandated a commission (to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense) to look at future nuclear policy. This was in response to a number of policy issues raised by our budget, especially our request to repeal the ban on research and development that could lead to low yield weapons. The Senate approved the Administration's recommendations; the House modified them somewhat. We will seek to have the Senate position accepted in conference. As I have testified, we have no plans to develop and field any new weapons at this time; what we are trying to do is remove some intellectual shackles on exploratory research so that we will be prepared to respond to needs that one day might be articulated by the President.

All of these will be subject to reconciliation during the House-Senate Conference on the FY 2004 Defense Authorization Bill and we still have the appropriations bills to be marked-up and debated in both houses. I'll keep you informed.

**Cabinet Spouses' Briefing.** On May 7, 2003, I had the privilege of briefing a number of the spouses of Cabinet members and other Administration officials on NNSA's major responsibilities. The Secretary, Deputy Secretary McSlarrow, Under Secretary Card, Assistant Secretary for Science Dr. Ray Orbach, and others also participated. This session, which has become an annual event, was hosted by Mrs. Jane Abraham and was very well received, according to my wife Barbara, who attended.

**Personnel Changes in the NNSA Front Office.** It is with mixed feelings that I announce that Captain Steve Matts, USN, who has served as the Executive Staff Director to the Administrator, NNSA, since November 2000, is moving to the United Kingdom to serve as the Commander, Naval Activities, London. While this assignment is in the best interests of Steve and his career in the Navy, I will miss him as a professional colleague and personal friend. Steve has done an outstanding job of assisting John Gordon and me and all NNSA senior officials in the effective management of NNSA activities complex-wide. We wish Steve, his wife Lori, and his two sons all the best.

Captain Matts' replacement is Captain Douglas Fremont, reporting from the National Defense University. A nuclear-trained submariner by trade, Captain Fremont is a Naval Academy Graduate and has served in a variety of submarine and shore commands. Most recently, he has been in command of the Trident submarine USS West Virginia. We welcome Captain Fremont, his wife Becky, and their family to the NNSA family.

**Progress toward the NNSA of the Future.** The next step in creating the NNSA of the Future is to continue filling the vacancies at the site offices. We have selected people, but need the funding to move them. We are seeking a reprogramming, which should let us move people this summer.

**Ideas.** Within NNSA, we've recently implemented two ideas received from staff members at our site offices. It was brought to my attention that, although Congress has designated May as Military Appreciation Month, neither DOE nor NNSA recognized that in May 2002. In May 2003, I highlighted this recognition in Lintgram #12. In a quite different area, we are issuing new Government credit cards without a U.S. Government logo in order to avoid harassment to travelers in this period of international turmoil. When I took over NNSA last year, I said that we don't have all the answers or good ideas here at Headquarters. Those are two good examples that help prove my point.

**Accomplishments.** We've had a number of people earn special recognition recently:

- Two of the three Annual Secretary's Project Management Awards went to NNSA teams. The Fissile Materials Disposition, Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend- Down Project Team won the "Secretary's Excellence in Acquisition Award," while the Office of Nonproliferation Research and Engineering, Nonproliferation and International Security Center (NISC) Project Team won the "Secretary's Award of Achievement" and the "Secretary's Acquisition Improvement Award."

- On an individual level, Jerry D. Lipsky, of the Los Alamos Site Office, was named the Facility Representative of the Year for 2002.
- Finally, over 35 individuals from NNSA received awards for community service.

Congratulations to all of the winners!

That's all I have. I hope you all had a pleasant Memorial Day weekend.

Linton Brooks

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:39 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #14

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 02, 2003 4:00 PM  
**To:** NNSACast Federal ; NNSACAST Contractor ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut) ; allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Cowan, John C. (KCAO) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ  
**Subject:** Lintgram #14

It has been a bit longer than I planned since my last Lintgram. In part that's because many of us at Headquarters (including me) have been consumed with a number of troubling issues of physical security, primarily - but not exclusively - involving the three National Laboratories. A series of events, some new, some not, has drawn a great deal of attention from the Congress. I have been routinely meeting with the Secretary and Deputy Secretary on these and related security matters. The security problems worry us a great deal. Our actions so far have been swift and decisive. However, much more needs to be done and I will shortly announce a series of steps designed to try and get a better handle on the problem.

Several of the incidents were preventable and involved failures to follow established procedures. But there is a larger issue looming that these incidents have revealed that bothers me a great deal and can only be fixed with your help. Over the last several months, we have had some serious (and some not so serious) incidents occur at various locations that have gone unreported - in some cases for up to several weeks. I have been told that one reason for this may be that people are reluctant to report things because they think that in the past we have been "shooting the messenger." Other reasons given have been that reporting incidents may reflect negatively on the respective organization and possibly impact the future of the management and operating contract for that site. I also know that, in some cases, there have been failures in people's understanding of the types of incidents that are reportable as well as in the reporting time line.

Regardless of the reasons for incidents not being reported at all or not being reported in a timely manner, we need to do better. Many of the recent incidents (though not all) are from the laboratory community, but the Federal workforce needs to set the example. I hope each of you (especially those working in operations involving nuclear weapons, special nuclear material, classified material, safeguards and security, and ES&H) will be meticulous in ensuring that things that should be reported are reported, and reported promptly. I know all the Site Office Managers and all the senior officials at Headquarters want to hear the truth, even when (perhaps especially when) it's painful. If you run into a reluctance to forward bad news, I want to know about it. As I told you when I took over, people who bring bad news forward are part of the solution, not part of the problem. I don't shoot messengers, I don't think my colleagues do, and I don't plan to tolerate anyone who does.

**Other Stuff.** Security isn't the only thing that we have been dealing with. Here are some others:

- I accompanied the Russian Ambassador to a visit at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. This was to reciprocate for a visit the American Ambassador in Moscow made to one of the Russian closed cities. It is further evidence of our attempt to build bridges between the two countries.

- I took part in a Leadership Coalition meeting focused on continuing to work out the rough spots as we proceed toward the NNSA of the Future. As always, I was impressed with the attitude of the field and Headquarters leadership and their attempts to work together to sort out specific issues.
- We will shortly issue the new NNSA Performance Management and Recognition Program. A great deal of hard work has gone into this document, which should help standardize employee performance appraisals throughout NNSA.
- I took part in the final deliberations leading to our revised Future Years National Security Plan (FYNSP). This will become the basis for our FY 2005 Budget Request this fall. I was impressed with all the hard work and good thinking that went into its preparation.

**Keeping Safe.** We pay a lot of attention to safety in the labs and plants. We need to pay equal attention to keeping ourselves safe if there is an emergency affecting our facilities. All of our buildings have plans to evacuate or shelter employees in an emergency. Those plans depend on volunteer wardens and monitors who help direct people to safety, assist people in an emergency, and report any problems that occur during exercises. We're always short of volunteers; if you are willing to help out, please speak up. Also make sure you know who your office monitor is and what to do in an emergency. This sounds simplistic, I know, but in some of our recent drills we've found people who are putting themselves at risk by not knowing what to do.

**FY 2004 Budget and Reprogramming.** Both Houses of Congress have passed the FY 2004 Authorization bills and are in Conference to reconcile their differences (which includes the differences outside of NNSA involving the Department of Defense). It is unlikely that they will finish work on a final bill before September. Meanwhile, we are waiting to see what the Appropriations Committees do. I am still optimistic that we'll do fine overall, but there are always areas where we have problems (for example, the new Presidential initiative to purchase additional Highly Enriched Uranium is unfunded in the House Authorization bill). Meanwhile, I am optimistic that the various reprogramming requests we have, including the one to provide money to let us do Permanent Change of Station (PCS) moves, will be approved. One of the committees, however, has said it wants to look at all of our reprogramming requests DOE/NNSA-wide in a comprehensive manner. There is one other major reprogramming for the Department that is awaiting OMB approval. What all this means is we probably aren't going to know for at least a couple of weeks about our reprogramming actions. None of this is unusual, although I understand it's frustrating for those of you directly involved. I'll keep you informed.

**People Changes.** This has been a period of transition for many of the people I work with on a day-to-day basis. Greg Rudy retired last week as Associate Administrator for Infrastructure and Security. I hope to name a permanent replacement soon; in the interim Bruce Scott will serve as Acting Associate Administrator with Toby Johnson picking up Greg's second hat as Acting Chief of Defense Nuclear Security. CAPT Steve Matts, who was Executive Staff Director since the very early days of NNSA, has left for an assignment in the United Kingdom as Commander of all U.S. Navy activities there. His relief, CAPT Doug Fremont, reported a week ago. CAPT Fremont, like his predecessor, is a submariner who comes to us from a year at the National War College.

Another transition will, I hope, come soon. On July 10, Paul Longworth will have his confirmation hearing to become the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. I hope that, by my next Lintgram, I can report that he is in place.

**Retirement Ceremonies.** Summer is a time for many things, including retirement ceremonies, which tend to peak in the summer months. I've gone to or presided over several such ceremonies recently. It occurs to me that I've not explained to you my views on them.

Retirement ceremonies are, of course, mostly for the person leaving. We come together to recognize their accomplishments, pay our respects, and bid our farewells. But retirement ceremonies serve another purpose as well. They remind those of us who remain that our service to our country is something to be proud of and to be celebrated. I cannot imagine why anyone would want to spend their life working in an organization that didn't show it valued the people who have already made such a commitment. I was, therefore, quite surprised to learn that much of the Department/NNSA doesn't do formal retirement ceremonies. I'm trying to change that. I urge all of you to try and change it too. People who are retiring deserve to be thanked for a lifetime of commitment. All of us deserve to be reminded from time to time that we are engaged in the service of something larger than ourselves.

That's all I have for now. Have a great Fourth of July.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:39 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: LINTGRAM #15

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 23, 2003 11:07 AM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Cowan, John C. (KCSO) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut)  
**Subject:** LINTGRAM #15

The most exciting news I have to report to you concerns people. First, I'm very pleased to announce that Monday Paul Longworth was confirmed by the Senate to become the new Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. Paul has a good deal of experience, has been working closely with us while serving as one of the Secretary's senior advisors, and is superbly well prepared for the nonproliferation job. I'm looking forward to his swearing in shortly.

The second piece of good news concerns this year's Service to America Medal finalists. The Service to America Medals are awarded by the Partnership for Public Service recognizing groundbreaking achievements of America's outstanding public servants. I'm extremely happy to announce that Debbie Monette, Assistant Manager for National Security at the Nevada Site Office, has been chosen as one of the finalists in the Homeland Security category, while Riaz Awan, Energy Attache and head of the DOE/NNSA office in Kiev, Ukraine, has been chosen as a finalist in the National Security and International Affairs category. Both were recently honored at a Capitol Hill breakfast. They were the only two from the Department that were so chosen. Since you know how strongly I feel about the outstanding public servants who make up NNSA, you can imagine how proud I am of them both.

That's the highlights. There is some more mundane stuff to report as well.

**Budget.** As you know, the budget process in Washington is confusing and complex. Our budget must be both authorized (through the Armed Services Committees) and appropriated (through the Energy and Water Development Subcommittees of the two Appropriations Committees). Since my last communication, the Appropriations Committees have acted. The good news is on the Senate side where the President's budget request was largely upheld. On the House side, however, the situation is more bleak. The House appropriators believe that we do not have a sufficient handle on the management of the existing complex and stockpile and, therefore, we should not be embarking on new ventures. They slashed funding for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and the Modern Pit Facility, and eliminated funding for improved test readiness and advanced concepts. We are thus in the somewhat strange situation in which the initiatives associated with the Nuclear Posture Review, already approved by the authorizing committees, have essentially been eliminated by the House appropriators. In addition, the House made a number of other cuts to the weapons program; the total reduction was about \$300 million, offset by some increases to the laser program.



I'm naturally disappointed by the House action. The House and Senate will now need to resolve their appropriations bills in a Conference Committee. We are hearing the usual words that this year, the Congress hopes to have the appropriations bills passed before the beginning of the fiscal year. This might happen, but I would not be surprised if we didn't have final appropriations action until very late in the fall. In contrast, I think we probably will have the Authorization Act by sometime in September.

What this means is continued uncertainty for some specific programs. I'm sorry about that. Unfortunately, it just comes with the territory. On the other hand, it is important to note that, even if everything the House did is sustained, our overall funding for Fiscal Year 2004 will be greater than 2003. The House reductions are significant, particularly in their policy implications, but they only amount to about three percent of our budget. I'll keep you informed.

**Security.** I continue to be concerned with security across the complex. Most of the problems appear to be with physical security, although other areas (cyber, material accountability, classified material control) haven't been immune. I think that, while some of the reported instances are more severe than others, in the aggregate they present a disturbing pattern. NNSA was invented in large measure because of security concerns and I want us to get a handle on what's going on. To help us do that I've asked for two commissions to be formed. One, to be headed by retired Admiral Richard Mies, will look specifically at what can be done about the existing problems. To help support him, we are reviewing past commissions and studies to see what we did about the ideas they generated.

A separate group, headed by retired Admiral Hank Chiles, will look at people, primarily in the Federal workforce. I am concerned that I have let the number of trained Federal safeguards and security experts atrophy. We have some very good people, but they are disproportionately nearing the end of their careers. You know that my view of oversight does not involve Federal micro-management. But, if there is to be good Federal oversight, there must be highly qualified overseers. I need to figure out how to make the security career field function well. Admiral Chiles, as most of you know, led a Congressionally mandated study on maintaining U.S. nuclear weapons expertise that was of significant assistance in our getting a handle on how to manage this scarce resource. I'm hoping he can do a similar job on the important resource of safeguards and security program experts.

**Sexual Harassment.** A couple of months ago, DOE held online sexual harassment training for Headquarters employees. In general, the material was quite straight forward, and provided a good refresher of do's and don'ts. As part of the training, people were urged to speak directly to individuals whose behavior was objectionable. Some questions have been raised about this advice. Some feel that it puts the burden on the victim rather than the harasser.

I thought it might be useful to make my own position on this clear. Sexual harassment in the workplace is unacceptable. Any NNSA employee has an absolute right to go to a manager or to an individual's supervisor to report sexual harassment without speaking to anyone else about it. At the same time, there are cases where a person genuinely doesn't realize that his or her behavior is objectionable, and would immediately cease such conduct if they realized how it was viewed. While I would, therefore, encourage people to speak to the person whose conduct they view as objectionable, this is strictly at their option.

All that said, sexual harassment in the workplace is intolerable and if, for whatever reason, an individual is unwilling to confront a harasser, he or she should still report the problem to management. I expect managers at all levels to deal with such issues swiftly. If you are uncomfortable reporting the incident to your local management, contact NNSA's Director of Diversity and Outreach. We will not tolerate sexual harassment and we will not put the burden for stopping it on the victim.

**The Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI) Agreement.** The continuation of the Agreement, under which we do our NCI work, is in doubt because of an overall dispute between the United States and the Russian Federation on liability. The United States has been trying to find a way to codify the agreement reached in establishing the Global Partnership (a G-8 initiative that will provide \$20 billion worth of nonproliferation support to Russia over the next ten years). In establishing the Global Partnership, the Russians agreed to certain liability provisions, but we're having some trouble getting that understanding codified. The Administration has decided not to renew any agreements that don't have the appropriate provisions. We've been working on ways to continue our NCI work until the situation is resolved.

**Odds and Ends.** Here are a couple of other things that have been happening:

- As you know, the Secretary has decided to consolidate NNSA and DOE Counterintelligence into a single office reporting to him. This will take a change to the existing NNSA Act. After consultation on the Hill, it appears we will wait to implement the consolidation until next year when the Congress can examine it more thoroughly. I don't expect this to have a great impact on most of us.
- Ev Beckner, Paul Longworth, and I met with the three Lab Directors for a half-day off-site last week. We discussed a number of things; I'll be getting a summary out to the relevant Site and Headquarters offices. I find these kind of brainstorming meetings useful from time to time.
- We presented our FY 05 program budget to the Deputy Secretary. I was quite pleased with the work that went into preparing the program which, I believe, is technically sound and fiscally responsible. The only loose end right now is the cost of implementing the new Design Basis Threat.
- I will be taking two Congressmen on a visit to Los Alamos, Pantex, and Y-12 the week of August 10. This is part of an effort to help the Congress understand both the capabilities and challenges of our physical security.
- The Congress should approve our long-awaited reprogramming requests in the next few days.

That's all I have for now. I hope all of you either have taken or will be taking some time for yourselves over the summer. While I don't always practice what I preach, I believe that it is exceptionally important to keep the right balance between work and the rest of our lives. We're all more pleasant and more productive when we take some time to refresh and renew ourselves and spend some time with our families. I hope you'll get a chance to do so.

Have a nice summer.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:39 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: LINTGRAM #16

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2003 2:28 PM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Cowan, John C. (KCSO) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut)  
**Subject:** LINTGRAM #16

Lintgram #16

I hope everyone is having a pleasant summer. Mine has included a good deal of travel. Since my last communication with you, I've been to London for an international meeting; to Omaha for the Stockpile Confidence Conference; to Los Alamos, Pantex and Y-12 to show two Congressmen our security; and, to Sandia and Los Alamos to commission some facilities. I have also been to Rocky Flats where I represented Secretary Abraham and announced that all of the weapons-useable material at Rocky Flats is no longer there - 12 years ahead of schedule. Rocky Flats is no longer a nuclear weapons site. NNSA's Office of Secure Transportation management and staff played a vital role in the success of this major campaign. I'll be back in Albuquerque and visiting Nevada in a couple of weeks to talk to people about our progress toward the NNSA of the Future.

I want to spend most of this Lintgram talking about our progress toward the NNSA of the Future, but I also want to report briefly on the Stockpile Confidence Conference. The Conference was attended by about 150 people from DOD and NNSA. The details are classified, but I thought the Conference was extremely useful. The presentations on transforming the current arsenal to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and on building a responsive infrastructure were especially valuable. Although the press portrayed the Conference as focused on developing new small yield weapons and resuming nuclear testing, discussions in that area were brief and much less dramatic than the press reported. By design, the Conference was for discussion, not decision. We will be working with DOD to see how to build on and implement some of the ideas discussed at this Conference. All in all, I thought it was an extremely helpful exercise and I appreciate all the hard work that went into making it so beneficial.

**NNSA of the Future.** It has been a while since I spoke of our progress on creating the NNSA of the Future. So perhaps I ought to give a little bit of an update. Since December 2002, we have reduced our on-board strength by about 140 positions. By the end of FY 04, our on-board strength needs to be reduced by another 160 or so positions. As you know, our hope is to maximize voluntary reductions. We had good results from the buyout and we are seeking authority from OPM for another one this fall. This one will be a little different. We will target it a bit more narrowly on the areas where we need to reduce most. We will also aim at having people who take the buyout off the rolls by the end of this calendar year. Thus, if this is something that may interest you, you should start thinking about your options. We'll get something formal out as soon as we have OPM approval.

In parallel with seeking buyout authority, we are continuing on the path for reengineering we set out last December. What happens next depends a bit on where you are. For the Service Center, it is now clear that everyone who wants to keep his or her job and move to Albuquerque will be able to do so. In November of this year, all Service Center employees outside of Albuquerque will receive a formal notification of their proposed reassignment to Albuquerque. Reporting dates will be between April 1 and August 3, according to employee needs. We think this will involve about 23 people in Washington, 89 in Nevada and 130 in Oakland. For those who receive this reassignment, we'll ask you to accept or decline by January 2004. For those who accept the reassignment, your supervisor will work with you to finalize the date by which you will report to Albuquerque. Of course, NNSA will provide you with relocation benefits. Those who decline the reassignment will get a formal *Notice of Proposed Removal* to be effective in September 2004. This will trigger your entitlement to Career Transition Assistance (discussed below).

For Headquarters, the specific individuals in jobs to be abolished will receive a formal *Notification of Expected Position Abolishment* in September. This does two things: it formally alerts you that you have a year to locate another job and it will make you eligible for Career Transition Assistance entitlements. I expect these notices to go to between 40 and 70 people in Defense Programs (NA-10) and about a dozen in Management and Administration (NA-60).

Getting entitlement for Career Transition Assistance is important. It means that people have priority for selection to any local NNSA jobs and some DOE jobs for which they are qualified. That will obviously benefit those who want to remain in Washington a good deal. But I hope it will also benefit people in Nevada as DOE offices associated with Yucca Mountain build up (the funding shortfall that has limited that buildup should be overcome in this year's budget). Oakland is more difficult because there are few other DOE facilities there. But we will be working to help people find a position in another Government agency in the Bay area. We'll also try to help people find jobs in the private sector. We'll have more information on that later.

Most Site Offices will not be affected by either of these procedures. There are about

16 people in the Nevada Site Office, however, who will follow the same procedures as Headquarters.

In earlier communications, I said we would use directed reassignments, a procedure where we direct people to take jobs in other cities and terminate those who are unwilling. We may need to do that, but we will be holding off for the present because those who decline directed reassignments end up with less time to look at other options. Instead we will try to match individuals in the Career Transition Assistance Program with vacancies throughout NNSA, including those parts that aren't being reduced.

I hope this gives you a sense of where we are and what happens next. I've tried to be as clear as possible, but personnel rules are complex and you'll want to check the formal documents before making any final decisions on what to do. In the next few weeks,

I will be coming out to Albuquerque, Las Vegas, and Oakland to discuss the situation with all of you. I'll be holding similar meetings with affected people in the Washington, D.C. area. I'll be looking for ideas about how we can make this painful process less painful.

**Do I understand?** This spring, I decided not to dwell on the turbulence associated with creating the NNSA of the Future in my Lintgrams until I had something new to tell you. Some of you have interpreted this decision as meaning that I don't understand how devastating these changes are for many of you. That's not true. I am fully aware of the sacrifices I have imposed on you. We're trying to meet people's needs, as I've described above, and to give people lots of time to explore alternatives. But I understand that a number of very good, hard-working, dedicated people are either going to be uprooted or cut off from what they thought was their career. I wish I could tell you that wasn't true, but I can't.

As I said in December, I made the decisions I did because I thought they were right. While we've made some minor adjustments, I still think that what I've done is best for the long-term health of the organization. But it isn't best for specific individuals and I understand that. I don't apologize for the decisions I made, but I do apologize if any of you have gotten the impression that I am unaware of how hard this is for you.

That's all I have on the turbulence associated with the continuation of our restructuring. I'm looking forward to that chance to discuss it face to face. In the meantime, there are a couple of other things I want to pass on:

**Budget.** Our various reprogrammings have been approved. Other than that, there's not much to report, since the Congress has been in recess. As you know, the Senate has not yet passed its version of the Appropriations bill and there are some things in the queue ahead of that bill when the Congress returns. As a result, I think it is a near certainty that we will be under a Continuing Resolution for at least a month and possibly longer. I'll keep you informed as the situation clarifies.

**Ombuds Program.** Over a year ago we established an NNSA Ombuds Program on a trial basis. Maggie Manning from NA-20 served as the first NNSA Headquarters ombuds. As you know, an ombuds (previously called an ombudsman) is a neutral observer who tries, on a confidential basis, to resolve issues between employees or between employees and management.

The pilot program we established under Maggie was highly successful, and we are now expanding the program by selecting additional ombuds for Headquarters. They include:

John Kerr; Lauren Lovick; John Ordaz; Betty (BJ) Morris; Jamileh Soudal; Jonathan Kiell; and Ann Walls. I urge people to take advantage of this program as yet another way to try to resolve issues that may be bothering you.

That's all I have for now. I'm off for a week of leave. I hope you've gotten a chance to get some time off this summer as well.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:39 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #17

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 30, 2003 4:07 PM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #17

It's been longer than I prefer since my last Lintgram. Part of the reason is that I spent the last week in August through Labor Day weekend on leave. I was fortunate enough to completely forget the office. That is an advantage of having back-up from people like Tyler Przybylek, Bill Barker, Ev Beckner, Paul Longworth, and Mike Kane. For those of you with management responsibilities, I strongly recommend that when you get away, you don't try to hang on and run things from vacation. I've never completely understood those people who go away and then call in a couple of times a day to make sure things are going well.

I've done a fair amount of traveling recently. I accompanied Chairman Hobson of the House Appropriations Subcommittee to Pantex to look at operations and security. I've also visited Kansas City and this week will be in Oakland and Nevada to talk to people about the continuing effect that the creation of the NNSA of the Future is having on their lives. Finally, I had a wonderful opportunity to attend the graduation of the first class of interns under NNSA's revitalized intern program. I was impressed with the caliber of the 14 graduates. It is important that all of us take time to nurture and mentor them.

**Reengineering - Notification of Surplus Employees.** As a next critical step in this overall process, as soon as Wednesday of next week (October 8), some Federal employees in Nevada, Savannah River, and Headquarters will be advised that it is likely that their positions will be abolished by the end of FY 2004 (a year from today). These employees will be entitled to career transition services and benefits, most notably, hiring priority for other positions in NNSA at Headquarters, the Site Offices, and/or the Service Center. Assistance will also be

given to those seeking opportunities elsewhere in DOE, with other Departments, or the private sector.

Earlier this week, I approved NNSA's Career Transition Assistance Plan (CTAP), and I will have this plan distributed to all employees in the next day or two. It is through the framework of hiring requirements and procedures in this Plan that I am hopeful that many of the employees whose positions will be abolished next year will voluntarily move into other NNSA positions. You can expect to hear much more about CTAP in the upcoming days.

**Reengineering - The Service Center.** Early in November, affected employees in Oakland, Nevada, and Headquarters will be formally notified that their jobs will be moving to Albuquerque. As I have said before, anyone willing to move will have a job. Still, I know many of you will decide not to move. We are committed to working with you to help you move to the next step in your career.

Some of my colleagues have suggested it would be useful to remind us all of how we got here and why I made the decisions on consolidating the Service Center that I have made. Last year we decided to eliminate a layer of management by eliminating Operations Offices. We decided that common functions would be provided by a Service Center. We looked at various functions and saw that each of the three (former) Operations Offices did things differently and each was more efficient in some areas than in others. So we planned to achieve efficiencies by using the best practices from each of the former Operations Offices.

Early in the process, I concluded that that we would not achieve those efficiencies if we kept all three existing sites operating. Thus, my real decision was between one or two sites and, if two sites, which two. Because of the very high investment we had in Albuquerque, I felt we had no choice but to keep that site, leaving the choices to close Oakland, eliminate the Service Center part of Nevada, or do both. I came to the conclusion that if I left two sites, sooner or later a future Administrator would be faced with another consolidation. This one has been hard enough. Further, keeping two sites wouldn't have reduced the number of people who had to move; it simply would have meant that different people would have done the moving. That's because the only practical way to have a second location would be to put one of the four major Service Center components there. But people in each area were roughly speaking evenly distributed. Thus establishing, for example, an element in Nevada would still have meant most people in Nevada would have had to move, while others would have had to move into Nevada. Ultimately, I concluded it was better to make the complete consolidation now. We can talk more about this while I'm out there, but that's the reason.

**Sandia contract.** Today we are signing the new Sandia contract, which I hope will serve as a model for other future contracts. It provides a model for increasing contractor accountability for daily operations and is thus an important step toward reengineering Federal oversight that is part of the NNSA of the Future. When the contractor has an acceptable Contractor Site Assurance System, Federal oversight will be conducted at a systems level, except for nuclear operations and safeguards and security where Federal oversight will continue the same. The contract also requires the contractor to capitalize on private sector expertise, provides a more disciplined Work Authorization process, and provides a number of other significant improvements. It also includes new performance incentives and an "award term" whereby outstanding evaluations combined with meeting several award term incentives can earn a year-by-year extension of the contract.

Patty Wagner and her team at the Sandia Site Office did a great job in negotiating this innovative effort.

**Budget.** The Senate has passed its version of the appropriations bill. The initiatives associated with the Nuclear Posture Review (advanced concepts, the nuclear earth penetrator, enhanced test readiness, and planning for the modern pit facility) are all fully funded in the Senate bill but not in the House version. There will need to be reconciliation between the two bills, which differ in a large number of specific provisions. It is not yet clear when the conference will meet, and it is still less clear when the conference will finish its work. It is certain that we will be under a continuing resolution. The Congress has passed one lasting through October 31 and I expect another one lasting until mid-November. I hope that by the middle of November we either have a specific Energy and Water Appropriations Act or a so-called "omnibus" bill that funds the entire Government.

I know this is frustrating, but the truth of the matter is that we're going to have this kind of problem every year. We will make efforts to minimize the impact, but the law doesn't give us a huge amount of flexibility. As always, I'll keep you informed, but I doubt I'm going to know a whole lot more for the next month or so. Meanwhile, we have submitted the FY 2005 budget to the Office of Management and Budget. It will be several weeks before we know how we fare; I'm quite pleased with the Secretary's recommendations and I think we'll be in good shape if the Office of Management and Budget supports him.

**Security.** We still are the subject of considerable outside scrutiny on security. In addition, internally we are wrestling with the implementation of the new Design Basis Threat. A "Design Basis Threat" is a document

formally approved by the Secretary of Energy that tells us what magnitude of threat our facilities must defend against. The idea is to ensure consistency across the complex and to give

us a standard against which we can evaluate ourselves. In May, the Secretary approved the new Design Basis Threat that is to be fully implemented by the end of fiscal year 2005. The new threat is based on an extensive global intelligence review undertaken in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks.

We have included additional funds in the FY 2005 request to the Office of Management and Budget to deal with the increased cost of this threat. It is almost certain that we will also need to spend additional money in fiscal year 2004. I'm not yet certain how much or where the money will come from. Given the growing concern in Congress to hold spending down, I suspect that we will need to do some form of reprogramming. It will be several weeks before we have a complete handle on what we are going to do. Meanwhile, I continue to be impressed by the positive attitude toward security throughout the complex.

**Safety.** One of the dangers in any large organization is to get overly focused on one aspect of the business. Since September 11, 2001, we've been very heavily focused on security. External pressure from Congress in response to reports of problems at some of our facilities has added to that focus. So has the need to figure out the implications for NNSA of the new Design Basis Threat. All of this is natural. But there is a danger in getting so focused in one area that we neglect other areas. Many of us have been reading the excellent report of Admiral Gehman's panel on the causes of the loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia. The panel attributes the causes of the accident to the program's historical cultural traits and organizational practices that were detrimental to safety. As the panel describes it, within NASA there were organizational barriers that prevented effective communication of critical safety information and an environment

existed where professional differences of opinion were stifled and insufficient attention was paid to abnormal conditions that had become routine.

I think there are some important lessons for us in this report. Many of the Site Office Managers have begun to look through it for lessons applicable to their own sites. I have chartered a small group at Headquarters, under the leadership of General Haeckel, to look for lessons applicable to NNSA as a whole. Wise people learn from the mistakes of others so they don't have to learn from their own mistakes. I think it's important that we look at reports like the Columbia report to help make our operation better and safer. I'll let you know the results of our review.

That's all I have for now. We have been fortunate in NNSA that there were no injuries from the recent hurricane, although many of our Washington colleagues were faced with significant cleanup from all the debris and a few have quite serious house damage.

Linton



## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #18

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 23, 2003 9:58 AM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Cowan, John C. (KCSO) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #18

The biggest news I have to report concerns people. On October 15, I had the pleasure of attending a black-tie dinner to honor recipients of the 2003 Service to America Medals. These awards, created two years ago, are intended to recognize the contributions of the Federal Career Civil Service. If you don't know how strongly I feel about the importance of the career work force, you simply haven't been listening, so, as you can imagine, I enjoyed the evening immensely. I enjoyed it even more because one of the medals went to Riaz Awan, of our Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Office (NA-20). Riaz is our energy attaché in Kiev, Ukraine, where he manages our nonproliferation and nuclear safety programs. He received the International Security Award in recognition of his work in managing the U.S. assistance to clean up and restore the site of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident. It was an honor to watch Senator Bingaman present him with the medal. Riaz wasn't the only NNSA employee recognized; Debbie Monette, of the Nevada Site Office, was a finalist in the category of Homeland Security for her hard work in the aftermath of 9/11. We can be very proud of both of them.

We've also recently announced several changes in NNSA leadership. Dr. Jan Cervený has just assumed her duties as the Assistant Deputy Administrator for Nonproliferation Research and Engineering. She comes to us with a long background in research management in the Air Force. It is my intention to appoint Rear Admiral Joseph Krol, U.S. Navy (Retired), as Associate Administrator for Emergency Management. He will report shortly. Rick Arkin, who has done a wonderful job in holding down both the top job and the deputy job will remain as deputy.

Most of you have seen the October 17 announcement about my intent to make Karen Boardman the Director of the NNSA Service Center in Albuquerque sometime this spring, when Jim Hirahara steps down, and my intention to make Patty Wagner the Manager of the Sandia Site Office at the same time. All of these changes bring strong leadership to important positions and I'm delighted that each of them has agreed to serve.

**Budget.** In the continuing saga of the budget, the Congress is attempting to pass both the Defense Authorization Act and the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill. While the goal is to pass both by the end of the month, it appears unlikely that will happen. On October 21, the Congress approved another Continuing Resolution, extending to the 7th of November.

We are working with the relevant Congressional committees to make our case for the President's budget. As you know, the House and Senate passed somewhat different versions of our budget, with the House having passed a significant reduction. It is simply not possible to predict how we will come out. I'm pretty sure, however, that we should know in two or three weeks.

**Safety.** On October 21, I testified before the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, along with Deputy Secretary McSlarrow, Under Secretary Card, and Glenn Podonsky, Director of the Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance. The Board was particularly interested in whether our creation of the NNSA of the Future would come at the expense of adequate safety oversight. They were concerned that we might be trying to do too much too soon. Preparing for that testimony and reading the report of the tragic loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia has gotten me thinking a lot about safety. One of the stark lessons of the Columbia disaster is that people ignored an abnormal event (the foam hitting the wing) even though there were technical people in the organization who were worried about it. Those voices didn't reach the top because the top didn't appear to be interested in minority opinions of junior technical people.

I don't want there to be any doubt about NNSA policy. I expect everybody to pay attention to safety and to speak up if they see an unsafe condition. I expect managers to pay attention to any safety issues raised, even if, on further analysis, the concerns an individual raises prove to be wrong. The person who points out an unsafe condition, and thereby prevents an accident, is a hero. But the person who points out what he or she thinks is an unsafe condition and thus forces us to take another look is equally a hero, even if that second look shows that the condition was not unsafe. If, at your location, you find that management is not receptive to your safety concerns, I want to know about it directly and immediately.

**Reading Lintgrams.** At the end of Module 5 of our Leadership Skills Training there was an opportunity to discuss specific things that NNSA is and is not doing. One topic that came up was Lintgrams. Most people who expressed an opinion found them useful. There was, however, a fairly strong minority who did not. These individuals are primarily concentrated in organizations affected most heavily by our creation of the NNSA of the Future, especially those who think (wrongly) that I don't understand how difficult this transition is for many people. I want to repeat what I said when I started these informal messages: I do Lintgrams because many people find them useful, but no one has to read them. If I have something official that I need to get out, it will be promulgated in a formal fashion. Thus if you don't find Lintgrams helpful, just delete them. That's why I always put "Lintgram" in the title.

**NNSA of the Future.** By now, all of the affected Federal employees in the Nevada and Savannah River Site Offices, and Headquarters (including some Headquarters people in New Mexico) should have been advised that it is likely that their positions will be abolished by the end of FY 2004 (just under a year from now). These employees will be entitled to career transition services and benefits, most notably, hiring priority for other positions in NNSA at Headquarters, the Site Offices, and/or the Service Center. Letters formally notifying Service Center employees in Oakland, Nevada, and Washington of our plans to move jobs to Albuquerque should go out in the next two weeks. As I told you, everyone in the Service Center who is willing to move to New Mexico will have a job. It now seems certain, however, that we will need to hire a number of additional people at the Service Center. As soon as we know the specifics, we will be opening up those positions. Those employees who have been declared surplus will have "head of the line" privileges.

In a related development, the Office of Personnel Management has approved our buyout authority. The notification has just been received and will be available from your HR specialist. Indications so far are that nearly 60 employees have expressed an interest. As you know, those taking the buyout will be leaving in early January.

**Combined Federal Campaign.** It is once again time for the annual Combined Federal Campaign. For some reason I always enjoy this period. I sit with my booklet and sort out where I want to direct contributions and feel very much like a philanthropist. I've been contributing to the Combined Federal Campaign for over 40 years. I started with very small amounts and have been inching it up each year to where I now can give an amount that would result in considerable sticker shock if I tried to sit down and write it out as a single check. The nice thing about this approach is that there are so many different organizations on the list that, no matter what you support, you can find a way to target your contributions. I hope as many of you as possible will take advantage of this

opportunity. I've spoken often about my pride in being an American. One of the things that makes me proud is that we are an inherently generous people. This is a good chance to demonstrate that.

That's all I have. The Service to America Medal ceremony reminded me again how fortunate the country is to have such outstanding career civil servants and what an honor it is for me to be part of this organization.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #19

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 19, 2003 11:32 AM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #19

The biggest piece of news I have for you concerns the FY 2004 budget. The Defense Authorization Bill has been passed; the Appropriations Bill is out of conference and will be passed shortly. In gross terms we did well. There was an overall reduction of about 1.5%, much of it through mandating the use of prior-year balances (i.e. money that was appropriated but not yet spent). There were the usual number of adjustments and earmarks that will complicate the life of specific program managers. Probably the most difficult involves the W80 Life Extension Program, where the Appropriations Conference made significant reductions. We're still evaluating exactly what that means.

From a policy standpoint, the biggest disappointment was the Congress' failing to fully support an important Presidential initiative. The Congress did not fund the new Accelerated Materials Disposition Program under which we plan to purchase weapons grade highly enriched uranium from Russia and have it down-blended to provide a strategic reserve in this country. This program would speed up the elimination of Russian weapons grade material and thus reduce the amount that has to be protected. Also disappointing was the fact that the conferees reduced funding for some initiatives associated with the Nuclear Posture Review. Funding for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) was cut in half, as was funding for the Modern Pit Facility. I would have preferred to see these programs fully funded at the President's request, but it is noteworthy that the Congress, after considerable debate, supported all of the nuclear weapons initiatives we proposed this year.

In addition to budget adjustments, the bills provide specific guidance in a number of areas. Perhaps the most striking is the requirement to compete the management contracts for Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, and three non-NNSA national laboratories. As you know, the Secretary had already decided to conduct a competition to manage Los Alamos, but we had made no decision on Lawrence Livermore. The Congress has now made the decision for us. There are a number of questions about exactly how we are going to conduct all of these competitions; I don't think those questions will be answered for a few weeks.

All in all, I am pleased, although I recognize that there is some disruption in some areas. We continue to get strong support from the Congress for the vast majority of our programs. With regard to FY 05, as I have told you, I'm quite pleased with our recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB); we will know within the next week what action OMB has taken.

**Deputy Under Secretary for Counter Terrorism.** As some of you remember, early this year we established a new position called the Deputy Under Secretary for Counter Terrorism. Ken Rapuano accepted the job, which is intended to be a focal point for the entire Department on Homeland Security and Counter Terrorism (the title is Deputy Under Secretary rather than Associate Administrator to emphasize that his responsibilities extend

outside NNSA). Ken is also a U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Officer and volunteered to serve in Iraq for the past six months. He has now returned and we are in the process of getting the new office off the ground. Right now, I think that most of the interaction will be at Headquarters rather than the field, but we're trying to be very flexible so that the office can grow to meet the needs. I look for all offices with counter terrorism and homeland security equities to work closely with Ken's office to examine the range of NNSA activities in these areas and identify the priority issues. As I said when we made the initial announcement, I'm delighted that Ken has agreed to take on this important post.

**ISO 9001.** Last year, in announcing the detailed plans for moving to the NNSA of the Future, I said that the Federal work force would become ISO 9001 certified by the end of 2004. I got that date by assuming that we wouldn't be able to start for a few months and looking at how long it has taken other large organizations to reach certification (typically about a year and a half). I have concluded that I was too optimistic about our ability to combine ISO 9001 certification with our other organizational changes. We will delay obtaining certification until the end of 2005 and focus on documenting our key business management systems over the next year.

While this may illustrate nothing more than my ability to guess wrong, I think it also illustrates an important principle. It is desirable to plan boldly. My experience is that we very seldom implement more than we plan to, although we often implement less. But, at the same time, I think it's important to be ready to tailor plans to reality. We've done that in adding 40 or so people to our initial estimates of Site Office manning. The decision to delay ISO 9001 certification is another example of recognizing reality.

**Outside Hiring.** For the past year, I have imposed a freeze on outside hiring. I did that because I wanted to make certain that people within NNSA had an opportunity to remain within the organization as we restructure and reduce the total work force. Often I find my job does not involve choosing between good and bad policies but rather in striking a balance between two things, both of which are good. I've come to the conclusion that I've given too much emphasis to preserving internal employment options and too little emphasis to filling critical needs. Therefore, I've decided to start lifting the ban on outside hiring in areas where we are having difficulty recruiting internally. This particularly applies to some of the critical jobs at the Site Offices. Naturally, those people on the CTAP list will still have "head of the line" privileges if they choose to apply. I remain committed to trying to place as many people as possible in available NNSA or DOE jobs, and I continue to believe that there will be jobs within NNSA for essentially everyone provided people are willing to relocate. Still, I am endangering our operations by the continued delay in filling some of these critical vacancies and I don't think I can do that any more.

**Ombuds.** In a perfect world, there would be no problems between people or between an employee and a supervisor. In a slightly less perfect world, such problems would exist but would be dealt with by management in a way that made everyone involved happy. In the real world, those things don't always happen. Therefore, I think it is important that there be other channels for individuals to raise concerns about their workplace. One such channel is, of course, the Office of Diversity and Outreach headed by Mary Ann Fresco. Other channels, for more serious complaints, include Equal Employment Opportunity Counselors and the Inspector General. But it's good to have a less formal channel that can help us alleviate problems before they become serious. That's what an Ombuds Program is all about.

Ombuds (previously called ombudsmen) provide informal mediation between employees or between employees and supervisors. They help eliminate friction in the workplace before it reaches the stage of requiring more formal intervention. They operate on two fundamental principles: confidentiality and impartiality. Although they report to me, they are precluded from providing me any details of who they're working with or what they are doing unless the individual involved requests that I be informed. Similarly, managers are forbidden from asking an Ombuds for any information about cases they are working. The only information that Ombuds are allowed to give me is broad trends (for example, if it appears that too many people are concerned about ethical

issues or that there are increasing concerns about the lack of adequate information on particular policies). Ombuds are impartial. They are neither part of management nor representatives of employees to management. Instead they're just good people trying to help eliminate the stresses that are inevitable in any workplace.

We've established an Ombuds Program within NNSA. The following seven employees have volunteered to serve as Ombuds: Lauren Lovick, John Ordaz, Betty (BJ) Morris, Jamileh Soudah, Jonathan Kiell, Ann Walls and John Kerr. We will be publicizing separately how to contact them. I'm very grateful for their willingness to serve. I'm also particularly grateful to Maggie Manning, who helped me establish the pilot Ombuds Program in NA-20 last year. Right now, our program is limited to Headquarters and Savannah River. We'll be trying to expand it as time goes on. I urge those of you that have workplace concerns, not to let those problems fester. If you don't think your manager can help (or if your manager is part of your problem) the Ombuds are there to assist you. I'm grateful for their willingness to help us all.

**Bum dope.** One of the things I said I hoped to do in Lintgrams is scotch rumors that have no basis in fact. Here are a couple I've heard recently:

- I have a secret plan to close the Service Center in Albuquerque. Not true. The NNSA of the Future is unworkable without a Service Center, and there would be no point in trying to move it after we've gone through all the burden of consolidation in Albuquerque.
- The forthcoming change in Sandia Site Office leadership is a result of pressure from the laboratories because the Site Office was pushing them too hard. Not true. While I think working relationships with contractors are important, they don't get to pick Site Managers. I do. In this particular case, the laboratory never raised any questions about Site leadership. As a courtesy, I did tell them about the changes shortly before making the public announcement.
  - At Los Alamos an inspection team took nuclear material out of TA-18 in a shopping cart. Not true. This appears to be the nuclear security version of an urban legend. You can help foster rational discussion of an important topic by expressing skepticism if you hear such a rumor.

**Administrative burdens.** One of the problems people have pointed out to me during my various field visits was our continued failure to reduce the administrative burden on the field. We said we were going to streamline administration; that was one of the reasons why we could get by with fewer people. People complain to me that Washington is still imposing too many requirements. Unfortunately, when I go out to Site Offices for specifics, I don't get a lot. If there are reports you are doing or things you are responding to that you think are unnecessary, let the Site Office Manager know (same goes for Headquarters and the Service Center). If he/she agrees, I'll be happy to try to fix the problem. But I can only fix specifics, not generalities.

That's all I have for now. I hope all of you have a peaceful, restful, and happy Thanksgiving and that you get to spend it with your families. One of the many things I am thankful for is that the country has such an outstanding and dedicated group of public servants in NNSA.

Linton

PS. Don't forget your Combined Federal Campaign pledge!



## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #20

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 16, 2003 2:44 PM  
**To:** allnnsafedemp ; Cowan, John C. (KCSO) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQFED  
**Subject:** Lintgram #20

Lintgram #20

The most important thing I did in the last few weeks was host a day and a half meeting of the Leadership Coalition. That is our name for periodic meetings among the Site Managers, Service Center director, and the Headquarters Management Council. There are 18 of us in all, evenly divided between Headquarters and the field. We established the Leadership Coalition a year ago in recognition of how well this same group worked together in helping prepare some of the decisions on creating the NNSA of the Future. Since then, we have met frequently, but this meeting was different. We wanted to minimize passive acceptance of information and focus on an interactive discussion of issues. Thus, there were no briefing slides, observers sitting around the edges of the room, and no lengthy discussion of topics on which there was pro-forma agreement. Instead, we tried to wrestle with some of the difficult issues facing us, using an outside facilitator to help. Our discussions were informed by a book we have been reading called, "The FIVE Dysfunctions of a Team," by Patrick Lencioni which argues that organizations often get in trouble because people don't trust one another enough to air strong disagreements. We made some progress.

We spent a good deal of the time talking about relations among the Headquarters, the Site Offices, the laboratories and plants and the Service Center. In addition, a lot of time was spent on safety, including the most recent hearings before the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and Brigadier General Ron Haeckel's ongoing study of the implications of the Columbia Space Shuttle accident for NNSA. General Haeckel's group has reached some tentative conclusions and is continuing to refine them. Their work so far suggests that there really are important parallels and that we need to work on improving our safety culture. We discussed some of the implications and I hope to have some specifics, once the group has completed its work and made its recommendations. The NASA problem was largely cultural. To the extent that NNSA has cultural problems as well, we will need to work hard to change them. Culture can change, but it tends to take a long time. I'll have more to say about this in the future.

We also spoke a lot about providing additional safety resources beyond the site offices. We concluded that we need a Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety who would report to me and help ensure adequate external support for the sites. We're still wrestling with the correct balance between assistance and oversight for this position. I'll have a good deal more to say about that in the future as well.

**Meritorious Executives.** Each year, the President, on the advice of his Cabinet officers, recognizes a small group of career Senior Executives with the President's Rank Award for exceptional long-term accomplishments.



Winners of this prestigious award are strong leaders who achieve results and consistently demonstrate strength, integrity, industry, and a relentless commitment to excellence in public service. Award winners are chosen through a rigorous selection process. After nomination, they are evaluated by boards of private citizens and approved by the President. The evaluation criteria focuses on leadership and results.

The White House soon will announce those members of the Senior Executive Service on whom the President has bestowed Rank Awards for 2003. I'm delighted to tell you that the President has selected six of our senior executives as Meritorious Executives. I notified the awardees several weeks ago and now I am notifying the NNSA family. They are: Bill Barker, the NNSA Chief of Staff; Jim Mangeno, the NNSA Senior Advisor for ES&H; Greg Rudy, now retired from NNSA as the Associate Administrator of Facilities and Operations, but holder of a number of positions throughout the DOE; Mike Hooper, now retired from NNSA and former Deputy Manager at the Livermore Site Office;

Ken Powers, as Deputy Manager of the Nevada Operations Office and Deputy Director of the NNSA Service Center; and James Mosquera, CIO for Naval Reactors.

The entire Senior Executive Service makes up only a small fraction of the Federal Civil Service. Those singled out by the President represent still a smaller fraction. They are truly the best of the best and we are all honored to be serving with them. Please give these individuals your congratulations.

**Longevity awards.** While it is important to recognize the achievements of our senior management team members, it is also very important that we single out individuals for their special accomplishments. However, NNSA's success also depends heavily on the sustained, year in and year out hard work of many individuals who don't get recognized by the President. They keep things moving, perform the analyses, build the budgets, prepare the travel orders, conduct the safety inspections, and think of the new ideas. Without them, we wouldn't have an organization. We don't even have a good name for these people. We call them the "rank and file" or "the staff." But those terms aren't adequate. Perhaps we should just call them "NNSA" because they ARE the organization.

We have only one way to recognize these individuals on whose sustained hard work everything depends. We give them service awards or, more formally, "Certificates of Service" and a silver or gold pin. I suspect you've all seen these. Most of you probably have more than one, perhaps on a wall, perhaps in a drawer. But I urge you to read the citations again. The citation is usually very straightforward and states something like "this certificate is presented in recognition of dedicated Federal service to the people of the United States of America." It's hard to think of a higher honor than that. Because I want to recognize that honor, I've been trying to personally present as many of these awards as possible, particularly for people with 25, 30, 35 or more years of service. Last summer, I had the privilege of presenting several 40-year certificates and pens to valued members of my front office team. Seeing these certificates helps remind me -- and I hope you -- of what a privilege we have in being able to serve our country in the company of so many other outstanding people.

**Security.** One of the important ways we keep our protective force trained is through performance testing or force-on-force testing. Sites conduct these exercises on their own, but the Office of Independent Assessment and Performance Assurance (OA) conducts the most elaborate exercises. I have been explaining the importance of this training/evaluation to the Congress and thought that I ought to go see for myself how these are conducted. I, therefore, went and witnessed OA's force-on-force testing at Y-12. I came away hugely impressed with the value of such exercises, the attitude of the security professionals, the site personnel, and the contractors, and the immense amount of work necessary to make these exercises realistic, safe, and effective. I find that, even though I understand the techniques and the concepts, there's a great benefit to actually having seen such exercises. It helps me to understand what they can and cannot do. It also reinforces my well-known view that there are a number of superb people in the complex.

**Budget.** We are now in the final throes of putting together the budget for Fiscal Year 2005, scheduled to be submitted to Congress by the President in February. While there is a good deal more work to do, most of the major decisions have been made. Nothing is final in the budget until the President approves it, so I don't want to get into detail. In general, I remain pleased by the strong support for our specific programs. Because of concern over the deficit, we'll probably see very little growth this year. This will be true for most areas of non-defense spending.

This week, I will be traveling in support of some of our international programs. I'll be meeting in London with the British as part of our 45-year long collaboration on nuclear issues. While I'm there, I'll also be speaking about our nonproliferation program at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Then I will travel to Murmansk (where the sun set on December 1<sup>st</sup> and will rise again in January) to commission some of the improved security facilities we have been constructing in conjunction with the Russian Navy. Finally, I'll have a couple of meetings in Moscow as I try to warm up after the extremely frigid weather in Murmansk.

Because of this travel, this is probably my last Lintgram to you until after the beginning of the new year. I hope all of you have a joyous holiday season. This is a time of year for turning to family and for thoughts of home and peace. But as we let the glow of the season warm our hearts, remember the men and women throughout the world, in uniform and out, who are preserving our freedom and supporting our country. They serve in discomfort and danger around the world so that we can gather in safety and joy around the Christmas tree.

I wish all of you a blessed, happy and prosperous New Year. It remains a huge pleasure and privilege to be part of NNSA. Thank you for all you have done for your country this year.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #21

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 03, 2004 12:05 PM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #21

It's been a good deal longer than I expected since my last Lintgram. For the first three or four weeks (over the holidays) there was very little happening that was worth telling you about. For the last three weeks, there has been so much happening that I simply have not had time to sit down and prepare one of these. As a result, this may be a bit longer than usual.

First of all, a belated Happy New Year. I hope all of you had a chance to relax over the holidays. My holiday had enough special events to feel festive and enough time hanging out with my family to feel relaxing.

I started out the New Year by taking a group of five Congressmen to visit Sandia, Los Alamos, and Pantex. Unlike previous Congressional visits focused on security concerns, this was an opportunity to show some of our strong supporters samples of the important and high quality science, technology, and production work being done in the nuclear weapons complex. It was a very successful visit, thanks in no small part to the hard work of the Site Offices and the facilities. I know Congressional visits require a lot of work and often involve some level of anxiety, but they are hugely beneficial. It is simply not possible for people to understand the complexity and the excellence of our work without the opportunity to see it firsthand.

I had a quite different opportunity to see the excellence of our work just before Christmas when I attended the formal commissioning of some of the security upgrades we have been funding in the Russian Northern Fleet. It was impressive to see what we have accomplished. It was also very cold and rather dark. The site is above the Arctic Circle and I was there almost exactly in the middle of the six-week "polar night," when the sun does not rise.

**Emergency Response.** While most of us were enjoying a pleasant break from the burdens of work, our colleagues in the Emergency Management organization were not. As is customary when the Nation goes to an elevated condition, such as Homeland Security Condition Orange, there is a great demand on NNSA's Emergency Management assets, both Federal and contractor. As always, Rick Arkin and his organization performed superbly, meeting all challenges with confidence and professionalism. It was yet another example of what a great national asset the capabilities of NNSA represent.

**People.** There are a number of changes underway in the senior leadership of NNSA. First, effective on January 12, Patty Wagner assumed the duties of Site Manager of the Sandia Site Office, with Steve Goodrum becoming her Deputy. Karen Boardman will divide her time for the next few weeks between preparing to take over the NNSA Service Center and providing assistance to Patty. I will announce the date of Karen's assumption of the responsibility of Service Center Director at a later date.

Second, I am very pleased to tell you that I have selected Steve Taylor as the new Manager of the Kansas City Site Office, pending formal approval by the Office of Personnel Management. He has done a wonderful job as the Acting Site Office Manager, while the process of selecting a new Site Manager was being carried out. I'm grateful he has agreed to take the job permanently. While the interview and selection process took longer than I had hoped, I was very pleased that we had such an excellent roster of candidates to choose from.

Third, for personal reasons, Ralph Erickson needs to return to Washington and will be leaving Los Alamos later this spring. This is a significant loss as Ralph has done magnificently in an important and challenging job. Fortunately, Ed Wilmot has agreed to take over the duties of the Los Alamos Site Office Manager. I'll have an announcement about Ed's replacement at Savannah River at a later date.

Finally, as I had previously announced, retired Rear Admiral Joseph Krol reported on January 12 to assume the duties of Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations. Rick Arkin, who has been holding down two jobs for a very long time, will remain as his Deputy. I am very grateful to Rick for all of his hard work, his professionalism and personal support to me and the Emergency Management infrastructure of the entire Federal Government. I'm delighted with all of these changes and believe that they represent good news for NNSA, DOE, and the country.

**Safety.** In previous years, the Department has held periodic safety summits involving both Federal and contractor officials. This year, the decision has been made to hold summits separately for NNSA and the rest of DOE. We will hold ours on February 4 in Albuquerque. It will give us a chance to discuss the implications for NNSA of the recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Hearings and the investigation of the Space Shuttle Columbia accident. General Haeckel and his team are in the final stages of putting together a report on the lessons NNSA should learn from this accident.

**Security.** As most of you know, Glenn Podonsky, who has run the Department's Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance (OA) for some years, has been appointed to a new position in which he will oversee both OA and the Office of Security. One benefit of this is to ensure consistency in security policy. Another benefit is to bring Glenn's strong knowledge of the Department to the security area. I regard this change as leading to a new set of opportunities to improve cooperation between NNSA and the Office of Security, and I am looking forward to working with Glenn. Glenn and his team have visited various sites to discuss the new organization and its workings.

In a separate development in security, I plan to hold our first-ever Security Summit later this spring, probably in May. By that time, we will have the results of the external independent assessment teams headed by Admirals Mies and Chiles and be in a good position to discuss the implications of their findings.

**Leadership Coalition.** We had a meeting of our Leadership Coalition (the Site Office Managers, the Director of the NNSA Service Center, and the senior Headquarters leadership) last week here in Washington. This was the second time we had tried our new procedure of focusing entirely on discussion, with no briefings and no items presented "for information" or "for formal approval." We continued to wrestle with the broad questions of oversight. We're trying to strike the right balance between my strong emphasis on the authority and responsibility of the Site Office Managers and the obvious fact that if we don't have some oversight, sooner or later mistakes will happen.

We discussed the implications of the Columbia accident for NNSA, based on the report General Haeckel and his team have prepared. We also did some further refinement on the idea of a Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety, a nuclear safety czar, if you will, who would report directly to me. We also discussed what sort of assist visits we should be providing the sites. I expect I'll have more to say about that soon. In addition, we discussed the planned transfer of responsibility for environmental issues at NNSA sites from EM to NNSA. We will be taking over responsibility for newly generated waste (at those sites where we don't already have it) in the near future.

We are still working with EM on a schedule for transferring responsibility for legacy waste. Obviously, we need to get the budget and the people and the understanding of regulatory commitments before we can carry out these functions. We're still wrestling with how we'll manage this effort from Headquarters. Finally, we discussed our progress toward the NNSA of the Future, including staffing and our workload reduction initiatives.

**DOE Senior Leadership Conference.** The day after our Leadership Coalition Meeting, the Department had its periodic Senior Leadership Conference. There was a variety of information exchanged, but the most exciting thing was to hear the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget tell us that the Department was currently evaluated as the best managed Department in Government, with regard to the President's Management Agenda. The Headquarters folks know about the President's Management Agenda, but many of the rest of you may not. As you know, President Bush holds a Masters Degree in Business Administration. He believes strongly that we have an obligation to improve the management of Government. He has chosen to focus on five specific areas: human capital, competitive sourcing, financial management, e- government, and budget/performance integration. Departments are rated in each area on a "red, yellow, green" standard, with separate evaluations for status and progress. We are the only Department that has all green ratings on progress and no red ratings on status. Since many of us are all too familiar with the old days when the Department had a reputation for poor management, this is very encouraging. I commend all of you for your excellent work.

A second major item that we discussed at the DOE Senior Leadership Conference was a series of what the Deputy Secretary is calling Management Challenges. These are discrete areas where we hope to make some specific improvements in the coming year. They cover safety, security, roles and responsibilities, timeliness of processing correspondence, laboratory competition, project management, and information technology. I think this effort will mostly involve Headquarters, but if we can get a handle on some of our remaining persistent problems, the benefits will flow to everyone.

**Budget.** The President's budget was released on February 2. I am generally pleased with the budget. We got strong support from the Secretary and Deputy Secretary and from the Office of Management and Budget for our program. This is particularly impressive because there was a significant effort to hold down non-defense spending this year. When you see the budget, you will notice some increase in Safeguards and Security funding, representing the Secretary's and my strong commitment to ensuring that we are fully capable of meeting the challenges posed by the new Design Basis Threat, even at the expense of program funding. Overall, I think we can all be pleased with the continued support for all of our missions, both within the Administration and on the Hill.

**NNSA of the Future.** Our colleagues in Oakland and Nevada have now all formally advised us whether they will accept a reassignment to Albuquerque. Approximately 100 have decided they will not. We will be working with them to help them find other opportunities in California and Nevada. About 100 have decided to accept reassignment. Some of those may change their minds if other opportunities arise, but even if all of the people who say they will relocate actually do, our totals at the NNSA Service Center will be well below what we need and we will be doing some additional hiring. This reassignment process is still underway for a number of Headquarters personnel who have been offered positions at the Service Center. I will have more to report on these individuals shortly. We'll also have to deal with the fact that, while our overall totals are below what we need, there are some areas in which we're over-staffed and we will need to retrain some people to fill other shortages. We'll be working on how we can even all of this out.

Meanwhile, we continue to work on an individual basis with those employees whose functions have been declared surplus to help them find suitable jobs either within NNSA or elsewhere. The CTAP status that gives them "head-of-the-line" privileges has helped a number of people find good and interesting jobs. I continue to believe that there is a job for everyone now in NNSA if individuals are willing to relocate. If people can't relocate, we'll continue to try to help them find other opportunities.

While I am pleased that the above process is working, I have received troubling reports concerning mistreatment of some employees who have begun new assignments. This mistreatment involves verbal slights and other indicators that these employees are somehow second-class. To say that I am disappointed by these reports is an understatement. I will not tolerate anyone in NNSA being mistreated or belittled. I am particularly upset that individuals who have accepted personal and professional disruption in the interests of the overall organization are being treated poorly. I expect these individuals to be welcomed with open arms and to be regarded as valuable colleagues. I also expect them to be treated professionally and with the utmost respect, in full recognition of all of the stress they have been under since their individual positions were declared surplus. Your personal efforts to make this transition as positive an experience as possible for all involved is particularly important to me!

That's all I have for now. I'll try not to go so long between communications next time.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #22

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 03, 2004 7:30 AM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #22

The most important thing that I've done in the last few weeks was to preside over a retirement ceremony for Jim Hirahara. Jim leaves Federal service after 32 years, the last of which was spent helping to establish the NNSA Service Center. While I'm grateful for the work Jim and his colleagues have done in setting up the Service Center, I'm even more grateful for his many years of service to the United States. As I hope you all know, I think it is very important that we recognize the service of Federal retirees who have given so much to our country.

**People.** As I mentioned in the last Lintgram, Ed Wilmot is moving from the Savannah River Site Office to become the Los Alamos Site Office Manager. I'm delighted to announce that Rick Arkin has agreed to replace him at Savannah River. Rick has done an exceptional job in carrying the load in our Emergency Operations organization while we searched for a permanent Associate Administrator. I'm glad he's agreed to take on another important task.

**Smoke, Safety, and Shuttles.** General Haeckel and his team have completed their analysis of the applicability of the Columbia Space Shuttle tragedy to NNSA. I have distributed their report. There are many lessons to be learned from Columbia. Four of the most important causes of the accident were:

- Safety professionals raised issues, but senior managers didn't pay attention.
- Some officials fell into the trap of wanting to prove that things were unsafe, rather than proving they were safe.
- People accepted things because "they've always been that way."
- The pressures of meeting schedules were given undue weight when it came to safety.

By coincidence, at almost exactly the time we were finishing our analysis of the report of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board, we had an opportunity to apply its principles. A safety professional at one of the Site Offices realized that we had no documentation of whether the smoke canisters used in force-on-force exercises were safe for observers. We'd always used these canisters; we had a major exercise scheduled that no one wanted to postpone; and there was no indication that the smoke was unsafe. We simply didn't have the proof that it was safe. But instead of dismissing the issue, the appropriate managers concluded that we should suspend the use of smoke until we could gather the data to make sure we understood what, if any, risks were involved. This seems to me exactly the right approach to questions of safety.

**Diversity in the NNSA of the Future.** Before General Gordon left, all of the NNSA leadership agreed that one of our goals in creating the NNSA of the Future would be to ensure that we were at least as diverse after all of the changes as we were when we started. I thought we could meet that goal, but it now appears we will not. Both the organization as a whole and leadership positions have become slightly less diverse. One reason is that a number of our colleagues in Oakland, among the most diverse sites, have chosen not to relocate. I am still wrestling with whether we have adequately identified and addressed the causes.

In any event, we are where we are. I will be working with the Leadership Coalition to try to target outreach activities to minority and diverse populations as we deal with the almost certain understaffing of the Service Center. I would also like to target recruiting for the Site Office vacancies toward minorities, but as a practical matter some Site Office vacancies are difficult to fill and we have to focus on the urgent need to fill them. I remain committed - as does the entire Leadership Coalition - to increasing the diversity of the work force and of our supervisors. I will keep you informed as we work toward this common goal.

**Project Management.** Each year, the National Research Council provides a report on project management in the Department of Energy. This year's report had a number of good things to say about NNSA. We are praised for our ten-year comprehensive site plans, for the strategy we developed for shutting down plutonium production reactors in Russia, and for general project performance. I was very pleased with all of this. One thing in the report, however, bothered me a lot. The investigators found that "a number of DOE project directors expressed the belief that DOE upper management would not support them if they rejected contractors' submittals or decisions, and they were thus reluctant to challenge contractors." I can't tell whether the people were from NNSA or not; the report doesn't specify. But I am very worried if this attitude exists among our project directors. It seems to me to be one more example of a widespread - but wrong - belief that individuals will not be supported by the chain of command. I expect individuals to raise issues when appropriate and I expect them to be supported by their chain of command when they do.

**Congress.** We are getting ready to begin a period of Congressional hearings that will be heavily focused this month. The Secretary has had his first hearing (which did not cover NNSA), and I will be having my first hearing in two weeks. I expect we will get good support from the Hill for most of our program. Two areas will be particularly contentious. One is security. I think we can expect a series of separate oversight hearings on security. In particular, I think there will be a good deal of concern about the implementation of the Design Basis Threat.

A second area where I expect a good deal of controversy involves the small fraction of our total budget that relates to the President's Nuclear Posture Review. This includes funding for advanced concepts, enhanced readiness for nuclear testing, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, and the Modern Pit Facility. In the eyes of critics, all of these are perceived to have significant policy implications. As there was last year, I expect there will be strong debate.

In addition to these two areas, we will doubtless have the usual unforeseen budget-related issues. I'll keep you informed as these arise. As most of the Headquarters' staff knows all too well, our workload increases dramatically during the Congressional hearing season. In addition to preparing and coordinating testimony, there are questions to be addressed just before and immediately after each hearing, meetings with committee staff and Members, and a number of short-notice requests for information. I know how difficult this can be for you. The Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, Ev Beckner, Paul Longworth and I all appreciate your hard work and untiring efforts throughout the hearing process. Gaining Congressional support for our program is important for the country. That support wouldn't be as strong as it is without all your efforts. Thanks in advance for helping us present the President's program so effectively.

That's all I have for now.



Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:41 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #23

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 31, 2004 7:19 AM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #23

The last few weeks have been reasonably busy in Washington. I've been focused on Congressional budget hearings, on security, and on the recommendations of General Haeckel's task force on the applicability of lessons learned from the Space Shuttle Columbia tragedy to NNSA.

**Congressional Hearings.** In the last three weeks, I've testified four times before Congress and Ev Beckner, Paul Longworth, and I have accompanied the Secretary to two other hearings. We have now completed all the NNSA budget-related hearings, although I expect two hearings in April on security. The Congressional hearing season is a period of some stress for the witnesses (i.e., normally me, Ev, and Paul) and a huge amount of work for the staff. For each hearing, we prepare an oral and written statement and then try to anticipate all of the possible questions and provide information so the witness can answer intelligently. With the vast scope of NNSA activities, that is a significant burden. It is even more difficult for the Secretary, who has all of our stuff plus all of the rest of the Department's. As a result, a large number of people worked very hard to get us ready for these hearings. They did a superb job and I felt exceptionally well prepared. As usual, no good deed goes unpunished. The same people who worked so hard to prepare me for hearings now must work to answer a series of so-called "questions for the record" that individual Senators and Representatives didn't get a chance to ask during the hearings.

In general, I was pleased with the hearings. I was very well prepared, thanks to the hard work mentioned above. I thought we made a good case for the President's program. Still, there were some areas in which we will have significant problems. My overall impressions:

- In both the House and the Senate, there will be substantial pressure to hold down overall spending. This means that there is very little chance of increases and a significant chance of decreases in the President's budget.
- As usual, nonproliferation seems to draw a great deal of support, although many were worried by our continuing inability to reach a liability agreement with the Russian Federation that would allow us to proceed with the plutonium disposition program (I am equally worried).
- There remains substantial skepticism on some of our new initiatives, especially the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. The argument is not technical, but rather a disagreement on policy, with opponents believing such a weapon lowers the nuclear threshold, hurts nonproliferation, and is unlikely ever to be used. Our arguments that all this budget request calls for is a study did not fully satisfy some of the critics.

- There is continuing concern with the size of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The Congress had requested a revised stockpile plan (which they clearly assumed would show significant reductions). The plan was due on February 1, 2004, but has not yet been completed. We are working with the Department of Defense (DoD), as the military requirements for nuclear weapons are primarily a DoD lead. Several committees indicated dissatisfaction with the delay, and, as a result, there were some suggestions that there would be holds placed on some of our Fiscal Year 2005 funds.
- The date for NIF ignition has also become a sore point with several committees that have expressed concern about when ignition will be achieved and our overall commitment to this critical facility.
- Security continues to be a major concern, although I think that our requests in this area are likely to be approved.

Although all the committees say that they will be marking up the bills in May, there is a good chance that this schedule will slip; thus it will probably be two or three months before we know how Congress will handle these major issues. I'll keep you informed.

**Leadership Coalition.** Last week we had one of our periodic meetings of the Leadership Coalition, which includes the Site Managers, Service Center Director, and the heads of the various Headquarters organizations. It was the last such meeting for Ralph Erickson, who is retiring from his position as the Los Alamos Site Office Manager. We will miss Ralph's knowledge and commitment. I will be going to Los Alamos to preside over his retirement ceremony on April 15. This was also a transition meeting for Ed Wilmot, who is to take over at Los Alamos and Rick Arkin, who will soon replace Ed at Savannah River. Finally, Jerry Paul, who has been named by the President to be my Principal Deputy, sat in on the meeting as an observer. This gave Jerry the opportunity to get more familiar with the issues, but much more importantly, to begin to learn who the players are. I am hopeful that by the next time the Leadership Coalition meets, Jerry will have been confirmed.

We discussed our progress on implementing the NNSA of the Future, the EM to NNSA transition, and the recommendations of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board, including the idea of establishing a Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety. We probably spent the most time discussing the potential responsibilities of the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety. It is vital that we get this right, since I believe that such an individual can be a huge help to me and to the organization. I recently sent you an NNSACAST on the EM to NNSA transition, so I won't discuss any of the details here. I do want to say a few more words on where we are on safety, however.

**Safety.** A month ago I got the report of the panel led by General Haeckel to see what safety lessons NNSA could learn from the Columbia Space Shuttle tragedy. Since receiving the report, I've provided it to each Site Manager and asked for suggestions on how to proceed. We are looking at each of the report's recommendation through two lenses. First, we want to make sure the recommendations will actually make things better and not simply make us feel good. That means we don't want any pro forma implementation of recommendations; rather, we want real improvement. At the same time, we do not want to change the basic approach to responsibility and authority that we established in the last year and a half. Specifically, the Site Managers are responsible to me for all forms of safety (as well as for everything else) at their Sites. They need to have the authority necessary to carry out that responsibility.

I see the recommendations from the Haeckel report as meeting three needs: (a) giving me some independent ability to make sure the Site Managers are acting as I want them to in carrying out these responsibilities; (b) giving the Site Managers the needed tools to do their job; and, (c) encouraging culture changes that lead to a greater willingness to step up to the plate on safety. We had good discussions on this topic at the Leadership Coalition, and I hope to have some announcements for you soon, although there are still some recommendations whose implications we are continuing to wrestle with.

**Security.** We are about to receive the report of Admiral Chiles' panel to look at what we can do over the long-term to improve the capabilities of our security professionals and to ensure they have the resources they need to do their job. Admiral Chiles' effort is focused primarily on the Federal work force. I have seen a preliminary draft and believe there will be some useful recommendations. Once again, as with the recommendations on safety, I want to make sure that we take the time to implement the recommendations in a way that will actually lead to positive change.

I anticipate having the results of Admiral Mies's review of the Safeguards and Security programs at our sites shortly. Admiral Mies and his team have been looking at our existing security problems and what can be done about them. As some of you know, we have scheduled a Security Summit for June 2. By that time, I believe we will be able to discuss the implementation of the various recommendations from these two outside panels of experts. I will keep you informed.

**Support for Public Service.** Because of my job, I get invited to a lot of Washington area receptions and other functions. I don't go to very many of these, but I did attend a recent Capitol Hill reception announcing the formation of a Congressional Caucus on Public Service. This new caucus is intended to help Members of Congress from both parties work together to promote a high-quality Federal civil service. At the reception, two Senators, three Congressmen, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Deputy Director for Management from the Office of Management and Budget all spoke. As you would expect from the nature of the event, all of the speakers were very strong in declaring that the American civil service is the envy of the world and that public servants need to be respected and honored. These are points the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and I routinely try to make, so it was heartening to hear them made by other influential figures. No one can predict the long-term consequences of these sorts of caucuses, but I think it is important that there are Congressional leaders who want to ensure continued excellence in the Federal workforce.

That's all I have for now. I hope you are enjoying the first signs of spring.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:41 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #24

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 27, 2004 11:54 AM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; NNSAKCSO FED/CON ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut) ; DOECAST, SNR ; Samantha Hughes Robillard (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #24

I don't have as much to tell you as I normally do because I spent a week on leave this month. Like many of you, I have somewhat of a reputation as a workaholic (not totally unfair). Thus, leave is especially important for me. The opportunity to get away from the office and spend time with family is something that I urge all of you to take advantage of.

Except for walking on the beach with my wife in Florida, the most important thing I did in the past month was preside over a turnover ceremony where Ed Wilmot replaced Ralph Erickson as the Site Office Manager at Los Alamos. The ceremony was combined with a retirement ceremony for Ralph.

I've spoken to you before of the importance I place on retirement ceremonies. They serve several purposes. First, and most important, they honor the individual retiree for his or her many years of service (in Ralph's case 33 years). They allow us to demonstrate to younger people how much we collectively value such long service. But I think they do something else as well. They remind us that all of us - those who retire and those who remain - are engaged in the service of something larger than ourselves. It is useful to stop and remember that we are serving the people of the greatest Nation in the history of the world. Retirement ceremonies are one way to do that. I'll be presiding over another one this week when Toby Johnson, our Chief of Defense Nuclear Security, retires after 34 years of distinguished service. Losing Ralph and Toby is a significant loss to NNSA. They have served our country well.

When I went to Los Alamos for Ralph's retirement, we combined the retirement ceremony with something we have not done before: a formal turnover ceremony similar to a military change-of-command. I believe that, for most people, important milestones seem to demand ceremonies. Weddings, graduations and retirements could simply be announced through the mails but, for most of us, the aspect of ceremonies adds to the dignity and importance of the occasion. I think that is also true of the assumption of important authority and responsibility. Within the military, a change-of-command ceremony is a centuries-old tradition that formally transfers responsibility from one commander to the next. It would have been inappropriate to have such a ceremony a few years ago when authority and responsibility were more diffused. Now, it seems to me to be exceptionally appropriate.

**Washington Update.** This is sort of an "in-between" period in Washington, at least from my perspective. We have finished Congressional budget testimony (although people are still working hard answering questions for the record), but we are about a month away from seeing the initial results of Committee action. On security, we're waiting for the results of Admiral Mies' Panel (which, as you remember, is looking at near-term security improvements) and studying the suggestions from Admiral Chiles' Panel about improving the career paths for Federal security specialists. In safety, we're continuing to work through the recommendations of General Haeckel's Panel. Thus, while we're busy, I don't have a lot of concrete progress to report to you.

There are a few things to tell you, however:

- For the last three years, we have had responsibility for most emergency management functions, but the Emergency Operations Center was assigned to DOE's Office of Security. We are now consolidating all emergency management within Joe Krol's NA-40 organization under the Deputy Under Secretary for Counterterrorism, Ken Rapuano.
- Our new Principal Deputy, Jerry Paul, had his confirmation hearing this morning. Assuming the Senate confirms him, we hope he will be on board full-time around the first of July. This will be a huge help to me. I expect he will be getting out to the various field sites relatively soon so you'll have a chance to meet him.
- We have recently taken over responsibilities for recovery of sealed sources. These are radioactive sources that could be of use to terrorists. We have consolidated both the domestic and overseas program under NA-20 and are making very good progress on eliminating a number of U.S. and foreign sealed sources.
- Bruce Scott is working with the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Jessie Roberson, to clarify the transition of responsibilities for legacy waste management and remediation from EM to NNSA. It's going well but, once again, there's nothing specific to report.

**The Importance of Administrative Support.** The week of April 19 was Administrative Professionals' Week. The cynic would say that this is when we try in one week to recognize our administrative experts instead of recognizing their value all 52 weeks of the year. I hope that's not the case for you. Large organizations cannot function without competent administrative support. The people who provide it deserve our respect and our thanks. I hope that you found the opportunity to show your appreciation; if you didn't, it's not too late.

**Holocaust Remembrance Month.** This is the time of year when we stop to remember the six million Jews and others who were exterminated during the Holocaust. In addition to remembering the specific horror, the Holocaust reminds us that there are evil people in the world. Guarding against such people is one reason why our work is so important.

**U.S. Nuclear Policy.** Over the past few months, I have spent a lot of time explaining and defending the Administration's nuclear policy. It occurs to me that I've explained it to everyone but you. So for those who are interested, I've put my most recent testimony on the subject on our NNSA web site ([www.nnsa.doe.gov](http://www.nnsa.doe.gov)). It tries to explain not only the basis for our policy, but also what it means for us in the NNSA. I hope you find it useful.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:41 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #25

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 18, 2004 9:13 AM  
**To:** DOECAST, SNR ; Samantha Hughes Robillard (E-mail) ; allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; NNSAKCSO FED/CON ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #25

The last three weeks have been unusually busy. As always, the most important things I've done concerned people. I traveled to Kansas City to swear Steve Taylor into the Senior Executive Service and formally make him the Site Manager. I said goodbye to Toby Johnson as he retired as Chief, Defense Nuclear Security, and named Bill Desmond as the Acting Chief. I presented Rick Arkin with an award for his work leading the Emergency Management organization and visited him in his new position as Manager of the NNSA Savannah River Site Office. I also presented a number of awards to the winners of the annual Security Police Officers Training Competition. Finally, I met with a number of new NNSA people. I'm trying to personally meet and welcome everyone who joins NNSA within the first few weeks after their arrival, although I sometimes get a bit behind. It gives me a chance to tell them how important our work is.

**Security.** A lot of our recent focus has been on security. I've testified twice before separate House Oversight Committees dealing with security. Although Oversight Committees don't directly affect our budget, they are still very important. They can both call attention to problems and influence legislation. Thus I was pleased that both of these hearings went reasonably well.

Most of the questioning at the hearings focused on a recent GAO Report entitled, "Nuclear Security: DOE Needs to Resolve Significant Issues Before It Fully Meets the New Design Basis Threat." The GAO: (1) questions whether the Design Basis Threat that the Secretary authorized last year is large enough; (2) expresses some doubt that we will be ready to meet that Design Basis Threat by the end of FY 2006, as the Secretary has directed; (3) says it took too long to get the Design Basis Threat issued because our procedures are cumbersome (they have a point); and, (4) expressed concern over how we are handling the threat from improvised nuclear devices. The GAO report is thoughtful, and I agree with much of it, although not with some of their conclusions. As a result of concern expressed by the GAO and others, the Secretary has directed a formal review of the adequacy of the existing Design Basis Threat. Glenn Podonsky, Director, Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance, John Russack, Director, Office of Intelligence, and I will be managing this review.

The other big security event was the Secretary's security speech on May 7, 2004. He laid out about a dozen initiatives, some of which are to be implemented and some of which are to be studied. Under his vision, we will try to move to an environment where we no longer have to worry about missing hard drives or removable media because all of our classified computing will be on systems without removable components. We'll move to an

environment where we don't use keys or electronic cards to control security access so we don't have to worry about losing them. We'll do a number of other things to try and enhance our use of technology. We'll have a much more robust set of defenses against cyber attack. We'll take a number of steps to examine whether we can further consolidate special nuclear materials.

Finally, we'll study the possibility of significant changes in the management of protective forces. The Secretary is concerned with a couple of issues. We don't have easy ways to ensure uniform standards for protective forces across the complex, and we don't have an easy way to shift security resources between sites. He has, therefore, directed that we look at alternatives to our present model. We'll examine at least two alternatives. One would be a single contractor that would operate protective forces at all sites with Category 1 and 2 special nuclear materials. The other would be a federalization of the security responsibilities at such sites. Such a dramatic change in the way we manage protective forces would have a number of implications that we have to work through carefully. The Secretary made it clear that we'll be doing a lot of consulting before we reach any conclusions. Glenn Podonsky will be leading the effort, with our support. Our goal is to ensure that we provide the most effective protection possible for the nuclear weapons and special nuclear material in our custody. Given my own strong views on responsibility and authority residing in line management, I'll be paying particular attention to how any of these changes would affect the responsibilities and authorities of Site Managers, Plant Managers, and Laboratory Directors. This is very much a moving target and I'll keep you informed as the situation develops.

**Budget.** As you know, two different Committees in each of the two Houses of Congress review our budget. We now have results from the two Authorizing Committees. In general, they were supportive of the President's budget with a few adjustments that, on the House side, kept the totals the same and, on the Senate side, provided a slight increase. This is good news, of course, but it's by no means the last word. Authorizing Committees say that, as a matter of policy, spending this money would be a good idea. Appropriations Committees have to decide whether there is money available. We haven't heard from them yet; historically, they have been more willing to impose reductions, especially on the House side. Still, it's good to see that our programs enjoy strong support. In particular, the programs that have significant policy content, such as Advanced Concepts and funding for studying the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, have survived intact, although there was a strong attempt to reduce or eliminate them on policy grounds. Once again, this is a moving target and I'll keep you informed.

Meanwhile, we are working on the program and budget for Fiscal Year 2006. I will shortly receive the recommendations of the various NNSA organizations. My job is to ensure a balanced program, which means that I will probably make some adjustments, although the Deputy and Associate Administrators craft the basic program.

**A Milestone.** Yesterday, May 17, was the 50th anniversary of the Brown vs. Board of Education decision that ended segregation in public schools and helped end all forms of legal segregation. We've come a long way from the segregated drinking fountains and bans on voting of my southern youth. After fifty years, however, we still haven't achieved the society Dr. King dreamed of where individuals are judged "not on the color of their skin but on the contents of their character." This 50th anniversary is a good time to remember the importance of valuing all our NNSA colleagues, all our fellow citizens, and all human beings.

**Kudos.** I keep learning about things that I didn't know we did at all that, as it turns out, we do very well. One is promoting intellectual property commercialization through licensing. DOE was just awarded the "Licensing Achievement Award" for 2004. The Award is the highest honor bestowed by the Licensing Executive Society, a 6,000 member professional society, and recognizes organizations that promote such commercialization. This is a great accolade for the Department and we in the NNSA can be very proud of our contribution to this accomplishment. NNSA laboratories, plants, and the Nevada Test Site were responsible for 1,941 of the 3,687



active licenses in force during 2003 (over half). We have numerous scientists, engineers, attorneys, and technology transfer specialists who made this happen.

**Speaking Up Without Fear.** I continue to worry that some individuals are afraid to speak up about problems they see within NNSA or at our contractors. The Secretary told a gathering of DOE managers two years ago:

"I am concerned that too many employees believe that their only recourse to address system failures is to go to the media or the Inspector General. And that is a result that should concern us all. It tells me that, fairly or unfairly, many of our employees believe that when they raise issues they will either be ignored, or, worse, harmed in terms of their career. That is a failure of leadership...I expect every manager down the line to make clear that we expect these concerns to be taken seriously and addressed quickly and effectively."

In his recent speech on security, the Secretary quoted those words and said: "My view hasn't altered a bit since I delivered those words...We need a system where management is more responsive and where people don't need to find a third party to get a fair hearing for their concerns... People should never have to be worried about the perils of doing their jobs honestly, safely, and correctly. People should not be afraid to bring problems to the attention of management, or be worried about facing retribution rather than receptiveness."

I agree with this completely. Neither the Secretary nor I want to discourage people from communicating with Congress or the Inspector General if they think they need to, but they shouldn't need to go outside NNSA to be taken seriously. I want to know immediately, directly and personally if any of you face a situation in which you believe you are being discouraged from pointing out problems.

**International Activities.** This week, the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, Everet Beckner, the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Paul Longworth, and the Directors of the three weapons laboratories are meeting in Russia with their counterparts. This is a follow-on to a similar meeting held in New Mexico in 2002. Good relations between the U.S. and Russian weapons laboratories have some scientific benefits (all scientific exchange is intrinsically good) and have often had political benefits as well. Quite often, important cooperation grows out of initial laboratory-level contacts. So I'm delighted to see this meeting take place. The following week the Secretary will be visiting Russia. These will be our first high-level discussions since the major reorganization of the Russian government that was announced in March and is still being implemented. That reorganization, which cut the number of ministries (what we would call Cabinet Departments) in half, is exceptionally sweeping. It puts the former Ministry of Atomic Energy (our primary contact) as a subordinate agency under a new super ministry dealing with energy and technology. It's too soon to tell exactly what all this means or where the real power will lie in the new organization. Right now, we expect most of our day-to-day contacts to be with the former Ministry of Atomic Energy under its new title, but we're still groping to see how it all sorts out.

**Public Service.** Unless you really haven't been paying attention, you know two things about me by now: I'm a huge believer in the importance and value of public service and, I'm pretty proud of my ability to write. Every once in a while, however, I find that someone else has said what I want to say better than I could possibly do it. The following is a quote from a letter I received from a colleague who was telling me of a decision to retire after 35 years. Many of you will know who the individual is, but I'm not going to include the name. I'd like to believe that this letter speaks for all of us. It certainly speaks for me.

"Although long time public service as you and I have known it is a more difficult concept for young people today to grasp because of all too frequent public ...cynicism resulting from the actions of a few...it seems to me in the end there can be nothing more rewarding. We have the opportunity to be both stewards of the public trust, trying to ensure a healthy environment, a high

quality public health system, an ensured national security, all of which are critical to this continuing experiment we call democracy, but equally we have the opportunity to actually influence the direction of each of these vital endeavors on behalf of the American public. No other profession, however satisfying, provides such an opportunity. And that is the compelling message we must convey to the young people we hope will add to our public service legacy."

That's all I have for you for now. Before I send my next Lintgram, we'll all have an opportunity to observe Memorial Day weekend. I hope you will have a pleasant and relaxing time with your family. But, in between picnics and taking the kids to the pool, I hope you'll spend a few minutes to stop and think about what the day means. I'll have a formal Memorial Day message a little later this month, but it does seem to me that with men and women being killed daily in Iraq, this is a particularly good time for us to remember the sacrifices of those who have died and are dying to help preserve our country.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:41 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #26

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 09, 2004 2:17 PM  
**To:** allcontrnnsa ; allnnsafedemp ; Burleson, John (Wachenhut) ; Goudouros, James (SRS) ; Harris, Roena (Y-12) ; Hurd, Shanel (Y-12) ; NNSACAST (CHICAGO) ; NNSACAST (SANDIACON) ; NNSACAST Contractor ; NNSACAST Federal ; NNSACAST(SRS) ; nnsa-concast ; nnsa-fedcast ; NNSAHQ ; NNSAKCSO FED/CON ; Thomas, Laura (Wachenhut) ; DOECAST, SNR ; Samantha Hughes Robillard (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Lintgram #26

Three major meetings have dominated the last three weeks: our program and budget review; the NNSA Security Summit; and a meeting of the Leadership Coalition (the leadership of both Headquarters and the field). I want to spend much of this message talking about those three sessions.

Program and Budget. In the spring, we are concerned with budgets for three different years. We're actually executing the FY 2004 budget. We're working with the Hill on the FY 2005 budget, which will take effect on October 1, 2004. And we're starting the process of preparing the budget for FY 2006, a year and one-half before the year actually begins. Along with each budget, we prepare a Future Years National Security Program (FYNSP), essentially a projection of budget requirements several years into the future. One of General Gordon's important accomplishments was to make this a true long-range projection.

To work the FY 2006 budget and program, we started with the control totals that came from the previous year's process. Each Deputy and Associate Administrator then made necessary adjustments within their program and presented their recommendations to me. As is typical, they included a series of unfunded or "over-target" requests for things they would like to do if there were more money. I maintain a small reserve (about 1.5 percent of the budget) so that I can deal with the most important of these "over-target" requests.

In the last two years, this system has worked reasonably well. This year it has not. In a total budget of about \$9B, the "over-target" requests came in at just under \$1B. My reserve is about \$129M! Nonproliferation and Safeguards and Security had the greatest degree of unfunded requirements.

In a situation like this, there are really only three choices. We can cut something that we planned to do in order to fund the new requirements. We can get more money from the Office of Management and Budget. Or we can decide that the new requirements, however valuable, simply won't fit. We've had two major meetings now to help me try to decide what to do. I expect to have preliminary decisions shortly. Almost certainly we will end up not doing some important things. It is easy to say that we should get more money but historically that doesn't work. With the very strong concern for the deficit now being shown by the Administration, it's even less likely to work this time. Thus, I expect my decisions are going to be difficult and that the results are not going to be terribly palatable. This is, unfortunately, the way the system works.

Security. We had our first-ever NNSA Security Summit on June 2. We modeled this session after the Safety Summits the Department has held in the past. Site Office Managers, Plant Managers, and Laboratory Directors, along with their Security Directors, met for a day of discussions. In the morning, we heard presentations from Admiral Mies on the report he will shortly be issuing on overall security and from Admiral Chiles on the report he recently issued on managing the Federal security workforce. In the afternoon, we broke into working groups to discuss the Design Basis Threat, the use of technology to enhance security, materials consolidation, and cyber security. The discussions were good and we got some recommendations that we're now evaluating. Perhaps the greatest benefit was making sure that we all had a common understanding of the difficult challenges we face, especially with the security initiatives that Secretary Abraham announced last month. In addition, the Federal staff met the next morning to review our plans for implementing Admiral Chiles' report. As you may recall, we asked him to look at what we could do to improve the training, retention, and professionalism of the Federal security force. He has a number of ideas, which we are beginning to implement. I'll get some additional details out separately.

Safety. I have two major developments to report in the safety area. First, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board has issued a recommendation on the Department's approach to safety at nuclear facilities. The Board is concerned that too much responsibility and authority is being shifted to Site Offices and that there is insufficient Headquarters' technical oversight. This is the same concern that some of the recommendations in General Haeckel's review of the Columbia Accident were designed to address. While the Board recommendation is addressed to the Department as a whole, it appears to me primarily driven by concern with some of my approaches to creating the NNSA of the Future. I take this recommendation seriously, as we take all Board recommendations. We are looking now at how to proceed. I don't expect that we will change our fundamental course, but this recommendation gives a new sense of urgency to sorting out what we want to do with regard to providing some Headquarters' oversight.

One aspect of improved Headquarters' oversight is the creation of a Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety. I have decided to create such a position, reporting directly to me (through the Principal Deputy when he arrives). This will be a staff, not a line, function and will provide both assistance and oversight to the Site Offices. Dan Glenn, Site Office Manager at Pantex, has agreed to become the Acting Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety for the next several weeks in order to get the office up and running. Meanwhile, we will embark on a nationwide search for the right full-time Chief.

We have also formed a task force, led by Dick Crowe, to come to some conclusions on the various recommendations from General Haeckel's report, "NNSA Lessons Learned and Recommendations from Review of NASA's Columbia Accident Investigation Board Report." You'll be hearing more about this in the near future.

Leadership Coalition. We held a brief session piggybacking on the Security Summit. Much of our discussions focused on issues associated with the day-to-day business of running the complex. We wrestled with how to ensure that good IT services are provided to the sites, reviewed progress on shifting legacy cleanup responsibilities from EM to NNSA, and discussed the approach to Dick Crowe's task force. We agreed to support an initiative at the National Training Center (formerly the National Nuclear Security Institute and before that the Central Training Academy) to expand from a security focus to include safety and project management. Because we are facing a number of major competitive procurements, we had a session with DOE's expert covering the legal and ethical requirements on managers during such competitions. It is hugely important that we be scrupulous in following the rules in these areas and the session and discussion were extremely helpful.

NNSA of the Future. We are in the final stages of the first step in creating the NNSA of the Future. For the last 18 months, one of the hardest parts has been and continues to be trying to strike the right balance between the steps we need to take to create a better NNSA and the heavy burden those steps are placing on good people who

have worked hard and been told that their functions are no longer going to be performed or that their functions were being moved to another location. Overall, we have already met our staffing targets, but that masks some problems in particular areas. I remain convinced that there is an NNSA job for everyone who wants one, but those jobs may well be at another location. We will be contacting each person whose future remains unclear to make sure that we have not overlooked any options. In addition, we will convene a Staffing Summit in late summer to address staffing requirements throughout the complex. This should bring more opportunities for additional placement at Site Offices or the Service Center. I know this has been a difficult time for many of you. I am deeply grateful for the way you have continued to carry out our mission under stressful circumstances.

As you read this, I am at Fort Chaffee, Arkansas, presiding over the graduation of 24 new agents for the Office of Secure Transportation. One of the things that constantly amazes me is how many different things there are to be proud of at NNSA. One of the things we can be proud of is our flawless record at transporting nuclear weapons and special nuclear material. With the increased emphasis on security since September 11, 2001, the demands on the Federal agents who accompany this material have never been higher. They have risen to this challenge magnificently, and I'm delighted to be able to welcome 24 new agents to their ranks. All of us support the national security of the United States, but those who travel long distances and spend time away from home prepared to risk their life for America support it in a special way. I'm proud of all of our agents and you should be too.

Also, as you read this, the Nation is preparing to observe a Day of Mourning in memory of President Ronald Reagan. I served for three years in the National Security Council during President Reagan's time in office. I was note-taker at a few meetings at which he presided, briefed him a couple of times, and got to observe him in some public sessions, although I had little direct contact with him and he almost certainly had no idea who I was. But his personality pervaded the Administration and the White House. What I remember is a sense of unfailing courtesy, an unflagging commitment to principle and, above all, a boundless optimism about the future of America. He always said America's best days are ahead. I believe that for our country and for NNSA. So, on the National Day of Mourning for the former President, think back on his accomplishments of course. But, primarily, think of his deep love for our country and remember how fortunate we are to be serving that country.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:42 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #27  
**Attachments:** Lintgram #27 attachment - Community Service Award list.doc

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 01, 2004 1:55 PM  
**To:** (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff (AL + SSO) ; (DL) DOE/AL Federal Staff Area Offices (REMOTE/AAO, SSO, KCAO, LAAO)  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #27

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 01, 2004 1:55:03 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #27  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Although I have been reasonably busy these past three weeks, it has mostly involved the routine, day-to-day business of the organization. I did have the opportunity to speak to several hundred people at the Carnegie International Nonproliferation Conference. I was attempting to make the case that the modest nuclear modernization that the Administration is undertaking is completely consistent with our strong commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. I got a respectful, though somewhat skeptical hearing. This didn't surprise me since the international nonproliferation community tends to favor extremely deep reductions in nuclear weapons. I have been doing a fair amount of speaking in support of the Administration's nuclear weapons policy lately. I think it is important to set forth our case, not just before friendly audiences, but before skeptical ones as well. John Harvey, my Policy Director, and Anson Franklin, our Congressional and Public Affairs Director, do an outstanding job of making sure I say the right things at these events.

**Budget.** We continue to spend time and effort on the budget, both the FY 2005 budget, now being considered in Congress, and what will become the FY 2006 President's budget request when it is submitted to Congress early next year. Both Houses have passed Defense Authorization bills that, by and large, fully support our request. The relatively minor differences for us (along with some more significant differences for the Department of Defense) now will need to be reconciled in conference.

On the appropriations side, however, the picture is more confused. The House has passed an appropriations bill that provides almost exactly the amount of funding for NNSA that the President requested. The House, however, specified some significant rearrangements within that total. It slashed funding for the various nuclear policy initiatives (advanced concepts, robust nuclear earth penetrator, test readiness, and the Modern Pit Facility) along with life extension for the W80. It increased funds for security and dismantlement. On the

nonproliferation side, the House cut plutonium disposition and transferred the funds to Material Protection, Control, and Accounting.

The Senate Appropriations Committee should be meeting next week. We will be working with them to try to get some of the cuts restored. We will almost certainly not know the final answer until fall. In addition to the problems with NNSA, there is a very significant funding problem associated with the nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain. It's going to take some time to work all this out. Because of the election, I don't think the issue will drag on quite as long as it did last year, but it certainly could. As always, I'll keep you informed.

Meanwhile, we finished the initial program review that will ultimately lead to the Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request and the associated Future Years National Security Program (FYNSP). The FYNSP is our attempt to have a five-year budget projection in order to ensure we don't start things we can't afford to finish. All those involved did an outstanding job in supporting this effort. And, in general, I was pleased with how the process went. I think we struck the right balance between allowing the Deputy and Associate Administrators the freedom to manage their programs and allowing me the ability to set priorities. We were able to work through a number of very serious issues and come up with what I regard as a balanced program.

In doing so, we had to make some very difficult choices. There are a number of worthwhile things that simply won't fit unless we get an increase in total NNSA funding, which I don't think we should plan on. Our proposals still have to be reviewed by the Secretary of Energy and the Office of Management and Budget so we won't have the final answers until the end of the year.

**Recognition for our colleagues.** A number of our colleagues have been singled out for special recognition recently:

- o Nicole Nelson-Jean has been named a finalist in the 2004 Service to America competition. Service to America promotes excellence among Federal employees; Nicole now runs our Japan office but is being recognized for her support of our Russian material protection work.

- o In May, at the yearly Facility Representative Conference, Joanne Lorence, of the Los Alamos Site Office, was named DOE Facility Representative of the Year. There were 14 finalists. This is the second year in a row that a Facility Representative from the Los Alamos Site Office has won this award. Facility Representatives are a key element in carrying out our nuclear safety oversight responsibilities.

- o In June, the Service Center's Energy Employee Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICP) staff was recognized for outstanding performance at the National Records Conference in Columbus, Ohio. The award was one of only four given throughout the entire DOE and specifically addressed their efforts to eliminate a substantial backlog of claims, improve processes, and improve the timeliness and quality of data.

Receiving recognition for nonproliferation in the Russian Northern Fleet, nuclear safety oversight in New Mexico, and business systems at the Service Center illustrates just how broad the talent in NNSA is. Congratulations to all of those who have been recognized.

Congratulations, too, to the 37 individuals whom the Secretary of Energy honored for community service. Community Service Awards recognize those individuals who have given at least 25 hours during the year to community service. When I see the long list of names (attached to this message) and I remember back to NNSA's spectacular performance during the Combined Federal Campaign, I'm filled with pride at the generosity and spirit that surround all of us.

**Special Emphasis Programs.** We frequently send out NNSACASTs marking specific months honoring groups who have traditionally been marginalized in U.S. society. These e-mails are intended to help us understand and

value the diversity that exists throughout NNSA and the Federal Government. A number of you have raised questions with me over the last few months about this practice. Those questions generally fall in three areas:

o **Why so many messages?** At times in the past we sent out e-mails quite frequently, often more than once a week. This tended to overwhelm people and we have established a policy that for any particular group we'll send two or three e-mails a month spaced throughout the month. At times you'll see more than this either because: (a) we made a mistake; (b) there was insufficient coordination between NNSA and DOE (which has a similar practice); or (c) e-mails providing general information overlap with announcements of special programs. We're trying to keep this to a minimum.

o **How do we decide what groups to include?** In general, we follow Department policy on nondiscrimination. That means we recognize diversity based on gender, race, ethnicity, and national origin. All of these are consistent with broad Federal policy. In addition, because DOE policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, we also recognize Gay and Lesbian Pride Month. Finally, at the request of a number of you, and in recognition of the large number of veterans we have throughout NNSA, we have been recognizing May as Military Appreciation Month.

o **Does this mean we are promoting a particular group's political agenda?** No. What we are promoting is tolerance for one another and nondiscrimination in the workplace. Separating this from broader social questions is relatively straightforward. We can celebrate the contributions of people who have traditionally been marginalized in American society without taking a position on a number of current issues being debated in the broader society. DOE and NNSA do not take positions on such issues, but this shouldn't preclude us from reinforcing the one issue on which there should be no debate: all of our colleagues have the right to be treated with dignity and respect.

Let me make it clear that, in sending these special emphasis emails, we are not trying to regulate individual beliefs. In free societies our beliefs are our own. What an organization does have a right to control is behavior. Thus DOE policy prevents discrimination, not attitude. This is an important distinction. Many individuals find these special emphasis messages help them to avoid inadvertent discrimination. Because of this, we will continue to send such messages. Those who do not find them helpful should continue to simply delete them. I don't see this as "political correctness" or a violation of our user policy, but rather as helping us comply with both the spirit and the letter of our policy on nondiscrimination.

**People.** I told you in my last Lintgram that Dan Glenn has agreed to spend the summer helping us create the new position of Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety. I neglected to mention that Steve Erhart has agreed to fill in as the Acting Manager at Pantex during Dan's Headquarters' assignment. I'm very grateful for his willingness to do so.

I also told you the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board had issued a recommendation (called Recommendation 2004-1) on DOE oversight. The recommendation, while addressed to the Department as a whole, is particularly relevant for NNSA because it expresses concern that the organizational changes aimed at creating the NNSA of the Future could have the unintended consequence of weakening oversight, especially from Headquarters. It's hugely important that we pay close attention to this concern. Based on recommendations from Ev Beckner and me, the Deputy Secretary asked Ted Sherry, the Deputy Site Manager at Y-12, to lead the Department's response to this recommendation.

Finally, I'm delighted to announce that Bruce Scott, who has been acting as the Associate Administrator for Infrastructure and Security (now to be called the Associate Administrator for Infrastructure and Environment as we take over some EM responsibilities), has agreed to accept the position permanently. Bruce has done a wonderful job with the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP). He's also had the lead in negotiating the transfer of responsibilities for both newly generated and legacy waste from EM to NNSA; he



and his team are carrying out this challenging task exceptionally well. I'm delighted that Bruce has agreed to take on the Associate Administrator responsibilities on a permanent basis.

This weekend marks the Fourth of July. I love the Fourth. I'm an unabashed red, white, and blue enthusiast for this country, warts and all. I love the band concerts, the fireworks, and the picnics. I hope you do too. It says something about our character as Americans that our national holiday doesn't celebrate the Constitution, which has given us a marvelous system of government unique in human history. Instead, our national day celebrates freedom and independence. America has endured for these 228 years only because of people, in uniform and out, who have carried out the oath we all took to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies." While you are watching the fireworks and eating the hot dogs, think of those people. Some of them are in Iraq in harm's way today. Some of them are happy in retirement looking back on a long career. And some of them are working in a semi-autonomous agency called NNSA. I'm proud to be part of such an enduring legacy.

Have a happy Fourth of July.

Linton

<>

Donna C. Stueve	NA-23
Wayne J. Evelo	SSO
Hannibal Joma	NSPD
Linda A. DeLong	NA-61
Eleanor C. Carlton	NA-30
Dollie T. Clayton	NA-64
Mitchell P. Kunich	NVSO
C. Lee Knoell	SSO
Vanessa D. Chambers-Poole	NA-30
Janice C. Crogan	NA-62
Anita C. Shinnerl-Martin	LLSO
Joseph C. Demko	NA-30
Andrew P. Meigs	NA-30
Alfred J. Laicer	NA-30
Lynn M. Swimm	NA-30
Keith A. Sturgess	NA-115.3
David J. Jonas	NA-3.1
Mohammad S. Mozumder	SERVICE CENTER
Ismael Valenzuela	SSO
John W. Newton	NA-12
Raeford Lee Phifer	NVSO
M. Roxanne Jump	SRSO
Joanne W. Wolfe	NA-62
David L. Aron	LLSO
Salvatore M. Cremona	NA-62
Kathleen Y. Foley	NA-62
David R. Steffes	SSO
Joseph P. Bozik	NA-262
Derick L. Wickliffe	SERVICE CENTER
N. Scott Dolezal	Pantex
Daniel E. Glenn	Pantex
William M. Blackburn	Pantex
William A. Gentile	LASO
Kiutus Tecumseh	SERVICE CENTER
Francis E. Broshnihan	NA-30 - Schenectady
William J. Leahy	NA-30 - Schenectady
Valerie G. O'Connor	NA-30 - Schenectady
Patrick J. Nolan, Jr.	NA-30 - Schenectady

As you may gather from reading the news, the recent problems at Los Alamos National Laboratory have dominated my life for the last couple of weeks. The Laboratory Director has ordered a complete shutdown of the Laboratory with a phased start-up based on his assessment of when specific sub-elements will be ready to resume operations. The Federal Site Manager will be involved in those decisions for operations with safety or security implications, and the Deputy Secretary of Energy will have to give personal permission for resumption of operations involving accountable classified removable electronic media (CREM), such as hard drives, zip discs, etc.

The inability to locate two pieces of CREM triggered this shutdown, but the problems appear to extend beyond the security area and to involve reluctance on the part of some to accept the need for procedural compliance. This is a very difficult time for Los Alamos, where most of the Laboratory employees clearly want to do what's right, but a minority has failed to appreciate the importance of following rules. There will be a number of lessons learned for us in terms of Federal oversight, but I think we should probably wait to try to draw those lessons until the situation clarifies.

I have informed the rest of the Department and the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security that it will probably be several weeks before all of Los Alamos is up and running. We are looking at what we can do to mitigate the impact.

The severity of the CREM problem (which will lead to some Congressional hearings in September) is indicated by the fact that we have stopped all operations involving CREM throughout the Department, pending a complete inventory and a review of procedures. I am hoping that this shutdown does not disrupt operations too much, but it is necessary to make sure the problems at Los Alamos aren't occurring elsewhere.

**The Budget.** There is little new on the budget for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1 (i.e., FY 2005). The Senate Appropriations Committee has not yet reported a bill, primarily because of issues unrelated to NNSA. I think it is all but certain that there will be a Continuing Resolution to carry us through the election. After that, it's anybody's guess. There could be a Continuing Resolution through the start of the new Congress, there could be a so-called Omnibus Appropriations bill, funding many Departments, or, if the issues now holding up progress in the Senate can be resolved, there could be an Appropriations bill sometime in November or December. A Continuing Resolution will pose some significant problems for us. Such a resolution normally caps spending at the previous year's levels while prohibiting new starts. We will be working with the Hill to try to figure out how to mitigate the impact of the current impasse, but it is not clear that there's a whole lot that can be done. Some of you have heard me say that a problem with no solution is not a problem, it's just a fact. I think the way the budget process works is largely just a fact, since our ability to affect it is quite limited.

**NNSA of the Future.** We are in the final stage of our 22-month effort to implement the reorganization and downsizing associated with creating the NNSA of the Future. Through a combination of mechanisms (contractor hiring, placement in other jobs, etc.), we believe we will be successful in accommodating everyone who had a job abolished and wasn't given an opportunity to move. We were less successful in providing alternatives for those who wished to avoid relocation. I remain committed that anyone now in NNSA who wants to have a job and is willing to move will have a job. Thus, those who have a last-minute change of heart should notify Mike Kane, Associate Administrator for Management and Administration, immediately.

A number of our colleagues, in both Oakland and Nevada, have concluded that their personal or professional situations do not allow them to accept transfer. These individuals will be leaving NNSA in early September. We will continue to work with them to find other employment opportunities. All of them have made important contributions to their country. I remain both impressed and deeply grateful by the professional way in which they have continued to carry out their duties at a very difficult time over the past year and a half. All of us wish them well.

Some of you have asked why I cannot offer one final buyout for those who are unable to relocate. The extra payment would ease the transition into a different career. I understand the logic, but that isn't the purpose of buyouts and we would not be able to get authority to use them in that manner. They are designed for where we have too many people and we need to induce some to leave. But that isn't the case here; we would be better off if all of the people now planning to leave were to accept transfer to the Service Center in Albuquerque, where it is clear we will now be short-handed. I'm sorry I can't give you a more welcome answer.

**Leadership Changes.** As you saw in the recent NNSACAST, I am delighted to announce that, just before recessing for August

and the political conventions, the Senate confirmed Jerry Paul as my Principal Deputy. As soon as he is in place later this summer, Jerry will begin taking over the interaction with the field that Tyler Przybylek has been doing. This will allow Tyler to concentrate on his responsibilities as the Chair of the Source Evaluation Board for Los Alamos. I am exceptionally happy that the Senate has acted and am looking forward to having Jerry on board. Once you've gotten a chance to meet and work with him, you'll understand why I'm so pleased.

I am equally delighted to report that the White House announced Monday that the President has named Ken Rapuano as Deputy Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. As such, he will direct the Homeland Security Council staff and supervise the interagency process on behalf of Homeland Security Advisor Fran Townsend. This is an exceptionally important job and represents a huge and well-deserved vote of confidence in him by the President. Ken's departure is a major loss to the Department but a major gain for the Homeland Security Council and the country. Ken will assume his new responsibilities immediately.

In another important leadership change, Dave Beck is stepping down from his position as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Military Application and Stockpile Operations and accepting a position at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Dave has combined strong management with strong vision and is one of the architects of the concept of a responsive infrastructure. He will become the Principal Deputy Associate Director for Weapons Engineering and Manufacturing where he will be playing a major role in helping to improve our capabilities.

Dave isn't the only important player who is leaving us to go to Los Alamos. Jon Ventura, who has been the Defense Programs Executive Assistant, will be joining Dave in New Mexico. Jon has been invaluable in a variety of ways, especially in helping us respond to the Hill's insatiable demand for data.

We will miss Dave and Jon and I am delighted that they both will continue to be involved in the weapons program.

**NNSA Ombuds Program.** It is now a year since we established the NNSA Ombuds Program. We have a number of ombuds at Headquarters and one at the Savannah River Site; we're working on establishing the program in other areas. After a year, it's probably a good time to remind people of what this program is and isn't. Ombuds operate on the basis of independence, confidentiality, and informal assistance. They are not a part of management. Indeed, they are not allowed to disclose anything that they are told to any manager without the permission of the employee involved. They report directly to me, but "report" doesn't imply that they are allowed to tell me what they learn either. I meet with them once a quarter ONLY to get a general sense of what is bothering employees.

I know some managers believe that the Ombuds Program ought to be unnecessary. So do I. In a perfect world, every employee would feel completely comfortable raising issues with their manager, and every manager would be effective and vigorous in resolving issues. But we don't live in that perfect world, and employees sometimes need an alternate source of information or advice. The ombuds can provide that advice. They don't take sides. They aren't a representative of an employee or a representative of management. They just try to help. They know a lot about NNSA policies, practices, and resources, they have good networking skills, and they have useful contacts throughout the organization. I encourage anyone who has a personnel issue (or any other kind of issue) and isn't comfortable with the formal channels for resolving it, to take advantage of this confidential assistance. Information regarding the Ombuds Program is available on our NNSA website.

**Defense Board Recommendation 2004-1.** The Secretary has formally accepted this recommendation, which deals with the Board's concern that, among other things, organizational changes aimed at creating the NNSA of the Future could have the unintended consequence of weakening oversight, especially from Headquarters. Work on an implementation plan is now in progress under the leadership of Ted Sherry, the Deputy Site Manager at Y-12. I will keep you informed as we work on this important implementation plan.

That's all I have for now. I hope you are all having a pleasant summer. If you count summer like I do, from Memorial Day to Labor Day, the season is half over. I urge those of you who haven't yet done so to find some time to take off and be with your families. It is important for all of us to make time for rest and renewal.

I'll have some more news in a couple of weeks. Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:42 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #29

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2004 11:07 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #29

There is a belief among some Washingtonians in a so-called "August lull." The theory is that with Congress out of town and many people on vacation, the pace slows down. I know that's been true for many people in years past. For me this year it hasn't worked out that way, largely because of the continuing attention being given to the problems at Los Alamos National Laboratory. As I think all of you know, following the discovery that the Laboratory could not account for two classified discs, the Laboratory director shut down all operations at the Laboratory (not just those involving classified material) because of a belief--which I share--that there were serious procedural compliance problems at Los Alamos that extended well beyond security.

The FBI investigation into the missing discs continues, although I hope it will be wrapping up soon. It is premature to speculate on what we'll find; we've been through a number of theories based on incomplete data and have learned to wait until we have a complete picture before forming opinions. But it is already clear that there will be a huge number of lessons learned, not only for the Laboratory, but also for NNSA. We are asking Glenn Podonsky's Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance to examine how our own oversight could have missed the quite serious problems in security that existed at the Lab. This is especially important because we appear to have had a good handle on other Laboratory problems.

Meanwhile, Los Alamos continues to work through its restart operations. The Laboratory schedule will have most of the Laboratory back in operation by the end of September, but this large a restart is unprecedented and meeting the schedule will be a challenge. The silver lining in this dark cloud is the exceptionally good cooperation between the Site Office and the Laboratory and the good support being given to the Site Office from the rest of the complex.

Because of the overwhelming importance of security, the Secretary directed a stand-down of operations involving what we call CREM, classified removable electronic media. All of the production plants are now back up and I hope to see Sandia and Livermore back in operation shortly (some parts of Livermore already are). We're still digesting the results of what we found, but thus far we have only a single accounting discrepancy we can't resolve. That is at our own Service Center. We have asked the FBI to assist us with the investigation.

While Los Alamos has dominated my time recently, it isn't the only thing that's happening. Here are some others:

**NNSA of the Future.** All the individuals who elected to move have now done so and we are in the final stages of working with our colleagues who have chosen to leave Federal service. As I have said before, these are really good people who have done good work for their country, and I'm very sorry we weren't able to find a way to let them continue with NNSA. We all wish them the very best and offer our sincere appreciation for all of their contributions.

Because many staff members chose not to relocate and are taking new career paths, the Service Center is now looking at some significant hiring in order to meet its responsibilities. We'll be conducting another staffing summit in January to try and see what adjustments, if any, we need to make to our staffing plans and hiring priorities for 2005 and beyond.

**Nuclear Safety.** Dan Glenn has done an excellent job in getting the Office of the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety started. I have conducted a number of interviews and hope to announce a selection for the permanent Chief soon. Meanwhile, Ted Sherry and his team continue to work on our response to the Defense Board's recommendation about Federal oversight. We need to strike the proper balance between the authority and responsibility that I want the sites to have and the necessary oversight that Washington must perform. I'll keep you informed.

**Budget.** I know everybody wants me to send out the "true facts" on the budget. Unfortunately, I don't have any idea what those "true facts" are! In essence, there are no new facts, there are just different rumors. I am positive we will face a Continuing Resolution that will probably limit us to FY 04 spending levels. We're working now to figure out how to mitigate the effects of such a resolution. There are two general problems. Some programs require a large amount of their funding early in the fiscal year, and Continuing Resolutions usually ration funding on a monthly basis. Continuing Resolutions also typically don't allow new starts. We're working both these issues and we'll let you know what happens, although probably not soon.

The much more interesting question is how long the Continuing Resolution will run. It now appears all but certain that the Congress will return for a lame duck session after the election. The Continuing Resolution thus could extend sometime into late November, but could also extend much longer, perhaps into February or even for the entire year. If this suggests to you that we really don't know what's going to happen, then I have accurately conveyed where we are.

**New Principal Deputy.** Jerry Paul, having escaped the recent Florida hurricane and gotten his family moved, will be here full time next week. I'm really looking forward to having him here. When you have a chance to meet him, you'll see why.

**Kudos.** I am constantly impressed with how many people in NNSA do really good things. Here are some examples:

- The Tritium Facility Modernization and Consolidation Project at the Savannah River Site received the Secretary's Award of Achievement for project management. The project objective was to relocate, consolidate and modernize tritium gas processing functions. The project is currently 99 percent complete. To date, there have been overall cost reductions of \$50 million (about one quarter).
- John O'Brien of the Pantex Site Office was selected out of a highly competitive national pool to participate in the "Department of Homeland Security and Naval Postgraduate School Master of Arts Degree in National Security/Homeland Defense." What's especially impressive is that his colleagues found the opportunity, brought it to his attention, and worked with him for months to ensure his selection. Because of this teamwork, we get increased technical competence within NNSA and he gets an exceptional professional development opportunity.
- Earlier this summer, the Kansas City Site Office conducted a "Day of Caring" Project where 16 volunteers built a ramp so a wheelchair-bound woman will be able to continue receiving dialysis treatments three times a week. The taxi service had threatened to discontinue transportation without this ramp because of struggles maneuvering her wheelchair up and down the front steps.

- Five Headquarters employees -- Mike Kane, Kate Foley, Dorsey Hibbitts, Ken Sheely, and Ken Sprankle -- were honored recently in a ceremony, which was presided over by the Secretary and a number of White House officials, for their contributions to the President's Management Agenda. The President's Management Agenda is an important initiative to improve the performance of the Federal Government. Our people, along with others, were honored for the great leadership DOE/NNSA has shown in this area.

I'm really proud to be part of the same organization as these individuals who have accomplished so much in so many different areas!

That's all I have for now. I did manage to slip away last week to spend some time visiting family. If you have not yet taken some time for yourself this summer, I urge you to do so.

I hope the rest of the summer goes well for you.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #30

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, September 24, 2004 5:34 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-ALL SITE OFFICES  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #30

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ (DOE HQ)  
**Sent:** Friday, September 24, 2004 5:36:20 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #30  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

I have taken part in several important meetings in the last couple of weeks. Ev Beckner ran a Defense Programs Strategic Management Retreat that I found extremely useful. He included both Federal and contractor leadership and wrestled with questions about the future stockpile, the future weapons complex, certification status, and NNSA's involvement in complementary (i.e., non-weapons) missions. The focus was, as you would expect, on the future. Ev will now take the results of the discussion and synthesize them into a revised future vision that the same group will review on November 9, 2004. I thought this was an excellent example of thoughtful strategic planning and I am certain we will get some useful results from it.

Immediately following the Strategic Management Retreat, I participated in a meeting of the Leadership Coalition (Site Office Managers, Service Center Director, and the heads of major Headquarters activities), which was run by Jerry Paul. We had an extremely full agenda with some decisions and some discussion in preparation for future decisions. Among the outcomes:

- We agreed to delay a formal staffing summit until early next year. We will approve some near-term adjustments to recognize some new requirements, a couple of which are mentioned below.
- We agreed on implementing a new fee policy for the Plants and the Nevada Test Site. The idea is to have a consistent approach to determining the maximum available fee, taking into account how much the contractor is willing to agree to do to improve performance. The actual fee will be determined based on performance, as it has been in the past. We will refine this approach if necessary next year. We haven't decided on how, if at all, this new approach should apply to the laboratories.
- We agreed on a new approach to small business contracting. Basically, we will set aside a pool, to be administered by the Service Center, which can only be used for small business in support of the laboratories. We envision that some things now being done by subcontractors will be done as direct prime contracts funded from this pool. In this way, we hope to implement



the Secretary's commitment to the President to significantly increase the fraction of the Department of Energy/NNSA budget that goes directly to small businesses. Supporting such businesses is an important Presidential priority.

- We agreed to establish a training program for new Site Managers. The program will be for individuals who have already been selected for assignment as a Site Manager. It will be primarily conducted at Headquarters, and will be several weeks long. It will cover safety, security, contract administration, and project administration. The curriculum will be tailored for each individual and will include formal open book tests to help ensure sound preparation. It will also include a period of shadowing the Administrator, the Defense Board and, for those with limited senior site experience, a period of shadowing an experienced Site Manager. Dan Glenn is supervising putting the detailed curriculum together and Rick Arkin, our most recent Site Manager assignee, will return to Washington to go through the curriculum in order to test and validate it. The fact that I am willing to mandate several weeks of full-time training is an indication of just how important I regard Site Managers in the NNSA of the Future. To make this work, I will need to select new Site Managers well in advance of the time when they are required to assume their new responsibilities.
- We reviewed progress toward the implementation plan for Defense Board Recommendation 2004-1, covering the way DOE and NNSA perform oversight. We also reviewed our progress toward implementing the recommendations of General Haeckel's examination of the Columbia accident.
- We discussed my concern with NNSA security oversight and our failure to anticipate quite poor performance on an OA inspection at one site or to uncover serious weaknesses in classified material control at another site. We agreed we should modify the approach to security surveillance to include more hands-on reviews conducted in the contractor's facilities, analogous to those performed in the safety area by Facility Representatives. We also agreed that we need greater Headquarters oversight of the performance of individual Site Offices. We will establish a small Headquarters staff under the Associate Administrator for Defense Nuclear Security to provide that oversight. This will be very similar to the approach we are using for oversight by the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety. The primary responsibility for effective oversight of contractors will continue to lie with the Site Offices, but because of the overriding importance of nuclear safety and security, we will strengthen our ability to ensure that the Site Offices are performing effectively.
- We reviewed the approach that Dan Glenn has crafted for the new office of the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety including: establishing an NNSA Technical Bulletin (the first issue is just going out); a procedure for surfacing differing professional opinions; the basic set of responsibilities for the individual Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety staff; and, the division of responsibility between the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety and the existing Environment, Safety and Health Advisor. We tentatively approved all of these pending a review by the permanent chief when he arrives, which I hope will be shortly. NNSA was extremely fortunate to have Dan Glenn available to spend 3 months working on this issue here in Washington and equally fortunate to have Steve Erhart available to fill in at Pantex during this period.

**Budget.** I have absolutely nothing new to tell you on the budget for the coming fiscal year. As I have said before, there will be a Continuing Resolution but we don't have any details yet. On the budget for the following year (the budget the President will submit in February), we are still reviewing the fairly

significant adjustments that will have to be made to accommodate recent decisions on the Design Basis Threat. I will keep you informed.

**NNSA of the Future.** We have been using the term "NNSA of the Future" to describe our progress toward a new vision of organization and oversight. Because the most visible part of that vision has been the consolidation of the Service Center, the associated staff reductions, and the significant shrinking of the Headquarters staff, it is easy to assume that the process is complete with the recent final closure of Oakland and of the Service Center portion of Nevada. It is not.

Our vision of the NNSA of the Future has a number of aspects. We want to move to a flexible workplace that will allow people to achieve their maximum potential and will cut through some of the bureaucracy and cumbersome procedures traditionally associated with Federal personnel management. As a first step, we are working with the Office of Personnel Management and the private Partnership for Public Service in a pilot program called "Extreme Makeover." We are one of three organizations throughout the Federal government that will test this program, which is designed to dramatically streamline the hiring process. This could be tremendously important for both our short-term needs (the Service Center, for example, is severely understaffed because a number of our colleagues were unable to relocate) and for the long term. Over the next few years a large number of people now in NNSA will be eligible to retire. While I hope many of them will choose not to do so, it is clear we will be seeing significantly more turnover in the next decade than in the past. The outstanding, motivated individuals we need to bring into NNSA will not sit and wait during an interminable selection process. Extreme Makeover, if it lives up to our expectations, is going to allow us to recruit the best and the brightest. You know my view that only such people are good enough for the extremely important mission with which we are entrusted. I will have a lot more to say on the people-related aspects of creating NNSA of the Future in the coming months.

**Recognition.** On September 22, the Secretary announced this year's E.O. Lawrence Awards. The Award honors scientists and engineers for exceptional contributions to the development, use, or control of nuclear energy (broadly defined) and is designed to encourage excellence in nuclear science and technology. Nominations are judged on the basis of scientific and technical excellence and for the significance of the work in its field. Of the seven recipients, four are from NNSA laboratories. They include Bette Korber (life sciences), Fred Mortensen (national security), and Gregory W. Swift (environmental science), all of Los Alamos and Claire Max (physics), of Livermore. We can all be proud of this latest demonstration of the outstanding science that is performed by the national laboratories.

**New assignment.** I am pleased to announce that I have approved Karen Boardman's selection of Dennis Martinez for the position of Director, Office of Field Financial Management/Field Chief Financial Officer, effective immediately. Dennis has done an outstanding job as Deputy at the Los Alamos Site Office and now gets to assume one of the most important financial management jobs in NNSA.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #31

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, October 22, 2004 7:15 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-ALL SITE OFFICES  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #31

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 22, 2004 7:17:27 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #31  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Probably the most important thing I've done recently is to visit six of our Sites for extensive discussions on security. As I told you in my last Lintgram, I am concerned with problems in NNSA's oversight of security and, in particular, our failure to anticipate quite poor performance on an OA inspection at one Site or to uncover serious weaknesses in classified material control at another Site. I wanted to get a better understanding of the problem and the trip allowed Jerry Paul, Bill Desmond, Cheryl Stone (Bill Desmond's new Deputy), and me to see the security situation first-hand. I omitted Kansas City (because there is no special nuclear material there) and Savannah River (because much of the security is the responsibility of someone else) but was able to visit the other six Sites.

I saw a number of things that pleased me, including some areas where there has been real improvement since last year. I saw some places where our efforts are, in my view, a model of what Federal oversight should be, but I also saw some places where I have some serious concerns. We will be working with individual Sites to try and improve both the security situation and our ability to monitor and assess that situation.

**Building the Future.** At the end of my tour of the Sites, I spent a day in Omaha at a conference sponsored by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and its Project On Nuclear Issues (PONI). As some of you know, I am deeply concerned that the number of people in Washington who think seriously about the policy aspects of nuclear weapons is dwindling. If you attend either a Government or a non-Government meeting on nuclear issues, you quickly notice that almost everybody in the room was at similar meetings in the mid-1980s. This is disturbing on two levels. First, as that generation (i.e., my generation) ages, many of them will cease being actively involved. Of even greater significance, despite our best efforts, many of us had our ideas shaped by the Cold War, and it is difficult for us to shed Cold War thought patterns and think creatively about the role of nuclear weapons in today's world.

As a result of concerns about the aging of the nuclear policy community, John Hamre at CSIS, encouraged by a number of nuclear policy experts, including General Gordon and myself, started a project to develop expertise and interest within the upcoming generation of intellectuals at the laboratories, think tanks, and academic institutions in the United States and the United Kingdom. NNSA and the Department of Defense are both supporting the effort. The conference I attended, which included the new Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, General Cartwright, gave some of these young thinkers the opportunity to present their ideas to an audience that was divided between their peers and the more "mature" (a euphemism for old) nuclear policy thinkers. I was extremely impressed with the thoughtfulness of many of the presentations. If we can continue to stimulate this kind of thinking, we can help ensure our nuclear policy will evolve in sound directions and be based on sound thinking.

The nuclear policy area isn't the only place where we need to foster the next generation, of course. NNSA is trying to establish intern programs to bring forth the next generation of leaders in security, operations, business, weapons, and nonproliferation. I think all of this is hugely important. In my experience, one of the most difficult things for Government officials is to look beyond the immediate and consider the future. The one thing we can be sure of is that the future will demand creative, committed people, both in Government, in the plants and laboratories, and in the intellectual community that supports national security programs. So, even when it's not absolutely certain what we should be doing to ensure the best weapons or nonproliferation future a decade or more hence, it is certain that we're never making a mistake by focusing on people.

**The State of Play in Washington.** This is a strange time in Washington as this inherently political city waits for the election. The Congress has recessed until mid-November, after passing a Continuing Resolution to fund the Government through November 20. Before departing, Congress did pass the Defense Authorization Bill, which is generally supportive of our programs. The levels authorized are very close to the President's budget, although we should probably not overstate what this means. Typically, the Appropriations Bill, yet to be passed in the Senate, does much more to adjust funding levels. The new Authorization Bill allows us to accept contributions from other countries toward the financing of the shutdown of Russian plutonium production reactors and broadens our authority to expand some of our Russian nonproliferation programs to other countries. One thing that the Congress did not do is approve the Administration's recommendation to combine the NNSA and DOE counterintelligence programs. We will, therefore, continue for another year with separate programs.

**Project Management Kudos.** While I'm proud of the work we do and the people who do it, I also know that we have a long way to go to reach our full potential. Still, every once in a while I get a formal reminder of how far we've come. The latest came in the third annual assessment by the National Research Council on sustainment and renewal of DOE's facilities and infrastructure. The preface reads in part:

To naysayers who contend that a consistent holistic approach is not workable at DOE, I point with professional respect to the National Nuclear Security Administration....NNSA's execution of Real Property Asset Management...is the most advanced in DOE. In the simplest of terms, NNSA "gets it."

We all should be proud of the hard work of the Federal and contractor workforce, both in Washington and in the field, that led to this finding. I certainly am.

**The Future of Science in NNSA.** While it is very hard to predict the future, one area in which we can be certain we will face continuing challenges is in the area of science and technology. I am struck by the way science and technology underlies so much of what we do. We look at nuclear safety issues and find they are often scientific or technological. We look at the new security challenges and recognize that we can't solve them with more guns, gates, and guards, but rather must use technology in new and different ways. We look at the fundamental approach of science-based stockpile stewardship (we often forget to include the words "science-based," but they are crucial) and realize that we must continue the transformation of weapons design from an art

or an empirical science to a theoretical science. We look at the long-term challenges of nonproliferation and see that many of them (proliferation-resistant fuel cycles, enhanced security, export control) have a strong scientific or technological base. Thus, it is clear that we will not be able to carry out our mission in the future if we don't preserve the scientific capability of the laboratories and our own Federal capability to oversee scientific institutions.

Since September 11, 2001, there has been an increased understanding in the United States of the importance of national security. One result is that the National Laboratories have been doing well in bringing a new generation of scientists on board. These are the scientists who will form the basis for the world-class science of the future. My own view is that great weapons science can only grow out of great science and that it is important to preserve the National Laboratories as places where major advances in fundamental science can be made. Indeed, one of the reasons we need to improve our performance in safety and security across the complex is to enable that great science to proceed.

**Ombuds Opportunity.** In 2003, I established an NNSA Ombuds Program. Ombuds serve as confidential, impartial, independent, and informal resources to facilitate fair and equitable resolution of workplace concerns. Seven employees are currently serving three-year terms as collateral-duty Ombuds. Six are at Headquarters and one is at the Savannah River Site. By design, I can't tell you specifically what they have done (they aren't allowed to tell any manager, including me, without the approval of the employee who contacted them), but they serve as one more way to help make a better workplace.

I'd like to expand the program in 2005. I'm especially interested in volunteers from Germantown and from NNSA field sites. Ombuds operate within the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of The Ombudsman Association (TOA), and TOA training will be offered to all new Ombuds. More information on the Ombuds Program can be found on NNSA's website (<http://hq.na.gov>). Ombuds programs are particularly important for organizations undergoing significant change, as NNSA has experienced. If you are interested in serving the NNSA community as an Ombuds, please contact NNSA Chief of Staff, Bill Barker, by e-mail ([william.barker@nnsa.doe.gov](mailto:william.barker@nnsa.doe.gov)).

**Voting.** In 10 days, we will have an opportunity to take an action that, throughout most of human history, only a few people have been allowed to do: decide who will govern us. It is easy for Americans to take this marvelous privilege for granted. But since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of Communism, we have seen the immense importance those who have been denied this privilege place on the ability to vote.

A common excuse for low voter turnout in the United States has long been that voting isn't important because "my vote won't matter." The last Presidential election should have taught all of us that this idea is wrong. In the year 2000, shifts in the votes of far fewer people than are reading this e-mail could have altered history. What is true on a national level is even truer at state and local levels, where, in every election, some races are decided by a handful of votes. I urge you to exercise this remarkable privilege of democracy and vote on November 2.

**Combined Federal Campaign.** All of us serve our country and the American people every day. At this time of year, we have a chance to be of further service--not through our work but through our wallets--by contributing to the Combined Federal Campaign. Whether you will be one of those who gets a Double Eagle pin or one who is only able to contribute a few dollars a payday doesn't matter. What does matter is that you will be helping so many organizations in so many ways. In America, voluntary giving is just that--voluntary. I will not know who contributed and who didn't. None of your managers will know who contributed or who didn't. But you will know and, if like me, are able to contribute, you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you have done a small part to help make the world better for all of us.

That's all I have for now. Don't forget to vote.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #32

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2004 2:29 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-ALL SITE OFFICES  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #32

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2004 2:27:27 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #32  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most important event since my last Lintgram was, of course, the election. All Americans can be proud of the high turnout and the absence of any significant irregularities. For most of my life I voted by absentee ballot. Because of this, I still get a thrill out of standing in line to cast my vote. It's a mundane act that has been beyond the reach of most people in most countries for most of human history. This election engendered strong feelings in the country and, I'm sure, with many of you. Whatever your views on the overall outcome, I'm delighted that I'll continue to be able to work with all of you as we build the "NNSA of the Future."

**Secretary Abraham's Departure.** By now most of you will have seen the Secretary's announcement of his resignation, effective on confirmation of his successor. Such confirmation probably won't occur until around February. While all of us who work with him closely understand the family imperatives, this is a significant loss to NNSA and to the Nation. The Secretary has been a strong supporter of NNSA and has made a particularly strong personal contribution in nonproliferation. I will miss him both personally and professionally. I have no idea who will replace Secretary Abraham or what, if any, other changes will occur. As is customary after an election, the Washington rumor game of "who stays and who goes" is in full swing. When and if I learn of any additional changes that affect us, I will, of course, let you know. Meanwhile, I urge you not to waste a lot of time speculating and spreading rumors. My experience with high-level personnel changes is those who talk don't know and those who know don't talk, so spending time in speculation about other changes is probably futile.

**Recent Meetings.** Last week we had two important events. We held the second round of Ev Beckner's Defense Programs Strategic Management Retreat, aimed at understanding the general needs and prospects for the nuclear weapons complex in 2030 and the more specific status in 2018. Long range planning is, of course, not about future decisions. It is about the future consequences of present decisions. Ev and I will be using the results of this effort in a variety of ways. You will see them in an updated Defense Programs vision document relatively soon and we will use them as we shape Congressional budget testimony this spring.

We also spent a day and a half last week in a meeting of the NNSA Leadership Coalition (the Deputy and Associate Administrators, Site Managers and Service Center Director). We covered a number of things, including lines of succession, the idea of improved issues management (a team will visit each site), the difficult problem of dealing with the new design basis threat, and the new DOE Tiger Team on diskless computing (to be briefed to the sites shortly). In addition, because of the great importance I place on site managers and our new, enroute training program for them, we will be trying to identify replacements for upcoming vacancies well in

advance. That means that we will start advertising in the spring of 2005 for replacements for two site managers who expect to retire in early 2006.

**My Plans for the Coming Year.** I took advantage of the Leadership Coalition Meeting to seek advice on what I should concentrate on personally during the coming year. Here's my list:

- Begin to make the concept "Employer of Choice" a reality by transforming our current work environment into an environment that will sustain excellence, encourage innovation, and foster dedication. I see two major components: resurrecting the workload reduction initiatives; and, significantly increasing the flexibility individuals have over their own work life and career.
- Jump-start nonproliferation. I want to focus on completing the material control tasks in Russia, ending plutonium production, beginning plutonium elimination, and, completing security upgrades for both materials and warheads.
- Continue the transformation of the stockpile. I want to institutionalize the concept of the responsive infrastructure (especially outside of the Department of Energy), make further efforts to reduce the legacy stockpile, and gain acceptance for some of the ideas for progressive transformation being suggested by the laboratory directors.
- Re-establish the credibility and efficacy of Los Alamos by: (1) institutionalizing the improvements being discovered during the restart process; (2) restoring morale, especially among the scientific staff; and, (3) ensuring that the contract competition goes smoothly.
- Ensure that we have a thorough review of the overall NNSA complex and gain enough insight to shape it for the coming decades.
- Improve security oversight, begin to rebuild the cadre of security professionals, and find a way to begin the transformation to technology-based security.
- Help Jerry Paul implement our new approach to nuclear safety oversight by making the concept of a Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety a reality. By the end of 2005, I want to have the new model of nuclear safety fully implemented, have the Columbia Accident recommendations either implemented or well along the way to implementation, and have solid progress on implementing Defense Board Recommendation 2004-1.

I want to make it clear I don't necessarily think these are the only things, or even necessarily the most important things, that NNSA will be doing in the coming year. But they are areas in which I think that I need to be personally involved. I'll have more to say about some of them, particularly the idea of an "Employer of Choice" in the coming weeks and months.

**Sad News.** I regret to announce that Bill Mullen, Assistant Manager for Nuclear Facilities and Safety Basis, at the Sandia Site Office, died Sunday following an accident while visiting his wife's family in Maui, Hawaii. Bill had 35 years experience, 17 with Naval Reactors and 18 with the Department of Energy, working at Idaho, Richland, Pantex, Los Alamos, and Albuquerque. In informing me of his death, the Sandia Site Manager said: "Bill was a very positive, intelligent, contributing member to any effort he applied himself to. He was one of those people you never heard an unkind word about. He will be greatly missed." I know all of you join me in extending our condolences to his family and his colleagues at Sandia.

**Combined Federal Campaign.** I turned in my Combined Federal Campaign pledge last week (to be honest I was sort of stalling until after the election to see whether I was going to have a salary to contribute). If you have not had a chance to turn in your own pledge, I urge you to do so. One of the great things about our country is the generosity of the American people. The Combined Federal Campaign lets us harness that generosity in a way that accomplishes wonders. No one in your management chain will know whether you pledge or not or how much you pledge. But you'll know, and you'll have the wonderful feeling that comes from having made a contribution to helping others. Don't deprive yourself of that feeling.

**Budget, Congress, and all that.** The Congress returns this week. It is unclear whether we will get an Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, an Omnibus Appropriations Bill, or another Continuing Resolution. I will let you know when I know. We also expect to hear back from OMB on our proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2006 late this month. Dealing with the OMB comments and adjustments will keep many of us in Washington busy in early December. For now, however, there's not a whole lot to say.



**A Cautionary Tale.** Recently, I became aware of a situation in which an experienced individual with a very good record was suspended and reassigned to a non-supervisory position for using government resources to operate his personal business. The individual had been counseled on the inappropriateness of using such resources to run a private business and had agreed to stop. A month later management learned the misconduct had continued, thus the disciplinary action was taken. As a result of failure to pay attention to the rules, the career of an otherwise good performer has been seriously tainted. Please don't fall into this trap. The Department, NNSA, and I, all take misappropriating government resources very seriously.

**Lawrence Awards.** For almost 50 years, the Department of Energy and its predecessor organizations have made annual awards for excellence in nuclear science. The awards are presented on behalf of the President of the United States and named for the late E.O. Lawrence, one of the great figures of the early nuclear programs and the man for whom both Lawrence Livermore and Lawrence Berkley National Laboratories are named. I attended the ceremony in the State Department diplomatic reception rooms at which the awards were presented. Four of the seven awardees came from NNSA laboratories. They are: Bette T. Korber, Los Alamos National Laboratory; Claire E. Max, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Fred N. Mortensen, II, Los Alamos National Laboratory; and, Gregory W. Swift, Los Alamos National Laboratory. Listening to the accomplishments of the winners of these prestigious awards is quite simply dazzling. I'm immensely proud to be associated with them. I think all of us should be especially proud of Los Alamos, which had three winners. As far as I can tell, this is the first time a single laboratory has had three awardees. This demonstrates the importance of getting through the current turbulence at Los Alamos so it can continue the great science exemplified by these three superb individuals.

That's all I have for now. Next week is Thanksgiving, a time of food, family and football. I hope all of you have a happy and relaxed day. I also hope, however, that you'll take some time during that day to remember those far from home in the service of their country. I also hope you'll think about those who are working on Thanksgiving in our neighborhood police stations, fire houses, hospitals and homeless shelters and all they do to protect and care for us on this day and every other day of the year. We all have a great deal to be thankful for. I continue to be especially thankful for the opportunity to work with such outstanding professionals in the service of our great country.

Happy Thanksgiving

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #33

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2004 10:42 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #33

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2004 10:40:31 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #33  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

From my perspective, the most important news recently has been the President's decision to name Dr. Sam Bodman as the new Secretary of Energy. Dr. Bodman is now Deputy Secretary of the Treasury and before that was Deputy Secretary of Commerce. He taught chemical engineering at M.I.T. for several years and has a very strong technical background, obviously useful in a Department such as ours. He's been a CEO of two large corporations, which will help him with the significant management challenges of the Department of Energy. Finally, as a Deputy Secretary for the past four years, he has a good understanding of how this Administration works. It is clear that we are extremely fortunate to get him. I understand his confirmation hearing will be just before the Inauguration. If so, I would expect Dr. Bodman to assume his new responsibilities around the first of February.

**Budget.** The other thing that dominates Headquarters thinking at this time of year is the preparation of the President's budget for Fiscal Year 2006. The process of putting together a budget starts a very long time in advance. Even though the Fiscal Year doesn't begin until next October, we have already been working on the budget for several months. In the spring of this year, the programs put together their proposals for the five years beginning in Fiscal Year 2006. We do five-year budget projections so we make sure we don't try to start things without understanding the cost to complete them. Our approach is one of the innovations General Gordon put in place for NNSA and provides a sound basis for planning. We are serving as an example to the rest of the Department in this area.

In the summer, I review and approve all of the programs, trying to make sure we have balanced our limited resources and used them in the most effective way. In the early fall, we submit detailed budgets to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). OMB reviews our submissions and provides a so-called "passback" with decisions. These are typically reductions (although, very occasionally, OMB will increase a particular area) and are based on fiscal constraints, failures to justify a program adequately, or concern about whether or not we can

actually execute specific proposals. The Department then has an opportunity to appeal specific decisions. That's where we are in the process now. Earlier this week, I signed the appeal letter to OMB for NNSA.

It is inappropriate to comment publicly on specifics of the President's budget until he has approved it and submitted it to Congress in February. Enough people read these Lintgrams that I consider them effectively public comment. So I'm not going to discuss any details. I will simply point out that the President was very clear earlier in the year that one of his goals was to reduce the deficit and the President is a man of his word. Everybody is in favor of reducing the deficit until it comes time to reduce spending on his or her particular program, and I suspect we are no exception. So we'll be working with OMB to balance the twin goals of holding overall spending down and continuing our important programs. I think you can expect the final result will be a little more austere than in the past, but we'll be fine overall.

As you can probably gather from this abbreviated description, there's a great deal of work involved in budget formulation. We've been very fortunate to have Mike Kane and Kate Foley leading the process of preparing our budget proposals and our appeals. Because of their leadership and the hard work of dozens of people, I'm convinced that we're going to come out with the answer that's right for the country. I'll keep you informed as this process continues.

With respect to the "other budget" - the one for this year - I was pleasantly surprised that the Congress passed an Appropriations bill for us as part of an Omnibus Appropriations Act. I had feared we would have to live with a Continuing Resolution, which would have constrained our flexibility. In fact, we got a budget and it was quite good. Essentially, Congress approved the totals in the President's request, though with some moving around of money. I'm pleased, although some of the more visible Nuclear Posture Review elements did not fare well (RNEP was killed and a ban was placed on site selection for a Modern Pit Facility).

**Nuclear Operations.** Next week, the Department will submit its implementation plan for Defense Board Recommendation 2004-1. This is a recommendation to strengthen oversight of nuclear operations and, in particular, Headquarters oversight of the field. Although it is phrased as a recommendation to the Department as a whole, it grows out of concern that, in placing responsibility on the Site Offices, I went too far in limiting Headquarters supervision. As a result, we will create a Central Technical Authority, a line position to be filled by Jerry Paul, my Principal Deputy. The new Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety, Jim McConnell, will provide staff support for this position. Our vision is to continue to place responsibility and authority with the Site Managers, but to ensure that there is strong technical supervision from here. There are a number of other aspects of the new recommendation, which, in my view, will make our operations even stronger.

**Other recent developments.** We have issued the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for the management of Los Alamos when the current contract expires next October. We will shortly be issuing the RFP for the management of the Nevada Test Site. The Los Alamos RFP contains a number of innovative features, many of them built on our experience with Sandia last year, that are part of our continuing efforts to help contractors achieve excellence. At the same time, the Los Alamos RFP will make it clear that, while world-class science must be enabled by excellence in safety, security and operations, conducting that science remains the single-most important thing that the National Laboratories do.

In a completely different area, this week we welcomed new Federal Agents to the Office of Secure Transportation. Jerry Paul spoke at their graduation and welcomed them on my behalf to the finest transportation security organization on earth.

In yet another area, we have issued an updated NNSA Strategic Plan. It's a good guide on where we are trying to go in the coming years. I appreciate all the hard work that went into it.

**Performance and evaluations.** We have just completed our first year with all of NNSA under a single performance management system. This is quite an accomplishment; only two years ago, we were under nine different appraisal and award systems. We wanted to have a balanced and fair rating system that distinguishes and recognizes sustained superior performance. That means we can't put everyone in the highest category. Although we don't impose quotas, my experience is most people are exceptionally good performers, perhaps a third stand out as way above the rest, and a handful fall short. We've been working to have our appraisal system reflect that reality. In looking at the overall distribution of ratings, I believe we have achieved that goal. Still, any new approach is subject to error, so I have asked Mike Kane to assess our first year and see if we need to change anything.

**The season.** This is a special time for almost all of us. As I write this, the eight nights of Chanukah are coming to an end. The feast of Eid, marking the end of Ramadan, is fading from memory, while Christmas is less than a week away and Kwanza lies ahead. My children sometimes claim that, at heart, I'm just a very large three-year old, and at this time of year there is some truth to the statement. I am, as always, caught up in the anticipation of the season with its opportunities for family and friends and fellowship. I hope that all of you have a wonderful holiday season and that you are able to take time to be with your families. I hope as you celebrate you will give some thought to those who stand watch over our festivities, whether they are the security officers and firefighters guarding our labs and plants on Christmas Eve or the Service men and women defending freedom far from home. Finally, I hope all of you, whatever your own religious beliefs may be, will feel the joy and wonder and peace that I feel during this season.

I'll be talking to you in the New Year. Have a wonderful holiday.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram 34

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, January 28, 2005 3:50 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram 34

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 28, 2005 3:32:25 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram 34  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The past month and a half has been an odd time in Washington, with the Congress in recess and much of the political attention focused on the selection and confirmation of new Cabinet Officers. I have been through transitions where a President is replaced by one of the same party, and I've been through transitions where a President is replaced by one of a different party. This is the first time I've been through the transition between a first and second term. It's quite unusual in ways it is difficult to describe.

**New Leadership.** I have now spent some time with the new Secretary of Energy, Dr. Sam Bodman. I anticipate he will be formally confirmed next week. He is a chemical engineer who taught at MIT and has run two major companies. I think we are quite fortunate to have him and suspect that you will be as impressed as I am when you get to know him. Secretary Abraham was a strong supporter of our work, especially in non-proliferation, and we will miss him a lot, but we've clearly got a wonderful replacement.

As most of you know, Deputy Secretary McSarrow has announced his resignation and will be leaving next week to become President and CEO of the National Cable and Telecommunications Association. He has been a superb leader and manager who has always been very supportive of NNSA. I will miss him a great deal, both personally and professionally. I am certain the Administration will move quickly to replace him, although I have no insight on when that will happen.

A number of you have asked about my personal plans. The NNSA Administrator does not have a fixed term. Like other sub-Cabinet appointees, I serve at the pleasure of the President of the United States. Assuming that nothing changes, however, I am hoping to remain for at least two more years. While we have done a great deal together, there is still a way to go before we can say that the NNSA of the Future has arrived, and I'd like to continue to be a part of that process.

**Safety of Nuclear Operations.** Probably the most important thing that has happened since my last message to you is the submission of the Department's response to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 2004-1. The Recommendation is designed to improve safety oversight of nuclear operations. Although addressed to the Department as a whole, the DNFSB recommendation grows, in part, out of concern that our emphasis on the authority and responsibility of Site Managers has unduly limited technical supervision from Headquarters.

As a result of this Recommendation, we will do a number of things. We've made commitments on training and on establishing a more visible nuclear safety research program. Perhaps the most important response the Department has taken is to establish two Central Technical Authorities, line positions designed to ensure consistent technical direction of areas involving operational safety. For NNSA, the Central Technical Authority will be the Principal Deputy Administrator,

Jerry Paul. The new Chief, Defense Nuclear Safety, Jim McConnell, will provide staff support to the Central Technical Authority.

The formal establishment of a Central Technical Authority helps clarify responsibilities but, otherwise, the response to the Defense Board Recommendation is related to the conditions that led to our establishing the Chief, Defense Nuclear Safety. As I have told you before, over the last year I have become convinced that, in areas of nuclear safety and safeguards and security, I may have let the pendulum swing too far in the direction of authority for Site Managers without providing the requisite Headquarters supervision. I think we will now move back to a somewhat better balance that recognizes that, in these two important areas, there must be both clear lines of authority and accountability and effective Headquarters oversight.

**Recognition for NNSA.** On one of his final days in office, Secretary Abraham presented the Department of Energy Gold Award to several officials, including Paul Longworth and me. I was, of course, flattered by the recognition, but I am conscious that the Secretary was, in effect, presenting the award to all of you for the work we have done together these past three years. I believe the Secretary is fully aware of what an outstanding group of public servants he leaves behind as he departs Government.

**Budget.** We have now finalized most of the details of the President's FY 2006 Budget. By long tradition, we don't talk details until the Budget is released, currently scheduled for February 7. I'm generally pleased with the budget, although I anticipate the totals will be somewhat smaller than we predicted a year ago because of renewed emphasis on deficit reduction. I'll get some details out to you as soon as it's appropriate.

**Site Managers.** You know how important I believe the Site Manager's job is in the restructured NNSA. As I mentioned above, we are going to provide a little more oversight in the area of nuclear operations and safeguards and security, but that isn't intended to diminish the central role of the Site Managers. Next year I expect two of our Site Managers to retire. We will shortly be starting the process of searching for their replacements. The reason we will start so far in advance is that we are establishing a four-month tailored training period at Headquarters for new Site Managers, patterned loosely after the longstanding Naval Reactors program for new commanding officers. I recognize that only a relative handful of you are at the right stage in your careers and have the right interests to want to be Site Manager. Only a slightly larger handful will be directly affected by these pending selections. But it is important for all of us to understand the efforts that we need to go to in order to make this crucial position a success. There will be more out on this shortly.

**Auschwitz.** January 27, 2005, was the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the most well known of the concentration camps that helped exterminate six million people during the Second World War. When I was 10,

I came across a box of photographs that my father had taken at the liberation of another camp (I no longer know which one it was). The impact of those pictures remains a half-century later. Auschwitz reminds us that there really is evil in the world and that there are times when the United States must use its power to resist that evil. It also reminds us that intolerance and bigotry left unchecked can lead to horrifying consequences. I don't want to over-romanticize the day-to-day work of administering contracts, planning programs, managing people, or overseeing site operations, but it is important to remember that - in a very real sense - our fundamental job is to help keep the United States strong and capable of resisting such evil in the future. As we mark this 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary, I hope you will reflect on the importance of our work, the sacrifices of previous generations, and the importance of ensuring that this kind of systematic slaughter is never again allowed to go unchallenged.

That's all I have for now. Sorry it has been so long since my last Lintgram.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:44 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #35

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, February 07, 2005 2:25 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FedS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FedS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FedS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FedS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FedS ; (DL) SO-Y12 FedS  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #35

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 07, 2005 2:23:35 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #35  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The biggest piece of news recently was Secretary Bodman's confirmation and arrival and the departures of both Secretary Abraham and Deputy Secretary McSlarrow. I hope you had a chance to listen to the new Secretary's remarks to the Department last week. I have had the chance to meet with and brief him on several occasions and can confirm what everyone has been telling us: he is going to be a superb Secretary.

The second biggest piece of news is the rollout of the FY 2006 budget (the budget for the Fiscal Year that starts October 1). Prior to the President announcing the specifics of his budget proposals to the Congress, Federal Departments/Agencies are embargoed from discussing this budget. Once the President has announced his proposals, we are then permitted to provide details on our budget and programs to the public and the press. This is done in what we call the budget rollout. We'll be sharing with the Sites and programs (most of whom already have it) the specifics of the budget that affect them, but I wanted to give you my overall impressions.

The President made clear in the State of the Union that one of his highest fiscal priorities was to cut the annual deficit in half over the next few years. As a result, most Government programs are being held to increases at a rate less than inflation, and many programs (including most of ours) actually are requesting less total funding in 2006 than they received in 2005. The striking exception is those parts of our nonproliferation program that are directly related to homeland security. The Administration will seek a significant increase in nonproliferation R&D funding, primarily for proliferation detection. The Administration will also seek a significant increase in funding for Material Protection, Control and Accountability in Russia and elsewhere, thus, allowing us to complete the security upgrades of the Russian Navy by 2006, of the Russian Federal Agency for Atomic Energy (our rough counterpart) by 2008, and, of a number of strategic rocket forces sites over the next two years. As part of this effort there will be a significant increase in the Megaports program, a program to install radiation detection equipment at the world's largest ports in order to screen cargo headed for the United States for nuclear materials well before it gets to our shores. This is a relatively new program, and we already have agreements with several countries and are looking for more.

There are some other things where the news was not quite as good. Here are the ones that seem the most important to me:



- We will keep on schedule for an ignition experiment at the National Ignition Facility (NIF) by 2010 and for full commissioning of all 192 beams by the same year, but we're going to have to accept some additional risks, and we had to drastically cut back some of the other inertial confinement fusion activities at other sites.
- Because of continuing problems in reaching agreement on liability protection with the Russian Federation, we will have to stretch out the MOX program, which will take surplus plutonium and turn it into fuel for commercial reactors. I'm cautiously optimistic that the problems with liability in Russia are behind us, but we don't have everything nailed down yet.
- Some of you know there was an adjustment made to the Design Basis Threat (DBT) last August. The DBT provides the overarching framework for the NNSA security program and drives the protection strategies for each of our facilities. The budget adequately funds our efforts to meet this refinement for FY 2006, but we're facing some shortfalls in subsequent years we're going to have to wrestle with.
- Similarly, we have had to stretch out some of the funding for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP), our get-well effort to restore the complex after the neglect of the '90s. I'm still not completely sure what we're going to do about this.
- Finally, the budget supports the transfer of environmental restoration at all of our Sites except Los Alamos and Y-12 from the Office of Environmental Management to NNSA starting in October. Los Alamos will be transferred a year from October. While we have received a respectful hearing on the Hill, we'll need to work hard to convince the Congress that this is the right thing to do.

As is often true in Washington, relatively small dollar items turn out to be the most contentious. Last year, we sought funds to complete a feasibility study on modifying an existing bomb to penetrate a few meters into rock in order to hold at-risk hardened and deeply buried targets (this concept is called the "Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator"). The Congress eliminated all funding for this effort. At the personal request of the Secretary of Defense, we are trying again, although we've de-scoped the request considerably. I expect we're going to spend a lot of time explaining why this is a good idea. My position is that there is an important debate to be had about whether we actually need this capability, but it would be better to complete the study before having that debate. There are some pretty strong alternate views on the Hill.

While some individual programs will receive less in 2006 than they expected, overall, I think the budget shows the Administration's strong support for all aspects of NNSA. My job will now be to convince the Congress that we're right.

**Ombuds Meeting**. I had my periodic meeting with the NNSA Ombuds last week. Most of you remember that these are non-supervisory individuals with special training who help resolve workplace frictions before they get out of hand. They operate on the principle of impartiality (they aren't representatives of management or representatives of the employee) and confidentiality (they aren't allowed to tell anyone, including me, about the cases they're working on without the specific permission of the individual(s) involved). We started this program a couple of years ago and have expanded it to cover Headquarters reasonably well. We are in the process of interviewing those that have expressed an interest in becoming Ombuds, so that we can provide closer support to our field elements, including having resident Ombuds at the Service Center and at least one at each of the seven Site Offices where we don't yet have them. In addition, some of the current individuals will be coming to the end of their three-year appointment over the next year. I tend to think that if people are good at this and they want to keep doing it, we ought to let them, but change is good too. If you don't know who the ombuds are, let me know and we'll get out some information (for right now, that mostly applies to Headquarters).

**Retaliation.** While the Ombuds aren't allowed to tell me about the specific cases they're working on, they can share the issues that they see among the NNSA staff. I was extremely disturbed to hear that there is a perception somewhere (I don't know where because I'm not allowed to know) that individuals are being retaliated against for raising issues or problems. Such retaliation is a violation of the law, a violation of sound leadership, and totally unacceptable to me. Not everyone who claims retaliation really is being retaliated against, of course, and there are two sides to every story. Still, if you believe you are being retaliated against, you need to let someone senior in management know so we can act on it. If you can't find anyone else to let know, tell me.

**Diskless Computing.** Last July, we were unable to locate two pieces of classified removable electronic media (CREM) at Los Alamos. Although multiple investigations have now made it clear that the "missing" disks never existed, the incident has focused attention on the protection of accountable CREM, hard drives, and other media. In NNSA, we control over 180,000 individual items, even after a significant effort that has destroyed tens of thousands of items that are no longer needed. Protecting and accounting for all this is a daunting task. One way to minimize the problem is to go to so-called "diskless" computing, where we don't have anything removable (or, in some approaches, anything removable by the individual desktop user). Shortly before leaving office, Deputy Secretary McSlarrow approved the establishment of a project office to help accelerate the move to diskless computing. It will be located in NNSA but will be responsible for the entire Department. Putting it in NNSA makes sense, both to avoid any issues with the NNSA Act and because the overwhelming bulk of the material at issue is ours.

The shift to diskless computing is already in progress at many sites, using one of several different approaches. We will not try to slow up the process by imposing a standard approach but we will be trying to make sure that this effort moves out as rapidly as possible. Once desktop users can retrieve data from a secure central storage on their desktops, the need for the excessive amount of removable media will be reduced, although we will never eliminate it completely.

I think this is a good example of trying to use technology in both improving security while still letting people do their jobs. We'll be getting out more information formally, but I wanted to let you know this effort was coming.

**Communications.** Unless you're very new or have a completely tin ear, you know that I place a lot of value on communications. Unfortunately, there are some constraints on my personal ability. I don't know why it should be so hard to have a periodic Headquarters "All Hands" meeting, but my travel schedule and the endless stream of pressing commitments seem to make it especially difficult. I'll try to do better. In the meantime, however, I have to depend on Lintgrams and the chain of command.

I hear from time-to-time people express concern with communications. When you pull this string, it usually turns out that they're working for supervisors who just don't think it's important to keep them informed. Such supervisors have a narrow view of what people need to know to do their job and no sense of the importance of people understanding how they fit into the overall NNSA picture. If you have people working for you, I urge you to take a look at your communications style. Some people believe that knowledge is power, and, if they hoard that knowledge, they increase their power.

That's simply not right. First, that attitude is lousy leadership, but it's also been shown time and time again to be ineffective. If you are routinely getting information from your boss that you're not passing on to your subordinates or if you are thinking of new ways to do our job, and you're not discussing them with your subordinates, you're probably making a mistake and are far less effective than you might be. I urge you to take this very seriously. I suppose that it is theoretically possible to do too much communication, but I've been in this business 46 years, and I haven't seen that situation yet.

**Sharing Lintgrams.** I draft Lintgrams primarily for the NNSA Federal workforce. I focus on this group because I believe I have unique responsibilities toward them as the senior NNSA Federal official and because I

think it is important to try to foster a sense of mission and cohesion among us. I am sometimes asked whether I have any objections to sharing these with contractors or others outside the NNSA Federal family. Doing so is fine with me. In the electronic era, once you send something to 2,000 people, it's kind of silly to pretend that it's a private communication. (In recognition of this fact, although I write everything in the Lintgrams myself, I do have a couple of people read them before we hit "send" just to keep from embarrassing myself in front of very large groups of people!)

**Sacrifice.** I don't know how many of you watched the State of the Union, but, near the end, there was an extremely touching moment when the President introduced first an Iraqi woman who, at great personal risk, had voted in the Iraqi election; and second, the parents of a Marine who had been killed in Iraq. Watching the Marine's mother embrace an Iraqi woman, whose exercise of her right to democracy was made possible by the American Armed Forces, reminded me of the sacrifices that people go through in the interest of their country (or, in this case, their two countries). Like all of you, I can get annoyed when there are bureaucratic problems or when something comes up at the end of the day when I'm trying to go home, or when my co-workers are not as responsive as I like. That's human. But watching those two women embrace made me realize that the price we pay for serving our country is far, far smaller than the price being paid everyday by outstanding men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and the difficulties we face in carrying out such service pale beside the risks being taken for democracy by men and women in Iraq. We should be immensely proud of those people.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:44 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #36

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2005 2:15 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #36

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2005 2:12:00 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #36  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Most of our attention in Washington this past month has been focused on the Congress and the defense presentation of the President's budget. Secretary Bodman has begun his rounds of testimony. I began mine with a hearing this week and I have two hearings next week. In addition, we have been conducting a number of briefings for Congressional staff. The process of presenting a budget to Congress is complex and very labor-intensive. We need to be able to convey both specific technical details on particular programs and a coherent overall picture of how our budget fits together. It is far too early to speculate on outcomes of the budget process. Traditionally, we have gotten very good support overall, and I have no reason to believe that will not be true this year. I am equally certain that there will be some specific areas where the Congress will have some significant questions, either on programmatic grounds (whether we can really make the dates that we assert) or on policy grounds (whether, for example, the President's proposal to continue a study of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator is wise). I'll keep you informed as the process unfolds but, as I have told you in prior years, there is an inherent degree of uncertainty built into this process.

**Travels with the Secretary.** Secretary Bodman is starting a series of trips across the DOE complex. Last week, I accompanied him on his first one to Sandia and Los Alamos. He was impressed, as he should have been, with the science and the scientists that he saw. Unfortunately, he didn't have time to meet separately with the Federal workforce on this trip. He's asked me to send a separate message to our New Mexico NNSA contingent saying how much he looks forward to meeting them on a future trip. He also asked me to remind all of you that he was quite serious in his opening remarks to the Department about wanting to hear from you. His e-mail is [the.secretary@hq.doe.gov](mailto:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov). Like me, he reads all e-mails sent to him. He can't promise to answer all of them (neither can I, although I answer most that I get) but he wants to hear from you if you have things that he should know (This might be a good time to remind you that my e-mail is [linton.brooks@nnsa.doe.gov](mailto:linton.brooks@nnsa.doe.gov)).

**Working with the Russians.** Former Secretary of Energy Abraham invested a substantial amount of time in working with the Director of Russia's Federal Atomic Energy Agency to smooth out obstacles and expand our cooperation with the Russians on the security of nuclear weapons and nuclear materials. Secretary Bodman has now inherited that role. I accompanied him to an initial meeting in which he led a U.S. interagency team that met with a comparable Russian team to help prepare for last week's Presidential Summit in Bratislava, Slovenia. During that Summit, the Secretary and his Russian counterpart were assigned responsibilities by the U.S. and Russian Presidents for supervising a number of cooperative efforts in the area of nuclear security. These efforts are intended to share best practices on security, improve security culture, cooperate on emergency response, and reach out to other countries to help them improve their own security. Naturally, they also include accelerating many of our ongoing efforts. While the Secretary has the overall responsibility, the day-to-day work of deepening our cooperation will fall to NNSA as well as to our counterparts in other agencies.

**Respect.** I have been hearing some disturbing stories that we aren't treating one other with respect. I think it is important that we hold each other accountable. If someone in another office fails to follow through on a commitment or didn't meet a deadline or isn't providing what you need, of course, you should call it to their attention and ask them to fix the problem. But I assume these conversations will be done professionally. Nobody deserves to be treated with disrespect, no one in NNSA, no one in the Department as a whole, no one in the contractor community. We may have fallen into some bad habits and, if we have, I want us to fall back out of them.

In my first set of remarks to you, I said "I have a reputation as being relatively easygoing and not much makes me grumpy. But I will not tolerate people in NNSA not being treated with respect by their NNSA colleagues...or anyone else." Nothing has changed my mind about this. Please take a look at how you are treating your colleagues, whether they are support staff, couriers, other professionals, people at the Service Center, or colleagues in other parts of Headquarters. We're all too good to do anything other than act professionally.

**Personnel Assignments.** Some of you have asked about our occasional practice of making personnel assignments without the normal competition or solicitation of expressions of interest. Obviously, we have to follow the formal personnel rules, but those rules give us some flexibility. Here is the approach I have tried to take. First, if a job involves a promotion (either in actual fact or in the appearance of the importance of the job), it should normally be competed. Second, when we're moving people laterally and competition is not required, we'll normally ask for expressions of interest to make sure we have the broadest possible choice. Third, notwithstanding these two practices, I don't approve of going through a facade. So, in cases where I already know what I want to do, and the rules allow me to do it, I don't believe in sending out an expression of interest simply to go through the motions. For example, when one of our Site Managers retired last year, unique circumstances at the Site made it clear to me that there was only one individual I was willing to assign. I went ahead and did that without raising false expectations by asking others. In contrast, the upcoming vacancies for two Site Manager positions will be competed.

While these examples involve members of the Senior Executive Service, who operate under somewhat different rules than most of you, the principle still applies. We want to give everyone a chance to express interest in challenging assignments, but we have too much respect for people to go through a sham process when special circumstances are involved.

I understand that these two principles tend to be somewhat in tension. I'm actually pretty comfortable with that. A lot of what we do in managing large organizations (or in life, for that matter) doesn't consist of picking the right over the wrong but of balancing two competing desirable principles. Usually we get it right. When we don't, we'll learn from the experience.

**Rumors.** In one of my earliest Lintgrams, I said that one thing I like to use these messages for is stamping out bum dope and defusing false rumors. I haven't done much of that lately because I haven't had such rumors brought to my attention. This could mean one of three things. It could mean that NNSA, unique in all of human history, is a place where there is never any misinformation circulated. That's possible, but I'm not sure it's likely. Second, it could mean that NNSA is a place where, when strange rumors circulate, supervisors are immediately able to get the correct information out. I hope that's the case and that's certainly what we should strive for. Finally, however, it could be the case that some of you are hearing bizarre rumors but not asking about them because you figure "they" won't get you the straight dope anyhow. If that's the case, then you're not getting what you deserve. If you hear things that sound like strange new policies without documentation, you should ask your supervisor about it so you could get the right dope, and your supervisor should get the word up to me so that I can make sure everybody else has the right dope. We are unlikely to be able to prevent all misinformation, but we ought to be able to get it corrected quickly.

**Recognition for Ev Beckner.** I had a wonderful experience a couple of weeks ago. I got to present, on behalf of former Secretary Abraham, the Department's highest award, the Gold Medal, to Dr. Everet Beckner. Secretary Abraham had wanted to present this before he left, but Ev was on leave. What made the presentation even more enjoyable was that Dr. Beckner was unaware that he was receiving the award, thanks to some clever collusion by a number of people. NNSA, like most organizations, has a small-town aspect that makes it very hard to keep secrets. Nonetheless, we were able to keep this one and to call Ev out of his office to find about 50 people from Defense Programs and elsewhere in the organization waiting for him. In presenting the award, I reminded people that Secretary Abraham often said that the single most important responsibility he had was the certification to the President that the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable. He didn't spend a lot of time on that responsibility, because he didn't have to. And he didn't have to because he had a superb custodian of the stockpile in Ev Beckner. It was both a privilege and an honor to present Dr. Beckner with this award.

**Dedication of the Atomic Testing Museum.** My job lets me do things that are interesting, important, challenging, and, occasionally, exciting. Its very seldom, however, that I get to do something that is simply fun. On February 19th, I had one of those rare opportunities that are purely enjoyable. I spoke at the opening of the Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas. The Museum is intended to preserve the legacy of the Nevada Test Site and is affiliated with the Smithsonian Institution. It is a fascinating reminder of the extraordinary efforts to which our predecessors went to ensure the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear deterrent. We're now trying to preserve that deterrent by using tools other than testing, but it's important to be reminded of the legacy that we have inherited. If you are visiting Las Vegas, I urge you to see the Museum. I think you'll be fascinated. I certainly was.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:45 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #37

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2005 3:35 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #37

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2005 3:30:22 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #37  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most important thing I have to tell you concerns people. First, Deputy Secretary Clay Sell was sworn in earlier this week. I have had the opportunity to work with the new Deputy Secretary when he was on the Hill, and we are fortunate to have him in the Department. Many of you know him, and those who don't will find him a pleasure to work for.

While the arrival of the new Deputy Secretary is good news, the other two announcements I have to make represent significant losses. Deputy Administrator Ev Beckner, who has been running Defense Programs since late 2001, has announced his intention to retire, effective April 30. In discussing Ev's Gold Award in my last Lintgram, I said, "Secretary Abraham often said that the single most important responsibility he had was the certification to the President that the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable. He didn't spend a lot of time on that responsibility, because he didn't have to. And he didn't have to because he had a superb custodian of the stockpile in Ev Beckner." Ev's departure is a serious loss to NNSA, the Department of Energy, and the country. The Secretary, Deputy Secretary and I will be working with the White House to identify a replacement. Given the demands of the job and Ev's unique capabilities, finding that replacement is going to be very difficult.

A second significant loss is Larry Kirkman, Associate Director for Federal Services at the NNSA Service Center in Albuquerque. After 35 years in Government, Larry will retire on April 1, 2005. He was an engineer for the Army Corp of Engineers and for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before joining DOE in 1980. We are losing a phenomenal amount of experience with his departure. In Albuquerque, Larry worked in jobs associated with safeguards and security, safety support, technical management, project management, and resources management. Prior to coming to Albuquerque, he worked in the Rocky Flats Area Office and the Nevada Operations Office. He was also the Manager of the Mound Area Office and the Acting Manager at both

the Pinellas and Los Alamos Area Offices. He is typical of the broadly-experienced, hard-working professionals who are the backbone of NNSA. I know you join Karen Boardman and me in wishing him well in retirement.

**Congressional Testimony.** I've now been through two hearings on our budget in the House and a separate hearing on security. I'll be testifying in about 10 days in the Senate on nuclear weapons policy and how our weapons programs fit into the President's overall approach. About 10 days after that, I'll have a budget hearing in the Senate. Thus far, our hearings have gone reasonably well. I've felt very well prepared for these hearings due to a great deal of hard work by people at Headquarters. Not surprisingly, the issues raised thus far are mostly those we wrestled with last year, especially funding for the Modern Pit Facility and for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. We've also had a somewhat mixed reception on our proposal for NNSA to assume responsibility for environmental restoration at NNSA Sites. At this stage, it is far too early to predict what adjustments to the budget the Congress might make.

**Correspondence.** I have mentioned to you that the Secretary has strong views on getting correspondence and reports submitted on time. This is more than a personal preference; when we are timely with reports and responses, we portray the image of a well-run organization and thus are more likely to be taken seriously. NNSA has been doing quite well in this area due to some exceptionally hard work both in Headquarters and in the field. I really appreciate this effort which continues to enhance NNSA's reputation.

**The Complex Study.** As some of you are aware, at the request of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, the Secretary has commissioned a well-qualified group to look at the long-term future of the weapons complex. They will be quite wide-ranging in what they consider. The motivation for the request is to see whether the combination of the smaller stockpile approved by the President last year and the more severe Design Basis Threat approved by the former Deputy Secretary in October, suggest a need for long-term changes in the complex. The task force has visited several Sites and will visit others over the next few weeks. We expect preliminary results by late April. I will keep you informed. I suspect that any changes that come from this effort will take some time to implement, but I can't say anything definite until I see what the task force recommends.

**Staffing Summit.** This week we held our long-awaited Staffing Summit under Jerry Paul's leadership. This was our attempt to adjust staffing now that the dust has settled from the consolidation and we have some experience with our new organization. Jerry and I were very pleased with the outcome, which marks a major milestone in creating the NNSA of the Future. This meeting was not easy. It was the culmination of countless hours of work, planning, and trial and error, beginning back when we crafted our original vision and carrying through the many days of standup, then the Functional Matrix Summit and, finally, the preparation for this summit. The resulting staffing levels do not match everyone's optimal request but provide the best outcome for NNSA in today's tough budget climate. We at Headquarters now need to work on helping the sites with the challenges they face, such as the Quality Assurance (QA) requirements, training, and budgeting for the additional facility representatives. I appreciate all the hard work that went into this summit.

**Recognition.** Each year, the President confers the rank of Meritorious Executive on a handful of members of the Senior Executive Service and the rank of Distinguished Executive on an even smaller handful. We send out a notice and we have a ceremony but until recently we didn't have any permanent way to honor people. Thanks to Bill Barker that is no longer true. At NNSA's suggestion, and due to Bill's work with his colleagues in the Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation, there is now a display in the Forrestal Building lobby listing the names of DOE honorees. It sits next to the list of Lawrence and Fermi Award winners and across from the listing of Nobel Prize winners (all prizes of enormous prestige). Take a look at this new display next time you have a chance. You'll see some familiar names. I'm delighted that these Presidential Award Winners-the best of the best-will now be permanently recognized.



**Headquarters Involvement in Security.** In December 2002, when I announced the organizational changes on the way to the NNSA of the Future, I wanted to stress the authority, responsibility, and accountability of the Site Offices. I thus set up a procedure in which there was essentially no routine Headquarters supervision of Site Offices (and, for that matter, no routine mechanism for Site Offices to get help from Headquarters). For most areas, I think that was and remains the right model. The oversight provided by the Office of Safety and Security Performance Assurance and their every-other-year inspections seem to be an adequate check on Site Office performance.

In two areas, however, I have concluded that I went too far. One you already know about, which is the safety of nuclear operations. There, we have established the Chief of Defense Nuclear Safety as a mechanism to both provide assistance to Site Offices and provide me a mechanism to carry out my responsibility to supervise Site Offices. Secondly, I have concluded that safeguards and security needs a similar mechanism, and we have established a new office under the Associate Administrator for Defense Nuclear Security. In the NNSACAST, I announced this new office as the "Office of Performance Assurance," but I don't like that name and will probably change it. It leads to too much confusion between what the new office does and what Glenn Podonsky's organization does. This isn't independent oversight; this is part of my line responsibility to make sure that Site Offices are carrying out their obligations as well as my equally strong responsibility to provide a mechanism to assist them when they need help. I know some of you are skeptical that the same organization can both provide supervision and assistance, but I have decades of experience watching this model work in other organizations and see no reason why it can't work here. It's going to be a growing process, but I'm convinced that this new approach will help us improve safeguards and security.

That's all I have for now. This is a little shorter than usual, but I'll be on leave next week and I don't like going too long without getting something out to you. I hope you are enjoying the advent of spring. Somehow, when I drive to work in full daylight instead of the dark, I feel like I'm not working as long.

Linton

**From:** NNSACAST HQ  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 10:39 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #38

***This is the final version of Lintgram #38. Please disregard any previous version that you may have received.***

Although it's been fairly busy, I did manage to slip away for a week in Florida since my last Lintgram. Getting away for a few days is always wonderful and this was no exception. I have noticed that I am not the only one in NNSA who has a tendency to work long hours. Those of you who also are minor workaholics have a duty to yourselves, your families, and to the rest of us to make sure you take a break from time to time.

**Budget.** A lot of our focus every spring is on the Congress and this year is no exception. I have finished my final hearings on the President's FY 2006 budget request. It will be a little while before we see the recommendations of the House and Senate (which will certainly be different) and still longer before we know how those differing approaches are reconciled. It is also true that every year we see Congressional adjustments to the budget that were not discussed at hearings and that sometimes come as a complete surprise. Still, I can tell you a little bit about what is getting high-level visibility.

While most other areas of the budget are being slightly reduced, the President's budget for nonproliferation shows a 15 percent increase. This has generally gone over well in discussions with Congress, reflecting the continued strong support for nonproliferation programs. One area of concern has been the program to eliminate excess plutonium by turning it into mixed oxide (MOX) fuel for burning in commercial reactors. This is the largest single nonproliferation program in the Federal Government and continues to be held up by a complex and arcane liability dispute with the Russians. There's obviously a great deal of concern on the Hill including, unfortunately, questions of whether the money for the program should be diverted to other purposes. I'm trying to discourage any such diversion, and I hope we will have the liability issue solved soon.

In the weapons area, the spotlight has been on a new program called Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW). This effort would modify warheads to use simpler, easier to manufacture and certify components, even at the expense of some of the high yield-to-weight ratios we needed during the Cold War. If successful, the program could go far to assure the long-term reliability of the deployed stockpile, allow us to consider further reductions in those non-deployed weapons being kept as a hedge against unforeseen geopolitical or technological problems, help us transform to a more responsive nuclear weapons enterprise and decrease the likelihood that we will ever need to resume nuclear testing. The RRW effort is in its very early stages (the program was first funded in the current fiscal year), and it's easier to see how the underlying concepts apply to some systems than it is to others. Congressional reaction has ranged from enthusiasm over the possible benefits to concern that it is a covert way to deploy new warheads. I have been explaining that, if the program succeeds, it will result in warheads that, while easier to manufacture, certify and maintain, will have the same military characteristics, be delivered by the same delivery systems, and hold at risk the same set of targets.

In other areas, there is continued concern over the very modest research we proposed on a nuclear earth penetrator (funding was eliminated for that program last year but, at the personal request of the Secretary of Defense, we are trying again), some concern about specific reductions we have made in

response to the President's desire to reduce the deficit, more skepticism than I had hoped on the EM to NNSA transfer, and the usual series of detailed technical questions, mostly handled between Congressional and NNSA staff. As is usually the case, the size of the program doesn't have a lot to do with the amount of Congressional interest. The RRW program, for example, only involves a 10th of 1 percent of our budget, but is getting a much greater fraction of Congressional interest. I'll keep you informed as this drama unfolds.

**Complex Study.** Another area of Congressional interest, not directly related to the budget currently under review, is the long-term future of the weapons complex. Some of you know that last year we agreed to establish an independent group to make suggestions about the complex. I told the group that I wanted them to think broadly, and initial indications are that they have done so. Much of their focus has been on consolidating functions involving special nuclear material. It's important to understand that (1) they haven't finished their work, (2) the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and I haven't reviewed it, (3) I have no idea which parts of it we will support and which we will not, and (4) while I've asked them to look at things that can be done soon, any major transformation of the complex will take years. Thus, it's premature to start speculating about what their recommendations may or may not mean for a particular site. I'll have more to say about this once their report is complete.

**Appointments.** I have three important appointments to tell you about. Because the President has not yet chosen a replacement for Dr. Beckner, and because the confirmation process is a lengthy one, we can expect a few months with an interim head of Defense Programs. Fortunately, Secretary Bodman has approved Tom D'Agostino, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Program Integration, filling this role after Ev leaves. Because Brigadier General Haeckel will also be leaving and we are uncertain when his relief will arrive, I have asked Steve Hafner, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Secure Transportation, to serve as the interim Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator for Defense Programs starting in June. I am very pleased with both of these interim appointments. They will ensure that the important work of NA-10 continues unabated.

Another important position has been vacant until very recently. Since Tyler Przybylek stepped down as NNSA General Counsel to devote full time to the Los Alamos competition, we have been without a permanent General Counsel. After a nationwide search and with my enthusiastic support, Jerry Paul has selected Dave Jonas for this important position. Dave has been acting as the General Counsel and was chosen over a number of very well-qualified candidates. I'm delighted he's agreed to accept this important responsibility on a permanent basis.

**Future Leaders (Intern) Program.** Last year we decided to institute an internship program in the areas of safety, weapons, business, and security. We have selected the first seven security interns, who will begin training this summer. This is a smaller class than we hoped and we will be more aggressive in future recruiting. We've elected to separate the security program from the other internships because we want to take a slightly different approach and because we are recruiting from a slightly different pool.

The broader internship program has been named the Future Leaders Program. This doesn't mean we are thinking of it as a management program. Rather, we want the kind of people who will be outstanding in their fields. You know the people you instinctively turn to for help with tough assignments. They are leaders no matter what block on an organization chart they fill. Those are the kind of people we want.

We have 26 people in our first two-year class and are looking for four more before the class reports in July. This class is heavily weighted toward technical skills, especially those related to safety, because that is where our greatest near-term needs are. We will adjust the mix each year based on workforce analysis of future needs. All field locations and many Headquarters locations will have interns (all of whom will do two rotations from their main location), but the program will be centrally funded.

I am committed to continuing these programs (and our long-standing Nonproliferation Graduate Intern Program) for at least several years. I urge you all to help the new interns make the most of their new assignments. By doing so you will help ensure our future success.

**Leadership Coalition.** About every two months, the Site Managers, the Service Center Director, the Deputy and Associate Administrators, and Jerry Paul and I meet for a day-long session we call the Leadership Coalition. We try to avoid formal briefings or discussions of areas where we all agree. Instead, we focus on trying to resolve issues. We met this past week. Here are some of the things we covered:

- We've been criticized for not having our Employee Concerns Program up to date and consistent across the sites. We agreed the Service Center would take the lead to improve this.
- We assigned responsibility for closing out the recommendations from the NNSA review of the Space Shuttle Columbia accident. We've done a lot on this but haven't promulgated much to all of you. We will fix that.
- We agreed that, for now, there was no need for a formal document on non-nuclear safety basis.
- We agreed to provide the Site Managers with a programming book that I get as part of the summer budget formulation process under the Planning, Programming, Budget and Evaluation system. This will allow them to make inputs, where appropriate, into my final decisions and recommendations to the Secretary.
- We reviewed the NNSA Future Leaders (Intern) Program and the separate security intern program (described above).
- We agreed with the recent decision by the Office of Security to ensure that Human Reliability Program Certifying Officials (Site Managers in most cases) will have access (with suitable provisions for privacy protection) to Personnel Security Case Evaluation Summaries. It is important to understand that this doesn't mean Site Managers will be second-guessing the security organization, but rather that they need to see all aspects of an individual case to make Human Reliability Program decisions.
- Finally, over dinner, we had a chance for the field leaders to say goodbye to Ev Beckner.

**Final random thoughts.** I've been looking at my schedule and doubt I'll be doing much travel to the sites over the next couple of months. I know it has been a long time since I visited some of you and I'll try to remedy this in late summer or fall.

I know all of you join me in wishing Dr. Beckner our very best! He has had an amazing career and we will all miss him. I hope to see many of you at his farewell dinner and retirement ceremony this Thursday.

That's all I have for now. I hope you have been enjoying the spring. Washington has been especially beautiful these past couple of weeks.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:45 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #39

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 2:50 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #39

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 2:46:12 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #39  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

I'm in the middle of a series of overseas trips (I'll be in Moscow when you read this). Last week, I was at a classified meeting; this week (May 23), I'm in Moscow with the Secretary working on the President's initiatives to improve security cooperation with Russia; and next week, I'll be back in Russia to represent NNSA at the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of one of the Russian weapons laboratories. While I don't travel nearly as much as many of you, it's an interesting and important part of my job.

**Budget.** At this time of year, Congress and the budget dominate our thinking. We are beginning to see individual committee action on the President's fiscal year 2006 budget request. As always, most of our programs were well-supported, but there are some exceptions. Two particularly disappointing results of initial committee action have been the reluctance of the Congress to approve the transfer of responsibilities for environmental cleanup at NNSA sites from the Office of Environmental Management (EM) to NNSA, and the significant reduction that is being contemplated in the Plutonium Disposition (MOX) Program. The first appears to be a disagreement on policy grounds on whether NNSA should take on new responsibilities. On the second issue, the Congress continues to support MOX, but doubts that we can make effective use of the funding given continued delays in resolving a complex liability issue with the Russian Federation.

Reflecting the generally austere fiscal climate (and unlike previous years) there could be a significant overall reduction from the President's request, although we have not heard from all of the committees and there is always a reconciliation process to go through between the invariably somewhat differing recommendations of the House and the Senate. I will keep you informed as this drama unfolds, although it will be several months before we know the final outcome.

**People.** There have been some important changes recently. On May 19, I attended the retirement ceremony for Brigadier General Ron Haeckel, Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Military Application, marking the

end of his 28-year Air Force career. General Haeckel has done an outstanding job for NNSA and the Nation. We will all miss him. We are continuing to work with the Pentagon to identify a suitable relief.

On May 20, I had the pleasure of swearing in Dave Jonas as a member of the Senior Executive Service (SES) and as the NNSA General Counsel. A promotion to the Senior Executive Service is a milestone that only about one percent of the Federal Government's civil servants attain. NNSA is blessed with an extraordinarily fine SES cadre, even by the very high standards of the Senior Executive Service. I try to conduct the swearing-in ceremonies for SES members myself whenever I can, in order to emphasize the great importance I place on this very talented group of public servants. It is also important to recognize the value of a General Counsel. All of us can make lawyer jokes, but the rule of law is what distinguishes civilization from anarchy and the legal profession is the custodian of that rule of law. I was delighted to be able to swear Dave in.

Finally, the White House has announced that the President intends to nominate James (Jim) Rispoli, currently the Director of the Office of Engineering and Construction Management, to be the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management. Because we work closely with EM, this is an important and welcome announcement for NNSA. Jim is well-known and highly respected throughout NNSA Headquarters and we look forward to working with him in his new role.

**Employer of Choice.** One of the things that Jerry Paul, Mike Kane and I want to do this year is move forward on making NNSA an Employer of Choice. It is important not to misunderstand what we mean by this. I believe that people function best when they have control, to the extent possible, over their own careers and over their own lives. To allow people more control, I favor things like alternate work schedules, telecommuting, etc., but I don't want to get off on a sidetrack about entitlements. Not everybody has a job where they can take advantage of this kind of flexibility. That doesn't mean we shouldn't use such provisions where we can, but it does mean that they aren't the only - or even the central - concept behind becoming an Employer of Choice. As public servants, we instinctively know that job satisfaction is more complex than simply monetary rewards or flexibility.

We have done extensive research on other government organizations and companies that are perceived as Employers of Choice by those who work there. They appear to be characterized by: clearly defined missions and goals; opportunities to make a difference; enlightened leadership focused on providing strategic direction and empowering employees; an inclusive culture that embraces high ethical standards; chances for personal and professional growth; rewards and recognition linked to performance; and, high quality of life within the organization.

As a way of prioritizing our actions for improving our own organizational climate, we are going to benchmark NNSA against other public and private sector organizations on the criteria listed above. In cooperation with the Partnership for Public Service, we are preparing an independent survey based on the Office of Personnel Management questionnaire that the Partnership uses to prepare its "Best Places to Work" report. During July, all NNSA Federal employees will be asked to respond to an anonymous, web-based survey that will be administered by a third party. During August, we will evaluate the results of the survey and begin developing NNSA-wide options for becoming an Employer of Choice. In September, we'll be choosing among these options.

I encourage you to take the upcoming survey seriously. I need your views to help make NNSA a better place to work for all of us.

**Odds and Ends.** A few random items:

- In early May, I took part in a ceremony to recognize recipients of the Secretary's Community Service Awards to honor those who have given significant time and energy to their local

communities. Fifty-two individuals from NNSA were recognized. We can all be proud to be working in an organization with such dedicated people.

- The Defense Department has announced its list of military base closings. While there was some concern that Kirtland Air Force Base (in Albuquerque) would be on the list, it was not, and NNSA is unaffected.
- At the suggestion of a number of people, we have arranged for NNSA logo merchandise (mugs, cuff links, shirts, etc.) to be available for on-line purchase over the Internet through the DOE's Energy Recreation and Welfare Association website at <http://www.recgov.org/energy/>. Click on the "[NNSA Employee Store](#)" to see what's available.
- A number of you have asked when the Secretary will visit the sites he hasn't yet been to, including the NNSA Service Center. He wants to visit as many sites as possible this year, but at this time, we don't have a firm schedule. I'll let you know when we do.

**Military Appreciation Month.** For several years, Congress has designated May as National Military Appreciation month. This year is a particularly fitting time to remember our military. As I write this message, American men and women are risking their lives in Iraq and other troubled spots in the service of their country. Earlier this month, we marked the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of the European phase of World War II. And next Monday, we will observe Memorial Day--a day when we especially honor those Americans who died serving their country. I'll have more to say about Memorial Day in a separate message, but I urge you to join Americans at home and abroad in honoring those who serve by pausing to stop and remember their service for one minute at 3:00 p.m. on Memorial Day. It is a fitting way to honor those who served and those who are serving.

While the Memorial Day moment is intended to honor those who served in uniform, it is also a useful time to stop and recognize the many others who also serve, including all of you. I was reminded of that again when I swore in Dave Jonas. I've administered that oath dozens, maybe even hundreds of times, but it always makes me stop and think what a responsibility - and what a privilege - it is to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States." I hope you feel that way too.

That's all for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:45 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #40

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, June 20, 2005 3:15 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) SO-KANSAS CITY Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #40

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 20, 2005 2:55:41 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #40  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

What I've mostly been doing since my last Lintgram is traveling. I've been to Russia twice, once with the Secretary in furtherance of our cooperation with the Russian Federation (more on that below) and a second trip to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of one of the Russian weapons labs and to participate in the periodic meeting between the U.S. and Russian lab directors. Closer to home, I've been out to talk to the Federal staff at the Service Center and the Sandia Site Office. I presented some awards for the efforts of the Los Alamos Site Office in helping with the Los Alamos restart, and I met with a number of people at Los Alamos as they continue to work through the issues associated with the first competition for the contract to manage Los Alamos in the history of the laboratory. I've seen enough runways for awhile, but each of the trips was valuable and a good reminder of the wide variety of our activities and the tremendous competence of the men and women who make up the NNSA.

**Clearances.** As I travel and talk to various individuals, a recurring source of frustration is the delay in getting Q clearances. I am as frustrated as everybody else. By far, the greatest delay in getting clearances is the time it takes to conduct a background investigation. We have no control over that. To give you an idea of the size of the problem, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Center for Federal Investigative Services tells us that in May of this year there were 387,000 OPM investigations in process, with over 200,000 exceeding OPM timelines for completion. They hope to work off the backlog by the end of this fiscal year. After that, the goal is to complete 90 percent of initial clearance investigations within 120 days, dropping to 60 days by the end of 2009. (That sounds great, but 2009 is a long way off.)

The Service Center is working to improve the time we spend processing clearances once we have the background investigation (background investigations just collect facts and it is our responsibility to



determine whether those facts suggest any reason not to grant a clearance). Several months ago, we conducted an extensive study, in cooperation with the Department's Office of Security, which identified a number of work-arounds, mostly ways people could be kept productive until their clearances were granted. All of these help a little bit, but they don't solve the problem.

The Accelerated Access Program (AAP) is one useful vehicle for expediting clearances. Not everybody is eligible for this Program, but for those who are it can speed up the process considerably. I'm looking at ways we can make more effective use of this concept. I was at one laboratory and met with a number of post-docs (ideal candidates) and discovered that fewer than half were even aware of the AAP.

I will keep you informed, but I don't think this one is going to get better soon. We will keep trying.

**Budget.** When we were all in junior high school we got a very simple explanation of the budget process. The President decides on a proposed budget and he sends it to Congress who approves it. The reality is a good deal more confusing. We now have the results of the review of our budget request by both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. They differ substantially, with the Senate numbers being generally higher.

Some key differences:

- The House dramatically reduced the Plutonium Disposition Program (also known as the Mixed Oxide or MOX Program) because of continuing problems in reaching an agreement on liability issues with Russia. The Senate funded the Program in the expectation that the liability issues will be solved shortly.
- The House made a number of adjustments in anticipation of the implementation of the soon-to-be completed study of the nuclear weapons complex by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board. The Senate took the view that this issue will require substantial additional study and precluded the use of funds to implement any of the Board's recommendations in FY 2006.
- The House fully supported completion of construction of the National Ignition Facility. The Senate would terminate construction and focus our efforts on using the partially completed facility for Stockpile Stewardship.

There are a large number of other differences. Later this summer, there will be a conference to reconcile the two approaches. The conference can result in funding levels for individual programs that "split the difference" between the two houses, but it can also result in accepting the position of the House on one program and the Senate on another. Occasionally, the conference takes account of developments since the two committees acted and comes up with something that is different from either committee's proposals. The one thing that is almost certain is that the conference outcome will be different from the recommendations of either committee.

**Future Budgets.** Meanwhile, we are continuing the process that will ultimately lead to the FY 2007 budget that the President will submit shortly after the first of the year. I will be presenting recommendations to the Secretary in late July. It's premature to talk specifics but, as I think I've told you, the President has made it clear that deficit reduction is important and, therefore, the total allocated to NNSA is less than we expected this time last year. As a result, I think the next budget will force us into some difficult and painful decisions. When there are small budget reductions or when it looks like next year's budget will restore them, we can slightly underfund everything and assume things get better later. But in this situation, where it seems clear that totals are going to be reduced for

the foreseeable future, that's an irresponsible course. What we need to do is simply stop doing something. I suspect we'll stop doing several things, all of which are important and valuable. But we're several months away from knowing exactly how this will come out. Once the Secretary approves or modifies our proposed Future Years Nuclear Security Program request for FY 2007-2011, we still have to have his decisions reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget. We will also need to adjust our recommendations to track with the final outcome of the budget now on the Hill.

**Security Protection Officer Competition.** I had the opportunity the week before last to present awards at the annual competition among the protective forces from the various DOE/NNSA sites, the agents from the three transportation safeguards commands, and a number of teams from the military, the police, and the United Kingdom. This year, for the first time, we had Russian observers at the competition as part of our ongoing effort to broaden cooperation with Russia in the area of security. As always, the competitors were impressive. They obviously represented the very best from their individual sites/organizations. At a time when we periodically see stories about weaknesses in our ability to protect special nuclear material, it was heartening to see just how good we can be.

**Cooperation with Russia.** Many of you know that we do extensive work with the Russian Federation to improve security of nuclear materials. In past years, that work, while done collaboratively, has essentially been assistance. The two Presidents are trying to move the relationship from assistance to partnership. This will involve our working together in a number of areas, from intellectual cooperation between laboratories to exchanging best practices in physical security to working jointly through the International Atomic Energy Agency to convert research reactors to use low enriched uranium (which is less of a proliferation concern). Last week, I had the pleasure of watching Secretary Bodman and his Russian counterpart, Director Rumyantsev of the Federal Atomic Energy Agency, sign a report to the two Presidents on the progress we have made in the last several months. It's one of a large number of things that we get to do that may make a huge difference in the long run. I'm proud of all the people who are involved.

**People.** There are a number of important developments to tell you about our co-workers. They include:

- The White House has approved the appointment of Dr. Steve Aoki as the Deputy Under Secretary for Counterterrorism. We established this position two years ago to coordinate all the many counterterrorism efforts of the Department. Steve has been acting in the job for months and I'm glad to see him made permanent.
- Secretary Bodman has approved my recommendation to name Bill Desmond as the permanent Chief, Defense Nuclear Security. Bill has been acting in the position for over a year and has done superbly.
- Congressman Porter of Nevada recognized Debbie Monette, the Nevada Site Office Assistant Manager for National Security, before the House of Representatives during Public Service Recognition Week. How Debbie finds the time and energy to give back to her community after doing so much each day for the Stockpile Stewardship Program is beyond me.
- For the third consecutive year, an NNSA Facility Representative has won Facility Representative of the Year honors. This year's winner is Jeff Cravens from the Y-12 Site Office. FacReps are absolutely crucial to nuclear safety so being the best of this elite group is quite an accomplishment.

- Gary Lyttek has been named DOE Headquarters Small Business Program Manager of the Year. Increasing small business participation in the activities of the Federal Government is one of the Administration's priorities. Gary has done a superb job in furthering this goal for the NNSA and we salute his creativity and tenacity.
- Finally, I am sorry to report that Jim Mangeno, who has been the Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H) Advisor to the Administrator since the creation of NNSA, will be retiring the first of July after 42 years service. Jim has been both our primary liaison with the ES&H community and my primary source of advice in this important area. His time with NNSA ends a very long and very distinguished career, much of which was spent in the Naval Reactors organization. The only reason I'm not completely panicked is that Emil Morrow has agreed to fill in for Jim on an interim basis.

**Outside Perceptions.** Recently a highly professional congressional staff body carried out an extensive review of NNSA's security. Although this particular organization will not publish a formal report, I did get a private debrief. I was exceptionally pleased, though not surprised, when they opened by commenting on the high quality of the people they had met, both in Headquarters and in the field. They were impressed by the attitude, enthusiasm, and professionalism of those they interviewed. In an area like security, where there are so many pressures put on people, it is pleasant to be reminded how lucky the country is to have such an outstanding group of NNSA security professionals.

**Ombuds Program.** In the fall of 2003, I established an Ombuds Program at NNSA Headquarters and Savannah River with an eye toward expanding it should the program prove successful. So far, I believe the Ombuds have served their purpose well and have been a great asset to NNSA employees, so I have decided to expand it to other sites. The following six individuals have volunteered to serve as Ombuds: Jody Pugh, Los Alamos; Phil Keary, Kansas City; Richard Blakely, Albuquerque; Frank Sanchez, Albuquerque; Elisha Demerson, Pantex; and Roger Snyder, Headquarters/GTN.

Ombuds provide employees a channel to communicate and raise concerns about the workplace. They can also provide informal mediation between employees or between employees and supervisors. They help eliminate friction in the workplace before it reaches the stage of requiring more formal intervention. The Ombuds operate on two fundamental principles: confidentiality and impartiality. Although they report to me, they are precluded from providing me any details on whom they are working with or what they are doing, unless the individual involved requests that I be informed. If you have workplace concerns, I encourage you to consider using the Ombuds.

That's all I have for now. Summer has arrived with a vengeance in Washington. Traditionally summer is time to take a break from work. I hope all of you will find time over the next couple of months to do that and to spend some time with your families. I certainly plan to.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #41

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2005 2:54 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) SO-KANSAS CITY Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #41

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2005 2:51:18 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #41  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most interesting thing I've done recently was to participate in a program at the National Academy of Sciences to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of Trinity, the first man-made nuclear explosion in history. What made the program so remarkable was the attendance of a panel of eleven veterans of that event, all of whom are in their late eighties. The history of the dawn of the Atomic Age is familiar, of course, but there was something special about seeing these extraordinary individuals and hearing their recollections of a remarkable day. I was asked to speak and I talked about how nuclear deterrents have influenced world history and the role of nuclear weapons as we move beyond the Cold War.

**Travel with the Secretary.** As I write this, Tom D'Agostino is accompanying Secretary Bodman as he tours Y-12. Later this week, I will join the Secretary for his tour at Livermore.

**Budget.** Much of our attention these past few weeks has been focused on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 Budget. The start of FY 2007 is 14 months off, but we are well along with the development of the budget. Although the President will not submit his budget until February, our proposals have to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in September. Since there is no chance that we will have the final FY 2006 Appropriations Bill from Congress by then, there will obviously be a need for adjustments later in the fall. Right now, we've completed our internal work and had a thorough review by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer. About a week ago, we presented our proposed budget to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary in a four-hour meeting. We are currently addressing some follow-up questions from that session. Next we will receive the Secretary's decisions on our FY 2007 budget and submit our material to OMB.

I really appreciate all of the hard work and extra effort that has gone into this year's budget process. We still have a ways to go. Since there is no budget until we get OMB's feedback in the late fall, I won't be discussing specifics. Still, as I've told you previously we face some very difficult decisions. We will need to see the Secretary's final decisions and the OMB reaction, but there is no conceivable outcome in which there aren't going to be some tough reductions. I have taken the view that we should look for things to stop doing rather than simply underfund everything. I think that's the right approach, but it will be painful. I'll keep you informed.

**Nuclear Complex Study.** One thing that the budget does not cover is the results of the study of the Nuclear Weapons Complex conducted by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's (SEAB) Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Task Force. Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, we can neither act on or comment on this report until it is formally transmitted to the Secretary of Energy, probably in early September. The report itself is available on the Department's web site at <http://www.seab.energy.gov/news.htm>. It is extensive and thought-provoking and will require very careful review.

**People and the Future.** I have several things to tell you about people. The most important is the departure of Paul Longworth, Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (NA-20) last Friday. Paul's leaving is a serious loss to the Department, to NA-20 and to Jerry Paul and me. While I understand the unique opportunity that has arisen for Paul, I will sorely miss him both personally and professionally. We will be working on recommendations to the President for a replacement as soon as possible. The Secretary has asked the President to designate Jerry Paul as acting NA-20 (Jerry will also continue to serve as my Principal Deputy).

In other news on people:

- We have formally named Alice Williams to be Bruce Scott's Deputy. As the Associate Administrator for Infrastructure and Environment, Bruce manages our facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program, supervises our environmental work, and oversees NNSA Project Management. Bruce's office is the only one of our major offices in Headquarters that did not have a formally designated Deputy and we have now corrected that. I'm delighted Alice was willing to take on these added responsibilities.
- Rich Goorevich, in NA-20, was named Chair of the Consultative Group of the Nuclear Suppliers Group for a second year. The Nuclear Suppliers Group is a group of forty-five countries that seek to foster non-proliferation through export control.
- Steve Hafner, who had been serving as the Acting Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator for Military Application in Defense Programs, has left DOE to pursue an unexpected opportunity in the private sector. Steve did an outstanding job as Director of the Office of Secure Transportation and he will also be missed. Tom D'Agostino has made an excellent choice in asking Marty Schoenbauer to serve as his Acting Principal Assistant Deputy Administrator. At this time, there is no news on a permanent replacement for Ev Beckner.
- We will shortly see two more significant departures. Bob DeGrasse, who was an enormous help to John Gordon in setting up the NNSA and more recently has helped me create the present NNSA, will be moving to the staff of the House Armed Services Committee (HASC). Bob is, in a sense, returning home as he worked for Congressman Spratt and the HASC before joining DOE 12 years ago. Captain Doug Fremont, my Executive Staff Director, will retire from the Navy on August 18. Throughout his two-year tour with us, Doug has continually demonstrated outstanding leadership

and professionalism. I wish Bob and Doug all the very best in the future. Both will be very significant losses.

We are continuing the deliberate process of creating the NNSA of the Future as an "Employer of Choice." We have sent out a survey to help us understand where we should go next. I'm a little disappointed at the limited response (only a little more than a third of you have responded) so we have extended the time for you to complete your surveys to the end of this week. I really hope you'll take the time to do so.

Two weeks ago, we had the formal press conference rolling out our participation in what is called "Extreme Makeover" -- a project in which we are one of three government agencies testing a dramatically new, streamlined method of hiring that uses an approach much like the one a private company would use. Finally, we have our first class of interns on board and we are looking forward to their professional growth and development and their integration into NNSA. The intern program is an important way to build the long-term strength of our organization.

**Random last thoughts.** We are well into the summer vacation season. If you haven't yet had an opportunity to take some time off with your family, I hope you will do so in the next few weeks. You owe it to yourself, and to your families and your co-workers. It's important for all of us to recharge our batteries from time to time. I'm taking my own advice next week and spending a week on the West Coast, visiting one of our daughters and spending some time away with my wife.

That's all for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #42

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2005 1:38 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #42

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2005 1:37:09 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #42  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most enjoyable thing I've done in the last several weeks was spending 10 days of vacation with my wife in northern California. The most moving thing I've done since I returned was to preside over the retirement ceremony for Captain Douglas Fremont, who ended a 26-year Navy career by serving as my Military Assistant and Executive Staff Director these past two years. I'll have more to say on this later. The thing that I did with the most direct relevance to you was help put the final touches on what will become the FY 2007 budget. That's what I want to start this Lintgram with.

**Budget.** We have completed most of the decisions on the version of the FY 2007 budget that will be submitted shortly for review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This budget presumes that the Congress will pass the President's budget for FY 2006 intact. We know that won't happen, although we don't know what the changes will be. Thus, we will need to make some adjustments once action on the current year's appropriation is complete. We will get the results of the OMB review of our submission in November and will spend December taking account of those results and of the final outcome of the FY 2006 Appropriation. The final budget gets submitted in February, but because of the time it takes to print the budget, all of our work will have to be done by early January at the very latest.

The budget we submit to Congress is the President's budget. Until the President has given his final approval (which happens around the beginning of the new calendar year), there is by definition, no final budget. For this reason, and because of the uncertainties I've just mentioned, it would be premature to start talking about details. However, I can tell you about the broad trends. We have shifted significant resources into safeguards and security in order to comply with the requirements to fully meet the Design Basis Threat by 2008, as well as to correct some past underfunding. We also shifted some money (most of it in the so-called budget "out years," FY 2008-2011, of NNSA's five-year PPBE process) to correct shortages artificially introduced in the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) last year. Even with those increases, we are probably going to have to stretch this Program past its Congressionally mandated completion date of 2011.

These increases, of course, have to be compensated for by decreases. The two major programs--weapons and nonproliferation--took the bulk of the reductions. The decisions on where to cut were very difficult and there will be plenty of you who will think I made the wrong choices. It is important to understand that, with the decision last year to reduce the weapons funding in the interest of deficit reduction, we have long since passed the point where there are unnecessary programs that we can cut. We have, therefore, been forced to reduce valuable efforts.

One of the areas NNSA has been working very hard on is to bring a true five-year perspective to the annual budget. That's the right thing to do (and it's being adopted by the rest of the Department), but it makes a difficult problem even harder. This year for example, although FY 2007 was difficult, getting within the totals for FY 2009 was, in many ways, our hardest task. It may seem silly to worry about a budget that is several years in the future, but it really isn't. Even though many things will change between now and FY 2009, we have the best chance of getting a coherent budget in the future if we start paying attention now. Otherwise, we run the risk of starting things in the current budget that we can't afford to finish.

**Recognition.** You know how proud I am of NNSA. I had two examples recently of why: one involving an individual in Headquarters; and, one involving a team in the field. In July, the Institute for Nuclear Materials Management awarded one of its two 2005 Distinguished Service Awards to Ron Cherry of NA-20, for 20 years of sustained and extraordinary effort in the fields of nuclear materials management, nonproliferation and safeguards. This is a very big honor, usually reserved for far more senior individuals.

More recently, I learned that the Nevada Site Office/Bechtel Aviation Program was selected as the winner of the 2004 GSA Federal Aviation Program Award for the best aviation program in the small operation category (20 or fewer aircraft). This is the third year in a row that a DOE aviation organization has won the Federal Aviation Program Award. An awards ceremony will be held on September 22 here in Washington.

I congratulate both Ron and the Nevada aviation team for their accomplishments.

**Leadership Coalition.** Every two months, Jerry and I hold a daylong meeting in Washington with the Deputy and Associate Administrators, the Site Managers, and the Service Center Director. I call this group the Leadership Coalition and try to make our meetings a discussion of issues (no briefings, no slides, no subjects on which we all agree). We held our most recent meeting last week. Among the results of our discussions:

- We looked at how to use the exceptional results of the nonproliferation intern program to ensure our new NNSA-wide intern program is as effective as possible. The key appears to be ensuring that interns are carefully vetted, get lots of interaction with senior management, and have the opportunity to interact with one another in order to foster a team spirit.
- We had a final discussion of our new training program for prospective Site Managers. We will be putting our first individual (once selected) through the program this fall enroute to Y-12. Bill Brumley, the Site Manager of Y-12, will be retiring in January 2006. Although this only affects a few of you, I mention it because it is an indication of how crucial I think our Site Managers are to NNSA's overall success.
- We discussed improving communications with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, getting organized to examine the Nuclear Weapons Complex Review once it is formally received, and understanding the Site Office role in program execution. On the last point, we have a good understanding in the weapons area, but need to do more thinking in other areas.
- We discussed revising the NNSA directives system to mesh more smoothly with the DOE system. We will have additional information shortly.
- I decided after discussions that we would reduce the number of application software packages (we now have 105 different applications, including eight different budget packages and ten different corrective action tracking systems). Reducing the number helps to maintain configuration control, improve security, reduce costs, and meet OMB requirements. We will do this sensibly to avoid disruption. I'll have additional details later.

Finally, I used the Leadership Coalition as an opportunity to swear in Jan Chavez-Wilczynski, Deputy Manager of the Los Alamos Site Office, as our newest member of the Senior Executive Service (SES). I like to conduct swearing-in ceremonies personally because of the great importance I place on the career leadership of the Department.

**Milestones.** The President has formally designated Jerry Paul to act as the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, in addition to his current duties. I appreciate his willingness to do both jobs. As I told you last month, Bob DeGrasse, who was an enormous help to John Gordon in setting up the NNSA, and more recently has helped me create the present NNSA, has joined the staff of the House Armed Services Committee, where he worked before joining DOE 12 years ago. We will all miss Bob a lot.



Lastly, I presided over a military retirement ceremony for Captain Doug Fremont. As I have often told you, I think it is important to recognize retirements. They give us the opportunity to honor those who have served our country and they help remind us of the importance of our own service. Military retirements are even more significant because of the particular and unique traditions associated with the military profession. It is very unusual for a civilian, even a former Navy officer, to preside at such a ceremony and I was greatly honored that Doug asked me to do so. I was especially pleased because of all Doug has done for NNSA and for me personally.

That's all I have for now. I hope you enjoy the last couple of weeks of summer.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #43

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2005 2:49 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #43

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2005 2:48:07 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #43  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Like most of you, my thoughts and attention these past two weeks have been riveted on Hurricane Katrina. While most of the press attention has focused on the devastation in Louisiana and Mississippi, President Bush also declared parts of Florida and Alabama as disaster areas. Some of you have asked that I talk about the hurricane and its consequences. I have not done so up to now because I simply don't know what to say. The scale of the damage is almost incomprehensible, and my understanding is that the television images, if anything, understate the impact. Watching these images is almost more than we can bear. It is even worse for our colleagues with ties to the area. Family and friends of some within NNSA have lost homes and some have relatives who are still missing. One DOE employee (non-NNSA) remains unlocated. Our hearts and prayers are with all of them.

In times like this there is a deep-seated human need to help. The Federal Emergency Management Agency website ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov)), has links to a number of organizations that are aiding in the relief effort. History suggests that the vast outpouring of generosity typical of Americans will provide adequate funds for the immediate needs. History also suggests that the long-term recovery will be more difficult, both to conduct and to fund. You may want to keep that in mind in deciding where to direct your contributions. We will shortly send out guidance on how you can contribute to the relief effort through early cash or check contributions to the Combined Federal Campaign.

Many also want to be able to help personally. You should have seen by now a DOECast with details about how to volunteer, especially if you have particular skills. Several DOE employees (including two from NNSA) have already volunteered. The Department has been working hard - and generally successfully - to monitor and, as appropriate, manage the shortages caused by the destruction in oil handling and refinery capacity. Within NNSA, we have shipped excess equipment, flown missions over destroyed areas to help recovery teams understand radiological hazards, provided high-tech equipment to assist in airborne monitoring of toxic

chemicals, allowed firefighters and their equipment from NNSA sites to support relief operations, and done a number of other specific things. Obviously, the broad responsibility for the daunting task of search and rescue and support of survivors lies elsewhere. If there are other opportunities for us to contribute to the recovery of this disaster, I will let you know.

**This year's budget.** Although Hurricane Katrina has dominated our thoughts, we have been continuing with the routine business of the Department. We are awaiting the completion of Congressional action on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 budget. The conference to reconcile the actions taken by the House and Senate, which are quite different, should begin later this month, but there is no way of predicting when it will end (the situation is considerably complicated by the fact that the Appropriations bill that funds us also funds the Army Corp of Engineers and thus could be significantly influenced by judgments made in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina). Because the Fiscal Year starts on October 1, we will operate under what is called a Continuing Resolution. That is a device whereby Congress allows us to continue operations even though there are no appropriations, but places significant limits on the pace of our spending. We don't yet have details but, as soon as we do, we will put out implementing guidance.

**Next year's budget.** This week, we submitted our budget recommendations for FY 2007 to the Office of Management and Budget. I was pleased with the hard work that went into the submission. While I'm convinced that I've made the best decisions under the circumstances, I'm a good deal less pleased with the substance of some of the decisions we had to make. As I told you in my last message, we have shifted a good deal of money into improving safeguards and security, largely to meet the requirements of the 2004 Design Basis Threat. This shift was necessary so we could comply with Departmental policy, but the overall result was a severe reduction in the weapons program. We made other, equally difficult, choices in other areas.

**EM Transfer.** As you know, last year the Department of Energy, at my recommendation, proposed that responsibility for the cleanup of legacy environmental problems at NNSA sites be shifted from EM to NNSA and that about 100 people (mostly in the field) be transferred as well. None of the four committees of Congress who have jurisdiction over our authorization or our appropriations supported this shift. Because of this, the Department will not propose this transfer in the FY 2007 budget. As far as working relations go, we will continue the current dual chain of command arrangements for the indefinite future and you should notice no change from what we have been doing this past year. As far as personnel issues go (promotions, evaluations, etc.), we will work with EM to develop appropriate procedures for the future as they undergo their own reorganization. It's important to me that people at our sites be treated fairly even if they are not technically part of NNSA. I'll keep you informed. I really appreciate how everybody has made the current arrangements work as well as they have.

**Combined Federal Campaign.** I have been asked to be the Departmental Lead for the Washington Area Combined Federal Campaign. Jim Turner, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Nuclear Risk Reduction, has agreed to help me in this effort. As many of you will remember from my communications on this subject last year, I am a very strong believer in the Combined Federal Campaign as a way to harness the generosity of Federal employees. With daily TV and newspaper images of the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina before our eyes, the need for institutions like the Combined Federal Campaign is obvious. But the opportunities will go well beyond hurricane relief. I'll have more to say about this in the coming weeks.

That's all I have. This is a bit shorter and a bit earlier than usual, but I want to make sure I told you what I know about Hurricane Katrina and the relief efforts in response to it.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #44

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2005 9:00 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #44

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2005 8:58:52 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #44  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

I am saddened to report that James Chwang, the Livermore Site Office fire protection engineer, was killed in an auto accident while commuting to work on October 11. He was scheduled to retire at the end of this month after 27 years of Federal service. I know all of you join me in sending condolences to his family at this time of tragedy.

This has been a busy period. Among other things, I spent several days in Russia two weeks ago. I spoke at the celebrations marking the 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Russian Nuclear Industry. For one who spent much of his professional life in the Cold War Period, standing there as an individual responsible for the U.S. Nuclear Weapons Program and bringing greetings to the Russian Weapons Program was quite an event. Slowly, we are building a new relationship with Russia and the nonproliferation work that NNSA does, plays an important role in creating that new relationship. While in Russia, I also had discussions with various Russian military and civilian officials and took part in the dedication of the Kola Technical and Training Center, a Russian Navy facility that will help ensure that the improvements in security we have made in the Russian Northern Fleet will endure long after the American involvement ceases.

**The Nuclear Weapons Complex.** The long-awaited report by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board on the Nuclear Weapons Complex of the Future has been formally transmitted to the Department. It endorses a number of things that we are doing and sets forth a number of other interesting ideas for action. Tom D'Agostino and I are still wrestling with the major recommendation, which involves moving over the next two decades to consolidate all NNSA operations involving special nuclear material at a single (unspecified) site. The advantages in efficiency, modernization, and better security are very clear. Unfortunately, the obstacles in terms of costs above our current plans and programmatic difficulties are equally clear. We hope to make a recommendation to the Secretary shortly. I'll keep you informed.

**Nuclear Executive Leadership Training.** I sat in on about half of this week-long training for senior Department leaders (Site Managers and Headquarters senior officials). I had taken part in the other half when the course was first given in May. Tom D'Agostino attended the entire course, as did the new Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Jim Rispoli. All of us thought it was excellent. I anticipate that this course will become a requirement for assignments to senior positions involving nuclear safety responsibilities.

**Budget.** As all of you know, we are now operating under a Continuing Resolution that will fund the Department at least through November 18. It is possible that we will have a final Appropriations bill by that time, but it is equally possible that an additional Continuing Resolution will be required. A wild card in all of this is the need to find funding to deal with the unplanned expenditures the Federal Government will be making in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. That will put pressure on the system to hold down spending in the individual bills, and it is possible that there would also be a Government-wide rescission to generate the needed funds. At the moment, there is nothing any of us can do except watch and wait. Meanwhile, the Continuing Resolution holds us to the lower of: (a) the Senate Appropriations bill; (b) the House Appropriations bill; or, (c) FY 2005 spending. For now, we are able to interpret this at the level of overall appropriations (rather than individual programs) giving us a good deal of flexibility to meet the needs of individual programs. As a result, we are not seeing any immediate insurmountable problems, although I know many of you are feeling the pinch on things like travel funds. Given the President's recent direction to further conserve energy, this may continue. I'll keep you informed, but frankly I have no idea when we are going to know anything firm about FY 2006.

**Major Step on Plutonium Disposition.** Last Friday, I joined Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) and Senator Jim DeMint (R-SC), along with Congressman Charles Norwood (R-GA) and Congressman J. Gresham Barrett (R-SC), in a ceremony at the Savannah River Site. The ceremony formally marked the beginning of site preparation activities for the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility and the associated Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility. The Plutonium Disposition Program is the largest single nonproliferation effort in history and will be the mechanism whereby the United States and Russia will each dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium by converting it to fuel for commercial reactors. This effort has been stalled for two years by an arcane liability dispute with Russia, that is now resolved. We have a long way to go before this effort comes to fruition, but this is an important step and I was thrilled to be able to participate in this ceremony.

**Combined Federal Campaign (CFC).** I am leading the Headquarters CFC effort on behalf of the Secretary this year. I think Hurricanes Katrina and Rita help remind us of how quickly people can go from comfortable to destitute, from healthy to ill, and from hope to despair. Through CFC, we can help such individuals and the affected communities. I think the great thing about CFC is that it lets us target our contributions to the areas we personally care about, from poverty to arts education, hunger to environment, literacy to animal rights, etc. I hope all of us will take advantage of the chance to help. I turned in my contribution this week and will be wearing my Double Eagle pin soon. It doesn't matter whether you choose to give at that level or to make a more modest contribution, but I urge you to consider contributing something. You'll feel good about it and it will make a difference.

**Upcoming Washington Initiatives.** From time to time, you will hear of new initiatives in Washington with potential consequences for your day-to-day life. Often these are portrayed in terms that suggest there will be a major disruption. Usually that is an overstatement, but it is also an overstatement to claim that nothing will happen. Here are the facts on a couple of impending actions:

1. We are about to publish the long-awaited Worker Safety Rule. In essence, this will make the DOE Order on Worker Safety into a Federal rule, fulfilling a Congressional mandate. The rule will allow us to fine contractors for safety violations. It will also be a convenient mechanism for us to implement an Executive Order requiring electronic medical records. In early drafts of the rule, there were a number of things that could have substantially increased both the financial and the bureaucratic burden on contractors. I think most of those have

been dealt with, although any new Federal rule obviously will have at least some implications for everyone's day-to-day business.

2. In Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12, the President has mandated that we switch to a Government-wide system of a single credential (badge) that provides both physical access to facilities and access to computer resources. The idea is that everybody in the Government would have the same kind of badge, thus making movement between agencies easier and ensuring common standards. The real innovation is that, in a few years, you'll need this badge to log on to your computer. We think we've worked out with the Office of Management and Budget an acceptable path forward and there will be some guidance out shortly. This is going to cost us about \$100 million Department-wide and there is going to be a certain amount of burden on everybody. The results will be worth it and I'll be looking for your patience as we get from here to there. Additional details will be provided in a more formal message.

**Senior Executive Service (SES).** I had the pleasure of presiding at the swearing in of three new Headquarters members of the SES on October 7. I'll be participating in a similar ceremony when I visit Albuquerque this week. I have been encouraging formal swearing-in ceremonies for new members of the SES and try to preside at as many of them as possible. First, I think the individuals deserve that recognition, since only a handful of career civil servants reach the SES ranks. But I also preside at these ceremonies because the quality of our senior executives is so crucial to the long-term health of the organization. Everyone in NNSA is important and all groups are crucial to our current success and future goals. But I expect more from members of the SES; they must help translate our vision for the future into action.

**Employee Survey.** We conducted a survey in which about 1,200 of you responded. Several of you have asked whether you will be seeing the results and what we will be doing with them. The answer to the first question is yes. The answer to the second question is I don't quite know yet. Although we collected the data some time ago, the extensive analysis done by the independent team has just been completed and I received a copy of the results last week. I plan to send out a separate e-mail discussing them, given the importance of your comments. The analysis looks at a number of dimensions and suggests we have a long way to go before we are an acceptable employer, let alone an Employer of Choice. I looked at some raw data earlier and discussed it with the Leadership Coalition; the fully analyzed data confirms my initial impression that we have some significant work to do. This is too important for me to react to without some study (especially since, in addition to the actual survey results, we got hundreds of individual comments) and it will take us a little while to do that study. I'll have something out as soon as I can.

To end on an upbeat note, as I told you in a separate NNSACAST, Frank Russo, formerly a Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Office of Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H), has reported as the NNSA ES&H Advisor, replacing Jim Mangeno. This is very good news for NNSA.

That's all I have for now. Don't forget to turn in your CFC pledge card.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #45

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2005 2:26 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #45

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2005 2:24:07 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #45  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Obviously, the development of most interest to many of us in the past few weeks has been the Conference Committee Report on the Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriations bill. I expect the President to sign this bill shortly. This is obviously good news.

Overall, we did reasonably well, although there are some significant challenges. We received full funding for the National Ignition Facility and for Directed Stockpile Work; both areas where I feared there would be cuts. There were a large number of adjustments and minor reductions in other parts of the weapons program, but for the most part, they do not pose exceptionally difficult problems, although individual program managers will have to make adjustments in many areas. The one glaring weapons-related exception is the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) that was cut by nearly 50 percent. I do not interpret this as a criticism of the Program (which is acknowledged on the Hill as being exceptionally well-run) but rather as a reflection of a Congressional need to make everything fit. I am still sorting out the implications; it probably means a delay in the current Congressionally-mandated completion date for FIRP.

In the nonproliferation area, we had increases in some specific programs, particularly those involving improving the security of weapons material abroad and shutting down Russian plutonium production. On the other hand, funds for the Plutonium Disposition Program were cut significantly, primarily because of continuing Congressional concerns with our delay in beginning construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility in South Carolina, which is now scheduled to begin in 2006.

Overall, Congressional action continues the broad support for our programs, although there was more than the usual specific Congressional direction in the form of so-called "earmarks" (directions to spend specific amounts on specific projects, reflecting Congressional priorities that sometimes are different than those in the President's

budget request). I am particularly pleased that we actually have an Appropriation and do not have to face the uncertainty of operating for an extended period under a Continuing Resolution.

What happens next? First, we are working through the adjustments to see if any pose specific problems. We have the ability to go to Congress and seek to reprogram money (that is, move it from one category to another) and I suspect we will need to do so in some areas. In addition, we are examining the Congressional action to see if it suggests any adjustments to the Fiscal Year 2007 Budget proposal now being reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. It will, of course, be easy to find areas where we'd like to increase the 2007 Budget to compensate for reductions this year. It will be much harder to find areas where additions this year allow us to reduce what we are asking for in 2007. Since the total available is not going to change, our ability to offset this year's reductions with next year's increases depends on being able to find compensating reductions in 2007. We're working on that issue.

**China Trip.** I made my first trip to China in my current job the week of October 24. I went to open an Integrated Materials Management Technical Demonstration that we have been working on with China for over a year. We hope that the Demonstration will be the first step in our working with China to improve the security of civilian nuclear materials. I was impressed with the enthusiasm of the American participants, both Federal and from Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, and Oak Ridge National Laboratories. I was also impressed with the enthusiasm of the Chinese representatives. I had a series of discussions that convinced me that there is substantial prospect for improved cooperation in the civil sector.

I also think that there are substantial advantages for the United States for increased cooperation with the Chinese military. This is, however, proving somewhat difficult because of concerns on both sides to avoid a repeat of the confrontation over espionage that ended the last round of cooperation between the Department of Energy and the Chinese military. Both China and the United States would like to resume such cooperation, but defining the parameters is proving to be time consuming.

**Dedication of Supercomputers at Lawrence Livermore.** On the way back from China, I had the privilege of presiding over the dedication of two supercomputers at Lawrence Livermore under the Advanced Simulation and Computing Program. These computers - called "Purple" and "Blue Gene/L" - are by far the fastest in the world. They allow calculations that would have been unimaginable in the past. Indeed, simulation is joining theory and experimentation as a third way of advancing scientific knowledge. While the scientific benefits are obvious, what is important to me is the tremendous tool they represent for Stockpile Stewardship. It is particularly striking that a decade ago the weapons community concluded that, for Stockpile Stewardship to work, computers needed to be improved by a factor of a million. Purple achieves that improvement, while Blue Gene/L offers radical new architecture with great promise for particular scientific calculations. Blue Gene/L has by far the fastest sustained operating speed in the world. We should all be very proud of the accomplishments of the Advanced Simulation and Computing Program.

**Naval Reactors Receives Meritorious Unit Commendation.** I don't usually talk much about Naval Reactors in these messages because they really are somewhat separate. Still, I wanted you to know that, on September 19, 2005, Secretary of the Navy, Gordon England, awarded a Meritorious Unit Commendation to the 680 military and civilian personnel who serve at Naval Reactors Headquarters and Field Offices. The award recognizes outstanding performance over a six-year period from September 1998 to October 2004, as Naval Reactors successfully transformed to better confront and defeat the 21<sup>st</sup> century threats. The Commendation concludes that Naval Reactors' strategic vision has directly resulted in a highly capable, flexible, and powerful fleet of nuclear-powered warships to fight the Global War on Terrorism and other campaigns. We should be proud of these accomplishments.

**Hurricane Support.** We should also be proud of our support in the aftermath of Hurricanes Rita and Katrina. Dozens of individuals throughout the complex volunteered to help. Site Managers acted on their own initiative



to find ways to offer support. For example, Dan Glenn, the Pantex Site Manager, assisted the staff of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve during recovery after Hurricane Rita decimated the communications infrastructure of the area surrounding the West Hackberry site. Pantex provided a communications/command van that enabled DOE to continue to draw down the reserve and ease the impact of the storm on the Nation. This is just one example of the outstanding professionalism and sacrifices made throughout NNSA in aiding America's recovery efforts.

**Cyber Security.** As everyone knows, we pay a great deal of attention to physical security. We have shifted a lot of money into security over the last two to three years to meet the requirements of the Department's Design Basis Threat. While these actions were fully justified because of the catastrophic consequences that could arise from losing control of fissionable material, our day-to-day challenges in security are, in fact, much more commonly in the area of cyber security. Recently, we have taken a number of short notice actions that affect many of you. In particular, we have disabled Outlook Web Access, which is how everyone at Headquarters accesses their e-mail account while they are on travel. Some of the field locations have taken similar actions. This is a considerable burden both to those who telecommute and to those whose duties require extensive travel (me for example). We did this for very good reasons, not suitable for discussion in this e-mail. Linda Wilbanks, our CIO, is working with the Department to find ways to allow us to restore the routine access that we have had in the past. I have no idea how long this process will take. I ask for your patience while we work this important and very serious issue.

**2006 Professional Achievement in Government Award.** I am extremely pleased to announce that the U.S. Black Engineer of the Year Selection Panel has chosen Dr. Kevin Greenaugh, Director of the Office of Stockpile Assessments & Certification, to receive this prestigious award. Kevin began making significant contributions to Federal programs during his tenure as a chemist at Los Alamos National Laboratory. In his current position, he manages two-thirds of a billion dollar research, development and simulation budget as part of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. Please join me in congratulating Kevin for this well-deserved recognition.

That's all I have for now. Next week we pause to celebrate Thanksgiving, a time when families gather to remember the many good things that surround most of our lives. As you gather with your families, I hope you will keep in mind both the less fortunate here at home, such as the still-displaced victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the many men and women who will spend their Thanksgiving far from their loved ones in the service of their country. The dedication and sacrifice of our service men and women is one of many things for which we can give thanks. As I have told you before, there is something else for which I give thanks and the American people should give thanks as well. That is the dedication and service of the men and women of NNSA. Your country and I continue to be immensely proud of all of you.

Happy Thanksgiving.

Linton

**From:** NNSACAST HQ

**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2005 4:36 PM

**Subject:** Lintgram #46

I want to devote this Lintgram to a single topic, the Employee Survey we completed in August and for which we received the analysis last month. A number of you have asked when the results of the survey would be shared. I have delayed doing so because the complete results are quite complex and I wanted to make certain I had fully and carefully thought through what they mean for the organization. After doing so, I would like to share my thoughts with you.

Some reminders about the survey itself. It was a web-based survey conducted in July and August and administered by an outside firm. The 78 questions have been used in surveys conducted by the Office of Personnel Management so our results can be compared with other parts of the Government (and, to a degree, with the private sector). Even though NNSA is unique, these comparisons provide a valuable benchmark to help us interpret the results. Forty-nine percent of NNSA's Federal employees participated, for a total of 1,227 respondents (Naval Reactors was not included). In addition to the quantitative survey, employees could give free-form answers to three questions: "What do you like best about working in NNSA"; "What do you like least about working in NNSA"; and, "What one thing would you change about NNSA". Over 3,100 such comments were received.

I was tremendously grateful that so many of you took the time to participate and to provide such detailed feedback. Only by understanding where we are can we make the improvements necessary to make us a true "Employer of Choice". I will need help from all of you to make those improvements. The candor and completeness you showed in completing the survey was an important first step.

We got results with scores on 11 different attributes including an overall "Best Places to Work". We got results from 23 different organizations within NNSA. To preserve confidentiality, organizations with fewer than 20 responses, including one Site Office and several Headquarters subdivisions, were not reported separately but were rolled up into the results for the next higher level.

The dimensions on which NNSA had the highest favorable ratings were the extent to which the job itself is rewarding and challenging, the sense of teamwork, and pay and benefits. Written comments supported these positive attributes, with respondents citing the mission, important and challenging work, collegiality and job security as what people liked best about working for NNSA. The areas where employees expressed the greatest concern were leadership within individual work units, the degree to which rewards are based on performance, and the existence of a family friendly culture. The concerns with leadership, which were not always aimed at the immediate supervisor, included issues regarding communications, the treatment of subordinates, and the bureaucracy. Many comments suggested that rewards were not based on merit and poor performers were not effectively dealt with. We will be working to try to understand the details behind these specific concerns.

As might be expected, results varied considerably across the organization. Demographic variance was relatively low, with Asian-Americans and African-Americans being slightly more satisfied on most dimensions. There seemed to be little difference in scores by gender. As is common in most organizations, satisfaction increases with job level and pay grade, although not dramatically, except for the very senior members of the organization. The greatest variation by far was in organization. Overall differences between Headquarters and the field were small, but in general those at Site Offices were slightly more satisfied than those at Headquarters while those at the Service Center were slightly less satisfied. Within these categories, however, there was wide variation. The highest unit on the "Best Places to Work" overall measure scored over twice as high as the bottom two units. My

assessment is that some of this variance relates to objective factors (some parts of the organization have had a particularly difficult time the past three years) while some is almost certainly related to leadership.

While solid majorities had either a favorable or neutral opinion on all the attributes, our favorable scores were almost universally below those of DOE as a whole, below the rest of the Federal Government, and (where comparisons were possible) below the private sector. The one exception was pay and benefits. I attribute our relatively more favorable score in this area to the fact that we make greater use of Excepted Service than most of the Federal Government. Overall, the results were characterized by the survey organization as showing "satisfaction, not enthusiasm."

That's what I think we learned. Now, what are we going to do about it? First, I reviewed these results with the Leadership Coalition last week. I provided each leader with a summary of their results and how they stood compared to the rest of the organization. I have asked them to take a month to digest these results and formulate a plan for those things that are unique to their organizations. I will then meet with them individually to review their plans.

Second, it is clear that we have a significant communications problem. I think we will need outside help in the form of communications consultants or additional training resources to overcome that problem. I am investigating how to get that help. In the interim, I am emphasizing the importance of communications to senior managers. I am also directing that we pay particular attention to holding senior managers accountable in next year's performance review process for what they are doing to improve communications within their organizations, including what their subordinates are doing.

Third, we are looking at each area (in some cases, at each question) where we were significantly below either the Government or the private sector benchmarks to determine whether there are specific actions we can take on an NNSA-wide basis that would improve the situation without detriment to the mission. This needs to be done with care; my first knee-jerk reaction to one specific problem would have been unworkable and counter-productive.

I do not plan to release any additional raw data on the survey. While I think we did a good job at preserving anonymity, I don't want to get into speculation about who might have provided what comment. I also want to avoid sterile arguments over the meaning of specific answers to specific questions. The overall trends are clear and that is what we should concentrate on.

I do not believe the weaknesses revealed by the survey are amenable to quick fixes or silver bullets. I have a vision for the organization that recognizes the great importance of what we do, which is supported by the fact that in many areas, we are on the verge of achieving major milestones in the Stockpile Stewardship, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation and Security Programs. It is clear we have a shared sense of the importance of our mission. Now we need to work together to create a working environment that recognizes both that importance and the absolutely crucial role of the career Federal workforce in reaching that vision. I will keep you informed of our progress.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:47 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #47

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 21, 2005 1:04 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #47

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 21, 2005 1:01:52 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #47  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Much of our efforts these past couple of weeks have been focused on final preparations for the submission of the Fiscal Year 2007 budget. With the exception of security (where we took some reductions), we fared well following the review by the Office of Management and Budget. We will still face a quite difficult year in the weapons program, however, as a result of the continuing effect of deficit reduction efforts. In addition, we will need to address a probable one percent rescission in this year's budget (FY 2006) that I anticipate the Congress will pass shortly. A rescission is a retroactive cut applied to appropriations bills after they have been enacted. In this case the rescission will be applied equally to all Federal discretionary spending, except for Veterans Affairs Programs and combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. That means it will apply to all our programs. We will put out something formal on this as soon as we have the details.

**Los Alamos.** The most important news I have to report has to do with the management of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. For some months, we have been engaged in a contract competition for the future management of Los Alamos. Reaching a conclusion has taken longer than we wanted because of the importance of the decision, the absolute necessity of making sure we were doing this right, and the equally important corollary of ensuring that the formal documentation we used was clear and supported the decision. As a result, we were not able to announce the results of the competition on December 1 as we expected.

Today, the Secretary of Energy announced that the Department has selected Los Alamos National Security LLC (called "LANS") to manage the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). LANS is a limited liability corporation formed by Bechtel, the University of California, BWXT, and the Washington Group International. We had two very strong teams competing and the United States would have been well served with either of them. In making the announcement the Secretary stressed that this is a new contract, with a new team, marking a new approach to management at Los Alamos. It is not a continuation of the previous contract.

We will now begin a transition period of several months. Because this will be the first management change in the history of LANL, I expect it will be a little turbulent. Los Alamos, like all of our national laboratories, is an irreplaceable national treasure and it is important that we make this transition as smooth as possible. We will be working with the new contractor, the existing Laboratory leadership, and the Site Office to ensure that the employees are kept well informed, and that the important national security mission of the Laboratory is not interrupted. Because we will also be conducting a competition for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in the near future, we will also spend some time learning lessons from the LANL procurement.

Because of the provisions for extending the contract for good performance, the selection of a new management contractor for Los Alamos is the largest single procurement decision in the history of the Department of Energy. It is certainly the most important single decision we have made in NNSA. We were fortunate to have a superb Source Evaluation Board under the leadership of Tyler Przybylek to help ensure that the decision was made correctly. Tom D'Agostino served as the Source Selection Official (i.e., the decision maker) and I want to personally thank Tom for all of his hard work on this very challenging assignment. I'm proud of them, proud of the decision, and proud of both the past and future accomplishments of Los Alamos.

**Leadership Coalition.** At the end of November, we had one of our periodic meetings of the Leadership Coalition (Site Managers, Service Center Director, and the line management direct reports from Headquarters). We did the following:

- Reviewed last summer's employee survey results and discussed the steps we will take in dealing with the results. I have sent you a separate message on this topic (Lintgram #46).
- Gave final approval to the training program we are establishing for individuals selected in the future as Site Office Managers. The program will be a dedicated five weeks, both at Headquarters and in the field, tailored to the background of the specific individual and will include safety, security, contract management, program and project management, and other areas. There will be open book examinations to ensure adequate preparation. We expect to put our first Site Manager selectee through this process enroute to the Y-12 Site Office immediately after the first of the year, with the strong probability of another Site Manager change later next year.
- Agreed to continue moving forward with the procurement of a commercially available action tracking system for potential use at the various Site Offices. We will not make use of this system mandatory, but it will become the only system that we will support centrally.
- Discussed the first three reviews conducted by the Chief, Defense Nuclear Safety. We agreed that the reviews, although they involved a good deal more work than some of us had initially envisioned, are beneficial and we will continue them for the coming year. We also agreed that once each Site has been through its initial review, we will do considerably more tailoring in the scope of subsequent reviews.
- Discussed implications of the Fiscal Year 2006 budget, particularly on Program Direction. We will limit the posting of new jobs until mid-January, except for a relatively small number of crucial replacements. Sometime in January, after we know if there will be additional cuts, we will consider our next steps.
- Took advantage of what was probably Bill Brumley's final meeting with us as the Y-12 Site Manager to discuss the approach he has used at the Y-12 Site Office which was, in many ways, the prototype for our current vision of a Site Office. Bill stressed the value of: documenting internal processes; doing things the same way in all components of the Site Office; a flat organization; and, a single issues management system that is virtually paperless. I do not see it as a Headquarters function to tell Site

Managers how to organize their offices, but I have urged them to look carefully at Bill's presentation for possible lessons that they can use to improve their own organizations.

**New Under Secretary for Science.** Right now, the Department of Energy has two Under Secretaries. The NNSA Administrator has the additional title of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security while David Garman is the Under Secretary for Energy, Science and Environment. The recent Energy Policy Act provided for a third Under Secretary, an Under Secretary of Science. This was in recognition of the Department's continuing role in science and technology (indeed, some would argue that DOE would be more accurately titled the Department of Science and Technology). The President recently nominated Dr. Ray Orbach, currently the Director of the Office of Science, for this important new position. This is good news for the Department and the country. Ray is an excellent scientist and an excellent colleague. The Secretary has been using Ray a good deal to provide personal independent judgment on technical issues involving weapons reliability and his insights have been extremely helpful. I'm delighted with this new appointment and look forward to working with Ray in his new capacity.

**Trip to Israel.** Most of you know that NNSA does a good deal of international cooperation. We cooperate heavily with the United Kingdom in weapons areas. We have massive interactions with the Russian Federation in a variety of nonproliferation and nuclear material security areas. We cooperate with dozens of other countries in areas like export control, Megaports (detection equipment installed at major global ports) and Second Line of Defense (detection equipment installed at land and air border crossings).

One modest set of cooperative relationships is with Israel. We exchange information and cooperate in nonproliferation research. We work with Israel in international organizations such as the IAEA. We have recently agreed to include the Port of Haifa in the Megaports Initiative. I spent three days in Israel earlier this month to sign the Megaports Agreement and discuss our cooperation. While I was there, I had the opportunity to tour Yad Vashem, Israel's memorial to the Holocaust victims. It is an emotional experience and a sober reminder that evil is real. Much of what we do in our day-to-day work (like much of what we do in life) is routine and mundane. It is useful from time to time to remember that preserving the security of the United States and the stability of the world is a hugely important goal and that there are real threats that must be opposed.

**Combined Federal Campaign (CFC).** We have just finished the Headquarters Combined Federal Campaign. Jim Turner ran the CFC and his team of NNSA staff members did a great job. Overall, DOE raised over a million dollars from Headquarters. Once again NNSA exceeded its goal, raising \$212,000, which is \$42K above our goal with a participation of 62 percent. We had similar impressive results in the field. I'm honored to be part of such a generous organization.

That's all I have for now. There are only a few days left until Christmas. If, like me, this is a special day for you, then I wish you the Merriest of Christmases. If your own traditions don't emphasize Christmas, I still hope the peace and happiness traditional to the season embrace you as well. I also want to thank each of you for making 2005 a very successful year for the NNSA. And I hope all of us have a happy, successful, healthy, and prosperous New Year.

I'll be talking to you next year.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:47 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #48

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 2:09 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #48

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 2:07:13 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #48  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Happy New Year! I hope all of you had the opportunity to spend time with your families during the holidays. I certainly enjoyed my time with my wife and our daughter. This will be a relatively short message. There isn't a huge amount of news, but it has been a while since I sent out my last message to you.

**Budget.** In Washington, we are consumed with preparing for the presentation of the President's Fiscal Year 2007 budget. On February 6, the President will submit his budget to Congress and we, in turn, will make a series of presentations to Congressional staff, to the press, and to stakeholders as part of what is referred to as the budget rollout. Tom D'Agostino has been working to finalize the site splits (i.e. the allocation of funds to each Site Office by program), which I know are important to those of you in the field. As I told you previously, I am generally pleased with the budget, but we will have to live with significant reductions in specific weapons programs because of deficit reduction, as well as with shortfalls in security and other areas. It is not appropriate for me to get into too many details until after the formal presentation of the budget. I'll try to get some information out to you at that time.

**Our Contractor Colleagues.** Since I joined the NNSA, I have tried very hard - some would say relentlessly - to convey to you the importance I place on the career civil service. I have done that because I think it is important for all of us to understand that what we do is, in a very real sense, a calling, not just a job. I become enraged when those who were honored in my youth as public servants are now denigrated by being referred to as bureaucrats. I've tried to make sure that we do not think of ourselves in that way and I intend to keep on doing that as long as I'm here.

Like many good ideas, however, this one has unintended consequences. In my focus on the importance of the Federal workforce, I sometimes fail to point out how important our contractor colleagues are to just about

everything that we do. Many of the bold ideas that we are implementing -- the responsive infrastructure, the Reliable Replacement Warhead, the improvements in safety and security, the working off of the facilities maintenance backlog, the deployment of Radiological Assistance Teams to help protect against terrorism -- may have been devised by us, but are actually carried out by contractors. In addition, in many cases we depend on our contractors to help us with the management of these important programs. I think it is particularly important that we recognize that our contractor colleagues are part of the same team that we are. From time to time, I hear of people who treat contractors with disdain, essentially regarding them as second-class citizens. That's wrong on at least two levels. First, it's wrong as a matter of fundamental personal courtesy. I insist - and you should too - that everyone in NNSA, no matter the rank, the position, the gender, or the race be treated with courtesy and respect. It is also wrong on a practical level. Many of us could not do our day-to-day jobs without the support of our contractors. The organization as a whole cannot do its job without the many contractors who support us. You should not let my past and future focus on the importance of the career civil service blind you to this important fact.

**Trip to Russia.** Next week, I will travel to the Russian Federation for my first meeting with the new head of Russia's Federal Atomic Energy Agency (usually called ROSATOM based on its Russian acronym). I plan to review our various programs with him so that we can continue this cooperation. The new director, Sergei Kiriyenko, is well experienced in government, having served briefly as Russia's Prime Minister during the 1990s. Although he has limited experience in our area, I think that he will be an effective partner. He and Secretary Bodman have spoken by phone and the Secretary was impressed.

**Chief, Defense Nuclear Safety Reviews.** We have completed three of the new biennial reviews conducted by the Chief, Defense Nuclear Safety. As I told you previously, the reviews, although they involved a good deal more work than some of us had initially envisioned, are clearly beneficial. I was asked at a recent "All Hands Meeting" about trends. Overall, we have not seen any major complex-wide deficiencies. Some recurring issues include: how to handle Federal requirements in light of resource constraints; the management of nuclear safety requirements in contracts; planning and execution of formal oversight programs; and, support for Federal training. Our Facility Representatives, operational awareness, and safety system oversight programs seem to be particular strengths. Jim McConnell will be issuing some additional information on these reviews.

**Los Alamos.** We are beginning the process that will lead to a shift in the management and operating contractor at Los Alamos on June 1. I have been impressed so far with the seriousness with which everyone is approaching this issue. This is the first time in history that we have had a change of this magnitude at a weapons laboratory (the Sandia transitions from Bell Labs to Martin Marietta and later to Lockheed Martin were not accompanied with mandates for radical change and, among other things, involved retaining the Laboratory Director) and it is important that the transition go smoothly. We have received good cooperation from all involved here at Headquarters (both NNSA and non-NNSA) and the Service Center in trying to ease the burden on the laboratory personnel during this changeover. The LANL Site Office has taken what we are calling a "strategic pause" with part of the staff focusing on overseeing continuing operations and another part working on processes for the future as the new contractor takes hold. Tom D'Agostino recently spent time observing this effort and was impressed with the candor, professionalism, and knowledge level of the team. While we face major challenges, both in the transition of the contract and the Site Office, we are off to a very good start.

**New Senior Department of Energy Appointments.** Secretary Bodman has made two recent appointments that will be both important and helpful to NNSA. He has named Dr. Jeffery Pon as the Chief Human Capital Officer. Claudia Cross, who most of those in the Human Resources business know well, will remain as the Deputy. Dr. Pon is a specialist in strategic planning of human capital and comes from the Office of Personnel Management. With those skills and Claudia's exceptional knowledge of HR policies, the Department will be well-positioned for the future. This should help the NNSA a great deal as we move forward with a variety of initiatives we have been working on.



The Secretary has also named a new Chief Information Officer, Tom Pyke. He has extensive Federal Information Technology experience and he is also an expert on high-end computing. He and Linda Wilbanks will be working together closely to ensure a smooth integration between the NNSA and the rest of the Department. To help understand the NNSA better, Tom will be visiting some of our sites in the near future.

That's all I have for now. I will provide more details on some of my expectations for 2006 in a future message.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:48 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #49

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2006 11:29 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #49

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2006 11:27:28 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #49  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Two things have dominated my time in the last couple of weeks -- the rollout of the President's budget and my visit to five sites and the Service Center to discuss with field leaders where we should go on the Employer of Choice initiative. The most important thing that happened, however, may be something that I wasn't involved in at all: Tom D'Agostino's "January Process," which is another step in helping us define the Weapons Complex of the Future. Because we are not quite ready to talk about the future of the weapons complex, I want to spend most of this e-mail on the budget and a little bit on performance evaluations. But first, I have three exciting pieces of news to pass on with regards to people.

- Tom D'Agostino had a spectacular week last week. On Wednesday, he had a hearing for his confirmation as Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs. On Thursday, he was reported unanimously out of the committee and, on Friday, the full Senate unanimously confirmed him. This is great news for Tom, for NNSA, and for America. There will be a formal swearing in shortly, but he is officially on the job now.
- On February 18, Kevin Greenaugh was honored as Black Engineer of the Year. This is a wonderful compliment to his technical and professional excellence and further confirmation of the exceptionally high quality people we have in NNSA.
- Finally, I have selected Ted Sherry to be the new Site Manager at Y-12. The selection is not official until we receive approval from the Office of Personnel Management, but it has been approved within the Department. I am looking forward to working with Ted in this important position.

As the fact that I have selected a replacement suggests, Bill Brumley, who has led the Y-12 Site Office since its inception as a separate entity from Oak Ridge, will retire on March 3. While I am in Oak Ridge for the next Leadership Coalition Meeting, which will be held at Y-12, I will preside over his formal retirement. Bill has done a magnificent job and has, in many ways, created what I regard as the model for the modern site office. We will miss him a great deal. I was very grateful he was willing to delay his retirement a couple of months to let us complete the process of selecting his replacement.

**Budget.** The President submitted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 budget to the Congress on February 6, 2006. The Department of Energy total of \$23.6B was almost identical to the budget passed by Congress for FY 2006 (which means, given the reality of inflation, that it will buy slightly less in real terms). The most striking change for the Department as a whole was a \$500M increase (from \$3.6B to \$4.1B) in the proposed funding for the Office of Science. This is part of a Presidential initiative to double science funding by the Federal Government within the next 10 years. A second major initiative is an additional \$250M for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, an extremely bold long-term effort to bring about a global renaissance in commercial nuclear power through the use of advanced reprocessing that does not result in separated plutonium but does allow reprocessed fuel to be burned in advanced fast reactors.

Both of these initiatives have relevance for us, although they are managed elsewhere. We, of course, cooperate closely with the Office of Science and the expansion of science anywhere has an impact on NNSA laboratories. The three NNSA laboratories are also involved in the search for advanced fuel cycles and a new generation of reactors. Finally, we will be working closely with the rest of the Department and the Department of State on the nonproliferation aspects of this new initiative.

In addition to these two major initiatives, the President's budget increases some funding for other energy programs. Since the total budget for the Department is flat, these increases required compensating decreases elsewhere. The largest reduction, about \$700M, came from the Environmental Management (EM) budget. While this will primarily affect accelerated cleanup, I expect it will put considerable pressure on all EM funding, including at our sites.

The total NNSA budget was \$9.3B, compared to \$9.1B in last year's final Appropriation Act. The increase isn't quite as good as it sounds; the FY 2005 budget was \$9.3B, and the Congress reduced the President's request last year. Thus, like the rest of the Department, we are seeing essentially flat budgets that do not keep up with inflation. Within the budget, the President has proposed a significant increase in funding for nonproliferation. Most of this goes to ending the production of weapons plutonium in Russia and to the disposition of surplus weapons plutonium both here and in Russia. We also are proposing a significant increase in the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) to recover from the serious reductions of the past year, especially the fairly significant cuts that Congress made in the FIRP budget for FY 2006. My assessment is that these cuts were not a reflection of Congressional concern with the FIRP itself, which is generally acknowledged to be well run, but simply reflect the reality that there are more things than we can fit into the overall budget.

The two areas of greatest difficulty for us in completing the budget were safeguards and security and weapons programs. As most of you know, the Department approved a modified Design Basis Threat (the standard of security that our sites must meet) in November 2005. The Departmental directives call for our complying with the threat by the end of FY 2008. We are evaluating how we will meet the Design Basis Threat given the reality of the budget. I think delays beyond 2008 may be necessary at some sites.

In the weapons program, we continue to face significant resource constraints, driven in part by the continuing impact of last year's decision to hold down out-year weapons spending in the interest of deficit reduction. Our budget will continue efforts on the Reliable Replacement Warhead and the Responsive Infrastructure. It will maintain our commitments to the Department of Defense on life extension; provide for the first pit to go into the stockpile in over 17 years; and, keep us on track toward an ignition experiment at the National Ignition Facility

in 2010. Consistent with the Congressional desire to accelerate dismantlements, we will add some funding for that purpose. But, we have had to make some difficult choices including ending the use of some important facilities. I expect there will be a good deal of discussion on the choices we have made during the upcoming Congressional review of our budget.

One thing that the budget does not do is to provide any funding to implement the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board Study (Overskei Study) completed last year. As most of you remember, the study proposed some fairly dramatic restructuring of the weapons complex. I continue to believe that while the study is bold and thoughtful, its major recommendation to move immediately to a Consolidated Production Complex will probably prove to be unaffordable. Under Tom D'Agostino's leadership, a group from across the complex has been wrestling with what we should do, using last summer's study as one input. We hope to be in a position to present the results to the Secretary in March. I am quite impressed with the work that I have seen so far and believe that we will be able to set the complex on a suitable course for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. I'll let you know once our efforts have been completed.

**Performance Evaluations.** As I've traveled to the sites and listened to people at Headquarters, I realize that there is considerable unhappiness with the approach that we have been taking toward annual performance appraisals/evaluations. I have been under formal appraisal systems with annual grades for most of my professional life. I have never found a system that is entirely satisfactory. I want to take some time to explain why I have chosen the approach we are now using.

In my experience with evaluation systems, no matter how many gradations they have formally, there are really only two meaningful categories. One is the large group of individuals who perform exceptionally well. They carry out difficult and demanding responsibilities cheerfully. They are the heart and soul of the organization, and without them, the organization would not function. They fully meet all expectations. Typically, this group is between 60 and 65 percent of the overall work force. Navy aviators used to call this "The Pack" because they were all very close in performance to one another.

There is another group that, for whatever reason, stands out. They go above and beyond in some manner. It isn't the same every year and it's not always easy to recognize exactly what they have done that exceeds even the very highest expectations, but there's clearly something that sets them off from the others. They are typically between 30 and 35 percent of an organization. This group might be thought of as "Ahead of the Pack."

Finally, in all organizations there's a very, very small group, almost always under five percent, that for some reason or other isn't keeping up. Perhaps they're in the wrong profession. They are "Behind the Pack."

While no one can put hard and fast rules on anything, my experience is that most organizations break down this way once they are large enough so that they rule out the notion of an "elite" or special selected small subgroup. I believe that NNSA as a whole is such an organization and most major subunits are as well.

I have seen two problems with the performance evaluation systems based on this sort of categorization. The first is the danger of what might be called the Lake Woebegone syndrome (the Garrison Keillor radio show in which "all of the children are above average"). Over time, the number of people in the highest group tends to increase. This often reaches statistical absurdities. For much of my Navy career, although there were a number of other blocks on the fitness report form, all officers were either in the top one percent or the top five percent. The danger in this approach is that it makes a lot of people feel good but doesn't let the organization single out the truly exceptional.

The other approach is to try and force the system to recognize the reality of the performance distribution I just described. That means that a large number of people who are performing exceptionally well and whose efforts are absolutely crucial to the health of the organization will be disappointed and hurt by being evaluated in the

larger group rather than in the smaller group. Put simply, someone like me will say that people are doing everything we ask, that they are crucial to the organization, and that they are part of a civil service that is the envy of the world. But what people who are evaluated as "Fully Meets Expectations" often hear is "not good enough."

I don't think there is any way to avoid falling into one of these two traps. I have chosen in the current evaluation system to lean toward the second model. I know that many of you believe that that is an error. I will spend the next several months thinking about it, but I wanted to make sure you understood what I'm trying to do. I also recognize that the Government's attempt to link pay for performance means that this decision has a financial as well as a psychological effect. I don't think most of us in public service are in it exclusively for the money, but we all cash our paychecks and money is a measure of how American society views performance. I understand all of that.

There are two things you have a right to expect under this or any other system, even if you do not agree with the overall approach to the evaluation of performance that I am taking. First, you have the right to expect that it will be applied fairly and consistently. In general, it is. This year, of the 16 separate organizations within NNSA, there have been two instances, one in the field, and one at Headquarters, where I believe the principles I've described were not being followed. I will fix that.

The second thing you have a right to expect is that you will not be surprised at the end of the year. I know that providing performance feedback is difficult. It is one of the things I don't do very well personally. But anyone who is surprised at the end of the year by his or her supervisor's assessment of their performance has a legitimate right to complain. In cases where this is happening, I believe this is part of our continuing need to provide additional training for supervisors. We will work on that as well.

**Nonproliferation Display.** Those of you who are in the Forrestal or will be visiting it between now and April 30 should stop by the first floor lobby and take a look at the display of what we are doing in the nonproliferation arena. The display, "Global Initiatives for a More Secure Future," is an impressive and well-designed story. It is also a well-structured display. It is easy to forget the breadth of what we do. This display is a good reminder. It's also interesting and fun.

That's all I have for now. We'll be starting our Congressional hearings soon. I'll let you know any insights that I get from those sessions.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:48 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #50

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, March 17, 2006 12:56 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #50

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 17, 2006 12:55:16 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #50  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Three things have dominated my attention in the past few weeks. The first is the start of the Congressional Hearing season. I have now testified before both of the authorizing committees (House and Senate Armed Services Committees) and will appear in April before both Appropriations Subcommittees. In addition, we will be expending considerable effort getting ready for hearings in early April on the nuclear weapons "Complex of the Future" which we now refer to as "Complex 2030." The second thing I have been focusing on is dealing with some concerns about the way we are operating the production complex that were identified in a recent Defense Science Board (DSB) report. I will provide some details on this issue later in this message.

**Site Manager Turnover at Y-12.** The third and most meaningful thing that happened these past few weeks was the opportunity I had to preside at a combined management turnover ceremony for the Y-12 Site Manager, and retirement ceremony for Bill Brumley.

My vision for NNSA depends heavily upon what I sometimes call the "strong Site Manager" model. One of the things I'm proud of is the way we have clarified lines of responsibility and accountability within NNSA and increased the authority, responsibility, and accountability of the Site Manager. To emphasize the importance I place on Site Managers, we are adopting the practice of holding formal management turnover ceremonies. These are quite openly modeled after military change-of-command ceremonies because, like the military ceremonies, I intend for them to mark the formal transfer of major responsibility. I, therefore, installed Ted Sherry as the new Y-12 Site Manager and expressed the gratitude of the Nation, the Department, the NNSA, and my own to Bill Brumley for his accomplishments and his service. I was particularly pleased that the managers from all of the sites joined Jerry Paul, Tom D'Agostino, and me at this ceremony.

**Other Personnel News.** Here at Headquarters, I had the honor of swearing in Teresa Tyner to the Senior Executive Service as the Director of Business Operations in Mike Kane's organization. Teresa has been with the Department for over 30 years and completed her college degree requirements while working here full-time. She is one of our star performers who is highly regarded for her expertise and commitment to excellence.

As you know, the heart of NNSA is our people. It is tremendously important, therefore, that we emphasize the responsibility of leadership and equally important that we honor those who have done it well. That's what I was doing in Oak Ridge and in Washington.

One final important piece of news is the naming of George Miller as Director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. He is an experienced manager and weapons designer who will provide strong leadership as the laboratory prepares for next year's management competition. I am delighted to be working with him.

**Strategic Plan and DOE Operating Principles.** The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) requires the Department to maintain a strategic plan and to update it periodically. The previous strategic plans have been booklets covering everything that the Department planned to do in every area, written at a high level of generality.

This year, the Secretary had us take a different approach. We will still perform the standard update, but the focus has been on a limited number of things where we can make a difference during the next three years. This is similar to the approach I have described to many of you for my own planning within NNSA. The resulting "plan" (more exactly a portion of a plan) will be distributed in the relatively near future. One feature of this simplified plan is a series of operating principles that originate personally with the Secretary and set the tone for enhanced management of the Department. They are to:

- Ensure safe, secure, and environmentally responsible operations
- Act with a sense of urgency
- Work together
- Treat people with dignity and respect
- Make the tough choices
- Keep our commitments
- Embrace innovation
- Always tell the truth
- Do the right thing

I think these are wonderful principles that we should all take to heart. They reflect the way the Secretary has been running the Department and the way we should all strive to operate.

**Defense Science Board's Review of Nuclear Capabilities.** Some of you may have heard of a recent review by the Defense Science Board, which included a look at the ability of the weapons complex to support the Department of Defense (DoD) over the long haul. The DSB is a very well respected advisory group within the DoD. They looked at a number of aspects of the nuclear weapons program, including the NNSA production complex. Their report concluded that we have become too risk-averse and allowed the balance between safety and production to shift too far. They fear that the weapons complex, as it is presently being operated, cannot support the long-term needs of the Department of Defense.

While I agree with some of the DSB conclusions, I do not agree with all of the details in the report. Thus far, we have been meeting all key deliverables for the DoD. We have, however, fallen significantly behind on things like surveillance. The fundamental DSB conclusion that we have become excessively risk-averse is, unfortunately, correct. Therefore, we are undertaking a series of reviews of regulations, orders, policies, and procedures, both DOE-wide and internal to NNSA, that could have the result of any of the following:

- Appear to weaken line responsibility and accountability
- Contribute to micromanagement
- Could lead to unacceptable risk-averse behavior
- Violate the principle that it is the job of the Federal Government to identify the "what" and the job of the contractor community to focus on the "how," and that within the Federal Government, the responsibility of Headquarters is to focus on the "what" while Site Offices focus on the "how"

The Site Managers and the leadership of Defense Programs are heavily engaged in this effort, as are Jerry Paul, Tyler Przybylek and I. If you have a specific idea that would focus on one of the objectives noted above, you should feed them into your leadership so that we can get something accomplished.

**Pollution Prevention Awards.** Over the past few years, Jerry Paul and I have had the privilege of presenting the NNSA Pollution Prevention Best-in-Class Awards at many of our sites. These important awards recognize outstanding environmental achievement. The results of the work recognized by these awards is reduced environmental liability and waste management costs, increased efficiency in our operations and improved health and safety conditions for all of us. This year we had 34 nominations for NNSA Pollution Prevention Awards and of those, 8 were recognized with Best-in-Class Awards. The sites receiving these awards this year include: Los Alamos National Laboratory; Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; the Nevada Test Site; and, the Y-12 National Security Complex. Fourteen of the nominations were submitted for consideration for the prestigious White House "Closing the Circle" Environmental Awards, which recognize accomplishments from all Federal agencies. Winners will be announced in April. Last year, Sandia National Laboratories/NM and the Pantex Plant received "Closing the Circle" awards. I am very proud of all of these awards and you should be too.

**Career Development.** Some of you know that I am disappointed with the level of funding we have been able to carve out for training and development. I hoped the downsizing of three years ago would free resources for more training. It has not worked that way. As a result, much of our training budget has to be used to meet immediate needs. We have, however, worked hard to preserve some options to develop tomorrow's leadership. One manifestation of this is the Future Leaders (intern) Program. But we also try to make some opportunities available for attendance at the War Colleges, the Federal Leadership Institute, Harvard's Executive Program in National Security and other similar opportunities. While we advertise these, I'm not sure everyone is aware of the various opportunities. I will shortly get something out so that those interested have an idea of what might be available. I think career development is crucial to our future and I am committed to finding ways to further that endeavor.

That's all I have for now. I suspect that like me, you are looking forward to spring. Somehow, when I start going to work when it is light, it always feels like I'm working less.

Linton



## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:49 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #51

-----Original Message-----

From: NNSACAST Federal  
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 1:41 PM  
To: (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL <DLSCEMPLOYEES@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS <DLSCTENANTSFEDS@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS <DLSOLIVERMORE@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS <DLSOLOSALAMOS@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS <DLSOSANDIA@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) DOE-NTC <DLDOENTC@doeal.gov>; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS <DLSOY12@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS <DLSOSAVANNAHRIVER@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS <DLSOPANTEX@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) EMFederal <EMFederal@doeal.gov>  
Subject: FW: Lintgram #51

>  
>

-----

>  
From: NNSACAST HQ[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV]

>  
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 1:36:41 PM

>  
Subject: Lintgram #51

>  
Auto forwarded by a Rule  
>

>  
Perhaps the most important thing that has happened recently has been our rollout of what we are calling Complex 2030, our long-term vision for the Nuclear Weapons Complex. Tom D'Agostino, who gets most of the credit for devising this vision, has briefed it on the Hill and has testified before the House Armed Services Committee. Our vision has a number of bold initiatives and agrees with many of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board recommendations, but it does not create a single Consolidated Nuclear Production Center. It involves the following:

\*Continued stress on the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW). We believe the RRW is an "enabler," providing enormous leverage for a more efficient and responsive infrastructure and opportunities for a smaller stockpile.

\*More integrated, interdependent nuclear weapons enterprise. To achieve this, we are creating multi-site incentives

and more uniformity in technical and business practices.

- \*Consolidation of all research and development (R&D) and all production involving large quantities of Highly Enriched Uranium at Y-12.

- \*Consolidation by the early 2020s of all R&D, surveillance, and production involving large quantities of plutonium at a consolidated plutonium center. The existing plutonium facility at Los Alamos will provide an interim capability until the consolidated plutonium center is operational.

- \*Improving the security posture at our National Laboratories by phasing out operations involving Category I/II (the most risky) quantities of special nuclear material (SNM) that are costly to protect. This includes eliminating the need for a Category I/II SNM security posture at Sandia by 2008. Our plan is to start removing SNM from LLNL by 2008 and complete de-inventorying of Category I/II quantities in 2014. By 2022, all R&D/production activities involving Category I/II SNM would cease in facilities operated by LANL.

- \*Creation of a new, modern and efficient, non-nuclear production facility by 2012, sized to produce components that cannot be procured from commercial vendors.

- \*Increasing the rate of dismantlement of retired weapons, beginning with a 50 percent increase from FY 2006 to FY 2007.

- \*Retaining two independent centers of excellence for nuclear physics located at Los Alamos and Livermore, each in partnership with Sandia for non-nuclear component design and with a site in Nevada for testing.

- \*Eliminating appropriate duplicative capabilities and activities and increasing the number of user facilities supporting the entire complex.

- \*Improving the performance of the complex by operating in a more integrated, less risk-averse manner.

Tom's testimony on this new vision has been distributed widely and posted on our internal website, and has more details. I am very proud of this vision, which will shape the nuclear weapons enterprise for the coming decades.

Budget and Congress. I have completed my final hearings on our FY 2007 budget request. In general, the hearings have gone well. That doesn't, of course, mean that we will get everything that the President requested or get it in the exact way that the President requested it, but we have not had any major emotional issues as we have in some previous years.

In parallel with the hearings, we are also discussing some potential legislative changes with the Hill. Last year, we got approval to accept foreign contributions for one of our nonproliferation programs (the one to eliminate plutonium production in Russia) and we are trying to broaden that authority to include two other programs. We are also trying to adjust the threshold for minor construction without requiring a specific line item authorization in future budgets. Finally, we are asking for an extension to the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program because past funding cuts make it impossible to complete the effort by the legally

mandated date of 2011. The proposal that is drawing the most resistance is a renewal of an idea, from two years ago, to consolidate all counterintelligence within the Department of Energy into a single office reporting to the Secretary. The new wrinkle is that the Secretary has decided to merge the Intelligence and Counterintelligence organizations, thus making it particularly important that our separate effort be folded in. I'll keep you advised on all of these proposals, although it will be several months before we have final answers on any of them.

**Line Responsibility.** As you know, inspired in part by an external look, we've really been pushing the notion of clarifying roles and responsibilities and improving line authority and accountability. We are trying to expedite our move to the model of non-nuclear oversight that we devised three years ago but have not yet fully implemented. Right now we are looking at taking advantage of the new contract at Los Alamos and of the fact that the Kansas City Plant does not have the complications associated with nuclear materials in order to conduct pilots at both locations. The pilot at Los Alamos will move toward the new model of oversight, while we are considering a more dramatic effort at the Kansas City Plant by drastically reducing the number of DOE directives applicable to the Plant and replacing them with commercial standards. Both of these offer significant potential benefits, but it will require great care to make sure that we do not compromise actual safety or security.

Another part of our emphasis on line responsibility is to look at our relations with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (the Board). We have a valuable resource in the technical judgment of the Board and we need to use that resource. But we have sometimes failed in our line responsibilities by appearing to substitute the Board's judgment for our own. Two important principles in Secretary Bodman's drive to improve management of the Department are line accountability and clear roles and responsibilities. The responsibility of the Board is to provide high-quality, technically competent, external advice. Our responsibility is to carry out our mission in a safe, secure, and environmentally responsible way.

The Department has made a number of formal commitments to the Board. I expect us to be meticulous in observing those commitments. I also expect us to fully discharge our legal obligation to ensure the Board has access to all information needed to carry out its duties. Finally, I expect us to pay attention to the advice of the Board and its staff. Sound technical advice, both formal and informal, is always valuable. But we must never confuse advice with authority and accountability. I have provided some additional thoughts in this area in the most recent edition of the NNSA Technical Bulletin.

**Travel Reimbursements.** One of the complaints in the Employee Survey was the speed of travel reimbursements. As far as I can tell, the problem is not with the actual reimbursement system but with the rapidity in which claims are submitted. I've asked the Site Managers and various Headquarters' Deputy and Associate Administrators to look into what we can do within each organization to speed up the internal approval process of claims so that

they can be submitted for payment more efficiently.

Change in Manager at Nevada Site Office. I suspect many of you know that Kathy Carlson has decided to retire after a long and distinguished career. She will step down as Manager of the Nevada Site Office on May 3. My plans are to compete the position. This is consistent with the approach we have been trying to take to maximize the number of jobs that we open up for competition. I am pleased that Jay Norman, the current Deputy Manager for Test and Operations, has agreed to serve as the Acting Manager until a permanent replacement has been selected. Because he chaired the Source Evaluation Board for the recent competition for the Nevada Test Site Management and Operating Contract, he will be particularly well suited to oversee the transition from Bechtel Nevada to the new Test Site operator, National Security Technologies, LLC. I expect that we will move as quickly as possible on the transition, but I will probably ask Jay to hold down the position long enough for me to send the new manager through our recently developed Prospective Site Manager training course.

That's all I have for now. I'm going to take next week off to visit Florida with my wife. Whether or not you are taking any time off, I hope you are enjoying the arrival of spring.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:50 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #52

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 16, 2006 7:25 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #52

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 16, 2006 7:21:09 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #52  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

This has been a relatively busy time, although shortly after my last Lintgram I did manage to sneak away for a week in Florida with my wife. Much of our effort this time of year is focused on Congress and the budget, but we are also working a number of other issues.

**Budget.** Let me start with the budget, which probably is on your mind as it is on my own. As you know, each year Congress passes an Authorization bill (intended to establish broad policy on what we can do) and an Appropriations bill (which provides specific funding levels). In practice, both bills focus in a fair amount of detail on what we are going to spend. The House and Senate have each completed committee work on Authorization bills and the House just last week took initial committee action on an Appropriations bill. The Senate Appropriations Bill will probably leave committee sometime in mid-June. So far, with two glaring exceptions, the President's proposals appear to have fared reasonably well. The total recommendations for NNSA are consistent with--and for some committees slightly above--the President's budget proposal, although the House Appropriations Bill directs some rearrangement of specific programs. In general, however, it appears that thus far NNSA is doing well.

The two glaring exceptions are our program to eliminate surplus weapons plutonium and, our new Complex 2030 proposal for the future of the nuclear weapons complex. In 2000, the United States and Russia agreed that we would each eliminate 34 tons of excess weapons plutonium by converting it to a mixed oxide (MOX) fuel and burning it in commercial light water reactors. This seemingly straightforward agreement has been very difficult to bring to fruition because of a series of disagreements with the Russian Federation, as well as difficulties we've had in sustaining an optimum funding profile. We are ready to begin construction this fall on our MOX plant at the Savannah River Site. In contrast, the Russians have now concluded that they will only move forward on the previously agreed path if the full cost is borne by the international community, which does

not appear likely. Otherwise, they want to delay disposition and shift to a different approach that involves as-yet-unbuilt fast reactors.

In reaction to these developments, all three committees that have acted so far have significantly reduced the funding for the program and one has directed that we not proceed with our own construction. The situation is extraordinarily confusing right now, and I think that it will be the end of the summer before we have complete clarity. A significant funding reduction in FY 2007 would further stretch out the U.S. part of the program. We want to proceed with our own construction to meet our international commitments and domestic legal obligations and because having a credible path to eliminate excess material is an integral part of materials consolidation, which is necessary over the long term to reduce security costs.

The second exception is the situation on Complex 2030, which is more confusing. The two Authorization Committees have given us strong support. The House appropriators, however, were critical of both the pace of our efforts and our decision to move toward separate centers of excellence for plutonium and highly enriched uranium. They made a number of fairly major changes, the full impact of which I am still reviewing. I am confident we will reach an acceptable resolution, but it will take us a while. I'll keep you informed. This sort of give and take between the Congress and the Executive Branch is a normal part of the process and usually leads to a better result, although I know it is frustrating for many of you, given all the hard work that has gone into Complex 2030. We are going to need to work a little harder to help people understand that Complex 2030 is not the same Cold War complex but a fresh vision that incorporates efficiency with reduced risks.

**Future Budgets.** Meanwhile, while most of you are busy executing the budget for Fiscal Year 2006 and we are working with the Hill on the President's proposals for Fiscal Year 2007, we are beginning the internal work that will ultimately lead to the Fiscal Year 2008 budget. This will be our first opportunity to put significant resources into the transformation of the weapons complex. This is exciting and important! It is also quite difficult because we are trying to fit new initiatives into a fixed amount of money while still maintaining all of our obligations to the Department of Defense. It is too early to say how well we will succeed; we are not very far along in the approval process, although a great deal of work has been done. Last Friday, we submitted our recommendations to the DOE Chief Financial Officer. We provided a base program, an indication of where we would cut if our totals were reduced, and a priority list of where we would like more funding added. The Secretary and his senior advisors (including me) will then review this input along with proposals from the rest of the Department. Ultimately, we will submit a proposal to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) around the first of September. The OMB review will take a couple of months and we'll spend late November and much of December putting the final touches on the budget. Even if everything we recommend is unaltered, there inevitably will be fact of life changes between now and then, including reflecting the implications of whatever emerges from the Fiscal Year 2007 Congressional process.

At this point, you are probably asking "so what?" I go through all of this because it is hugely important. On the other hand, it is also confusing and a great deal of work. I know everybody would like a nice, clear, and predictable long-term plan. Unfortunately, a system of annual appropriations doesn't always give us that plan. Still, the system works reasonably well largely because of the extraordinary efforts of many of you.

**People.** There have been two significant developments in the leadership of NNSA in the past few weeks, one is very good news and the other represents a significant loss. The very good news is that the President has nominated Will Tobey to be the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, the job that I started in nearly five years ago and the position Jerry Paul has been holding down in addition to doing his full-time job as Principal Deputy. I am delighted about this nomination (as, obviously, is Jerry!). Will comes to us from the National Security Council (NSC) where he has been helping to shape counter proliferation policy for a number of years. He served previously in the Administrations of both President Reagan and the first President Bush as an NSC official. I served with him there in the Reagan Administration. Will is a wonderful colleague, a

strong leader, and will bring a solid vision to the Department. Exactly when he arrives depends on the confirmation process, and I hope that goes quickly.

While I'm delighted that Will is joining us, this has also been a bittersweet period because I presided over the retirement of Kathy Carlson on May 2. Most of you know Kathy, who left the Government after over 30 years of Federal service in the weapons program. Most recently, she was the Nevada Site Office Manager, but prior to that, she had a number of other jobs including serving as the Acting Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs during the chaotic time surrounding September 11, 2001. I was delighted that all the Site Office Managers, the Service Center Director, and Tom D'Agostino, were able to join me in Nevada to honor her service. She is typical of the amazing talent represented by our long-term Federal civil servants. We will miss her. Jay Norman, the NSO Deputy Manager for Test and Operations, is now acting as the Site Office Manager while we conduct a competition to find a permanent replacement.

**Laboratory Leadership and Management.** On June 1, we will complete the transition of Los Alamos from management by the University of California to management by Los Alamos National Security (LANS), LLC, a consortium involving Bechtel, the University of California, BWX Technologies, and Washington Group International. The transition--the first in history for Los Alamos--has been smooth due to the strong, collegial efforts of the Site Office, the Laboratory and LANS. I'm very proud of the efforts of the Site Office. We've also been fortunate in the recent leadership of the laboratory provided by Bob Kuckuck and Don Cobb. I'm looking forward to continuing to work with the new Laboratory Director, Mike Anastasio, who comes from a similar position at Lawrence Livermore.

Meanwhile, we have issued a draft Request for Proposals that will lead to a new operator of Livermore in the fall of 2007. I'm looking for a similar smooth selection and transition there.

**Continuous Improvement.** While we were in Nevada, for Kathy's retirement, Tom D'Agostino and I took the opportunity to discuss a variety of topics with the Site Office Managers and the Service Center Director. I was concerned by the strong perception that there is too much Headquarters micromanagement, some from outside NNSA but much from within. We came up with a list of specifics to work on, but we almost certainly need a more structured look at the issue. We will take that look. I think everyone is trying to do what they think is right, but we aren't quite there yet on the proper division of labor.

In a similar fashion, we also discussed improving the support from the Service Center. The Service Center concept is an important one and making it work is vital. One area for improvement is to eliminate any confusion between Headquarters and the Service Center as to who does what. We are starting that process. We are also looking at specific steps to make things easier (for example, speeding the hiring process by more use of generic position descriptions). I will keep you informed of our progress.

**Safety.** One reason I send out these periodic messages is because in a large bureaucracy my intentions sometimes get garbled. To avoid that, I want to make sure you hear directly from me on important issues. Safety and the importance of safety professionals is one of those issues. An inherent responsibility of all of us in NNSA is to balance our important national security mission with our equally strong obligation to carry out that mission in a safe, secure, and environmentally responsible manner. Over the past few months, I have become convinced that we are becoming excessively risk averse. That doesn't mean I think we should be less safe or take more actual risks. It means that I think we have become too fearful of criticism. We should not allow our mission to be held up by excessively conservative analysis and re-analysis once we have enough data to make an informed judgment. As a result of this conclusion, we are taking steps to, for example, ensure we apply management judgment to external recommendations and focus on clear, measurable production objectives.

Unfortunately, this message has been misunderstood by a handful of people. I have heard that a few of you are acting as though you think this means we are not interested in safety. That is absolutely wrong. We have an

obligation to ensure the safety of both our workforce and the American people as we carry out our national security mission. I think safety and mission are absolutely consistent and we must do both. In particular, I've heard that some of you have been suggesting that safety professionals are no longer important or worth listening to. I urge you to disabuse yourselves and others of that notion. The emphasis on improving our mission performance means that our safety professionals are more important, not less. Please make sure that you understand what we are trying to do and let me know if you need any further clarification.

**Site Office Managers Reporting Chain.** In addition to ensuring the proper balance among safety, security, and mission, it is also important as we move to transform the weapons complex to ensure that the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs has the full authority to carry out his responsibilities. To strengthen that authority and improve overall line management, we have changed policy, effective May 10, so that the NNSA Site Office Managers report to the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs rather than to Jerry and me. I want to make it clear that this in no way is intended to downgrade the Site Office Managers, who remain absolutely crucial to our success. Tom D'Agostino has also made it clear that this change doesn't alter our commitment to clear lines of authority. Specifically, the change doesn't mean that everyone in the Site Offices reports to everyone in Defense Programs. It simply means that the Site Office Managers personally report to Tom and not to Jerry and me.

As I said in formally announcing this change, "All organizations have strengths and weaknesses. No organization is as important as the confidence, collegiality, and professionalism of the people running it." While I recognize that we will have to work out a few details as we go, I expect all of us to implement this change in that spirit.

**Death of a Colleague.** I need to end this message on a somber note. On May 5, Protective Force Lieutenant Carlos N. Saenz, a 21-year security veteran from the Nevada Test Site, was killed in Iraq, where he was serving on active duty as a U.S. Army Reserve First Sergeant. His death, which occurred a week before he was due to finish his tour, was caused by a roadside bomb that detonated near his Humvee. He leaves a widow and a 14-year old son.

In a democracy, the actions of government are a proper subject for citizens to debate. There are many views on how we should proceed in Iraq and it is entirely appropriate and understandable that we may disagree both over the wisdom of past actions and on the best course for the future. But there can be no disagreement on our attitude toward the men and women who have answered their country's call and are risking-and in this case losing-their lives on our behalf. The only attitude we can possibly have is pride and gratitude for their service and a deep sense of sorrow at their loss. As we look forward to Memorial Day, when America honors all those who have died in the service of their country, it is important to remember that while you are reading this e-mail, men and women who are our friends, neighbors, and colleagues are in harm's way in response to their Nation's call.

I didn't know Carlos Saenz personally. Neither did most of you, but he died for you and for me. Our obligation to his memory is to carry out our own national security responsibilities in a way that will be worthy of his service and his sacrifice.

Linton



## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:50 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #53

-----Original Message-----

From: NNSACAST Federal  
Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2006 7:34 AM  
To: (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL <DLSCEMPLOYEES@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS <DLSCTENANTSFEDS@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS <DLSOLIVERMORE@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS <DLSOLOSALAMOS@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS <DLSOSANDIA@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) DOE-NTC <DLDOENTC@doeal.gov>; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS <DLSOY12@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS <DLSOSAVANNAHRIVER@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS <DLSOPANTEX@alomail.al.gov>; (DL) EMFederal <EMFederal@doeal.gov>  
Subject: FW: Lintgram #53

>

>

-----

>

From: NNSACAST HQ[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV]

>

Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2006 7:14:27 AM

>

Subject: Lintgram #53

>

Auto forwarded by a Rule

>

>

No single event has dominated these past three weeks. We have been working the routine but necessary actions to run the organization. For me personally, however, that won't be true for the coming three weeks. I expect to have my days almost completely dominated by the Department's internal review of various aspects of what will ultimately be the FY 2008 budget and accompanying Five-Year Plan. We will present our NNSA proposals to the Deputy Secretary, but all of the Under Secretaries are involved in the review of most major elements of the Department. In addition, there will be a very heavy focus on what we are calling "crosscutting issues" where actions in one organization affect other organizations. Examples include the future of the Advance Technology Reactor run by Nuclear Energy in Idaho, which provides services to both Naval Reactors and our nonproliferation office or H-Canyon in Savannah River, operated by EM but used by Defense Programs and others for materials processing and disposition. And, of course, there are always issues like the Design Basis

Threat. It should be a fairly interesting three weeks, especially because this is the first time the Department as a whole has tried to get serious about five-year budgeting. I suspect it will be a while before I have anything significant to tell you.

New Under Secretary for Science. The Energy Policy Act of last year established a third Under Secretary within the Department of Energy. I'm the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security (in addition to being the Administrator). Dave Garman is the Under Secretary of Energy. The new Under Secretary for Science will be Ray Orbach, currently the Director of the Office of Science. He was sworn in last Thursday. Ray's job will be, among other things, to help integrate science better throughout the Department. He has been extremely helpful to NNSA on a variety of issues and I'm delighted with the appointment. One thing I hope it lets us do is find a way to get more recognition for some of the great science that we are doing.

Los Alamos National Laboratory Transition. As some of you know, Los Alamos National Laboratory shifted to the management of a new contractor on June 1. As part of the shift, Mike Anastasio, former Director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, replaced Bob Kuckuck as the Los Alamos Laboratory Director. The Los Alamos National Security, LLC that now operates the Laboratory is a partnership between Bechtel, the University of California, BWXT and the Washington Group. This is the first transition of Los Alamos in its 60 plus year history and it went remarkably smoothly due to excellent work on the part of everybody involved. I'm particularly proud of the role of the Site Office transition team, under the leadership of Jan Chavez-Wilczynski. We are also passing through a similar transition at Nevada. The competition that leads to such transitions is beneficial in many ways but competition and transitions are a great deal of work. All of us can be proud, both of the way these two competitions were conducted and of the way in which the transitions are being implemented.

Budget. I have nothing new to tell you about the FY 2007 budget. It now appears we will not know the Senate action until the third week in June at the earliest. It will almost certainly be different from what the House did and will need to be reconciled in a conference between the two chambers. When that will occur is anybody's guess. I expect that, because this is an election year, Congress will try to finish work on the Appropriations Bills promptly, but there's no guarantee and it will almost certainly depend on how much difference there is between the House and Senate approaches. I'll keep you informed, but I doubt we're going to know anything for a while.

Possible DOE Headquarters Reorganization. Many of you have heard that the Department is considering merging the Office of Environment, Safety, and Health with Glenn Podonsky's Office of Safety and Security Performance Assurance. The idea is to replicate on the safety side what we did on the security side two years ago, which is to have the people establishing policy and the people monitoring policy implementation in the same organization. If the Secretary decides to approve the proposal, one or two operational functions (such as NEPA compliance and nuclear safety research) will spin off to other parts of the Department. Having safety and security policy

together should help in improving the interface between these two important disciplines. While no final decision has been made, the merger is extremely attractive. I will keep you informed as we continue to work through this effort. Assuming that we do it right, there should be relatively little impact for NNSA in the short term. In the long term, I think we will benefit from the better integration of safety and security and from the closer coordination between policy formulation and policy auditing.

Russian Visit. On May 22, the head of the Russian Federation Agency for Atomic Energy (called by its Russian acronym "Rosatom") met with the Secretary and other officials at DOE. Rosatom is our primary partner for much of our nonproliferation work in Russia. We had an excellent review of progress and discovered one or two potential areas for expanded cooperation. A huge amount of work goes into getting ready for these high-level meetings and I was pleased with how thorough our preparations were. Tom D'Agostino, the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, is also leading a delegation to Russia this week to help celebrate the 60th anniversary of one of their weapons laboratories.

Communicating on Problems. Both the Secretary and I have made it clear on a number of occasions that we welcome input from anybody in the Department. Often those inputs involve problems. I don't want to discourage your raising issues with me at any time and in any venue-but in a couple of recent cases, it does not appear that people have given their local chain of command any opportunity to solve an issue. In most cases, problems can best be solved by people within their own organizations. If they can't, I want to know about them. Obviously, I also want to know if you believe that someone in your chain of command is the problem, but that's not usually the case.

The worst thing we can do is know there are problems and do nothing about them. I don't want to do that. But most problems get solved better and faster at the local level and I hope that you will keep that in mind as you look for solutions.

Tidbits. Some odds and ends for your information:

?Bob Braden, our Senior Procurement Executive, retired on June 2. He helped create the acquisition organization for NNSA and was the leader in looking at an enterprise-wide approach to acquisition. We will miss him greatly.

?Our Ombuds have heard rumors that a recent revision to the Department's grievance procedures has dropped provisions allowing an employee to have a representative with them during some phases of the process. Not true. An employee has the right to be accompanied, represented, and advised by a representative of his or her choice at any stage of the proceeding. Thanks to whoever told me of this rumor so we can get out the accurate information.

?DOE has reminded people that computer drives with sensitive information must be protected. We want to avoid a repeat of the recent

incident in another Department where personal information on millions of individuals was lost.

?I'm still worried about electrical safety. We'll probably be talking again to leadership soon about this issue. We are going to hurt or kill someone if we don't improve.

Risk Aversion: What It Is and What It Isn't. In our efforts at continuous improvement, especially focused on our production activities, I have been using the term "risk-averse" as something we are seeking to avoid. Becoming less risk-averse is one of four criteria through which we have been examining the number of policies and procedures (the other criteria are improving line accountability and responsibility, avoiding micromanagement, and ensuring that the Federal Government concentrates on what to do while contractors concentrate on how to do it). I have become concerned that some may be misunderstanding what I mean by "risk-averse."

In many ways, our entire job is about balancing risks--safety risks, security risks, risks of not completing our mission, risks of overspending our budget, and risks of burning out our people. Our job is to manage and balance those risks and nothing we are doing is intended to change that. In balancing risks, we place great emphasis on ensuring the safety of the public and of our workforce. I have no intention of changing that emphasis. When I call for us to be less "risk-averse," I don't mean that we should take greater risks with people's safety.

But there is another kind of risk that we don't acknowledge but we all respond to. That's the risk of being criticized by somebody for not having done something. The "somebody" criticizing us could be the press, the Congress, or other outside bodies that audit us. Avoiding this kind of risk is not good management. It leads us to do extra analysis when we know we have enough information for a technically sound decision. It biases away from trying something with promise because we might be criticized if it fails. It causes us to mindlessly accept recommendations from outside bodies that have no responsibility for balancing all the requirements we must deal with. It leads us to focus excessively on those things that are being audited and, therefore, to downplay the equally important things (typically associated with mission) that are not being audited. It is this form of risk-averse behavior that we must eliminate. As we continue to move toward the NNSA of the Future, it is important for all of us to remain clear on our objective.

Los Alamos Pentagon Memorial. One part of my job is representing the Administration at important events. I had the opportunity to be at Los Alamos during ceremonies that unveiled a memorial, dedicated a building, and marked the end of the 63-year stewardship of the University of California. I made some short remarks stressing the importance of scientific accomplishment, intellectual freedom, and public service. But, the truly moving thing for me was to see a piece of the Pentagon from 9/11 with the names of the victims on it. On 9/11, I was at a think tank supporting the Navy. This work entailed frequent meetings in the Pentagon Navy Command Center. Some of the people I routinely worked with were lost in that

attack. Had it happened on a different day of the week, I might well have been among them. Having that memorial at Los Alamos helped remind everybody that, while we advance knowledge through great science and while we work a lot of mundane issues, we are all engaged in the deadly serious business of defending the United States. It reminded me again of why I am so proud to be able to contribute to that defense and how proud I am of all of you for your efforts.

That's all I have for now. After an absolutely beautiful spring, summer is trying hard to arrive in Washington. I'm looking forward to the season, if not the weather.

Linton

## Lintgram #54

Although I just sent you a Lintgram, the recently revealed, highly sophisticated cyber attack on an NNSA computer system is so important that I need to talk to you about it at once. As most of you know from Friday's DOECAST, an attack on an unclassified NNSA system resulted in personal information on approximately 1,502 NNSA Federal and contractor employees being unlawfully obtained. About 75 of the affected individuals are Federal employees. Most others work at the production plants, the Nevada Test Site, or the national laboratories. Some are retired. The data was in a list that included names, social security numbers, level of security clearance, when that clearance was last updated, and a code identifying the company (but not the geographic location) where the affected individuals worked. Neither dates of birth, nor addresses, nor other personal information were included in the compromised information. Still, this is a very serious event.

Starting last Friday evening, and continuing nearly around the clock all weekend, senior NNSA managers began contacting by phone each employee whose personal information was compromised in order to provide them with information about protecting themselves from such dangers as identity theft. About 80 percent of the affected employees were contacted by last night. We are continuing to try to reach the remaining employees until we have personally contacted everyone. In addition to these phone calls, I sent letters first thing Monday morning directly to the Federal employees and to the managers of the contractor employees who were affected. The contractor managers were asked to provide the information to their employees (we don't have mailing addresses for most contractor employees). I have also instructed the NNSA Site Managers to follow up and ensure that the contractors promptly provide the information to the employees.

I suspect that most of you who were involved (and many who weren't) are upset and angry, both over the incident and over the fact that I was aware of it for several months before I told you about it. You have a right to be. With regard to the attack itself, because the criminal investigation is still ongoing, I cannot provide you any details. I am convinced that no NNSA employee could have prevented this attack. Due to the nature and sensitivity of our work, NNSA is a frequent target for sophisticated hackers. Every day there are thousands upon thousands of attempts to gain unauthorized access to our computer systems. And every day, such efforts are thwarted by the safeguards built into these systems and by the expertise of the hundreds of cyber security experts across the NNSA and DOE complex. These experts go to extraordinary lengths to protect our data. They do an incredible job. Even with this strong cyber security effort, the fact that we lost data testifies to the sophistication of the attack.

The delay in informing you, however, could have been prevented. Quite simply, we screwed up. Given the involvement of other Federal agencies that investigate such breaches, when attacks occur, we are not always at liberty to immediately notify people. Sometimes we need to delay while investigators try to identify the hacker(s) and determine the level of compromise, etc. Thus, some short delay would be understandable. Most of the delay, however, was preventable and unnecessary. I am still

trying to sort out exactly what happened, but it is clear that a number of people, including me, failed in their responsibilities to keep you informed.

All of you deserved better. I am working to fix our procedures so that such an inadvertent delay cannot happen again. I will keep all of you posted on this matter as progress is made, with particular attention given to those of you directly affected. In the meantime, I apologize for our failure.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #55

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:27 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #55

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:13:18 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #55  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most important thing I've done since I've last sent out one of these messages is try to figure out how I'm going to get along without Jerry Paul. I am hopeful that the Senate will act to confirm Will Tobey as the new Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation this month. His confirmation hearing is scheduled for July 20. That will take care of one of the two jobs Jerry has been holding down. For his day job as the Principal Deputy, we have not yet identified a name to recommend to the President, although I am working on it. In the interim, Tyler Przybylek has agreed to reprise his role as Chief Operating Officer. I will assume Jerry's responsibilities as Central Technical Authority. I suspect it will be a while before I have anything useful to tell you about Jerry's replacement. This is the President's appointment, not mine, so even when we think we've settled on a name, it would be inappropriate to say anything until the White House makes an announcement. I would hope for that to happen sometime in the fall to allow confirmation this year (assuming, as I think probable, that the Congress comes back in session after the election).

**Travel Payments.** Department-wide statistics suggest that we are continuing to improve on promptness of travel payments. From the completion of a trip to the receipt of payment was averaging 27 days a few months ago; now it is averaging 18 days. By definition, "average" means some people are doing worse (and a lot of people are doing better). It appears that where there are systematic delays, those delays are related to something individual offices are doing. In any case, if you are seeing a dramatically different result than I'm suggesting, you should pass that back up the chain so we can figure out what the problem is.

**Energy Policy Act.** The Department is coming up on the one-year anniversary of the signing of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I expect we will try to get some publicity for this Act that has major implications for the future of energy in the United States. NNSA is not hugely involved in this area, but we are part of the Department and I wanted to make sure you are aware of our successes in this area.



**Budget.** The final committee (the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development) that has influence over our budget has now acted. As has been true in other actions, the totals are very close to what the President recommended but there is a good deal of rearranging, some of it in directions other than the House. It is gratifying that there continues to be strong support for the Reliable Replacement Warhead. What happens next is reconciliation between the actions of the House and the Senate. On the Appropriations side, I have no idea when that will occur. It is possible that it could happen before the end of September (roughly when I expect the Congress to adjourn in preparation for the election) but there are no guarantees. If the two bills are not reconciled, we will face a Continuing Resolution which, given some of the differences between the two houses, will cause some management problems. As we get closer to the beginning of the next fiscal year, I'll have more information for you.

**Electrical Safety.** I continue to worry about the number of close calls we're having in the area of electrical safety. Someone is going to get killed if we don't get a handle on this. We will be holding a conference (via video) on this subject in early August involving the leadership of the labs, plants, and site offices. I think it is important to figure out what we can do to get a handle on this issue. I'll have more to say about it later in the summer.

**Upcoming Summit.** The President will meet President Putin and then participate in a summit of the G8 countries in Russia in a few days. This is an important opportunity to advance the U.S. agenda and I am hopeful that I will have some useful things to report once the summit is over. I continue to be a little worried that the pace of our efforts in Russia is slowing a bit.

**Weapons Complex Performance.** Most of you know that the Defense Science Board, a prestigious Department of Defense advisory panel, issued a report late last year that was quite critical of NNSA, arguing that we had become excessively risk-averse and it was hampering our ability to deliver on our commitments to the Department of Defense. It is important to take such criticism seriously and we have. We are, slowly, striking a better balance between production and such important areas as safety and security. It is vital that we continue this effort. But it is also important that we notice places where we have done well. In the last few weeks, we've had two significant events occur at Pantex. First, we delivered the first production unit for the life extension of the B61 bomb. This is a major milestone, reached on time because of excellent work by the plants, the site offices, and Headquarters. At almost the same time, we completed the disassembly of the last W56 warhead (an old warhead for Minuteman missiles). Designed in an era where disassembly was not given a great deal of thought in design, the W56 posed a number of difficult challenges that were successfully overcome. I am very pleased with these accomplishments. So is the Secretary.

That's all I have. I know this is short, but I don't have a lot of news to report. I hope you all had a great Fourth of July and had a chance to reflect on how fortunate we are to live in such a marvelous country.

Have a good summer.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #56

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, August 11, 2006 8:45 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** Lintgram #56

The most important two things that have happened since my last message to you both happened last Thursday. Jerry Paul left Government, at almost exactly the time that Will Tobey was confirmed by the Senate as the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. That qualifies as "just in time" delivery considering that Paul Longworth left a year ago. I expect Will to be on board on Monday, August 21.

I know all of you will enjoy working with Will who is an outstanding leader and will build on the work of Jerry, Paul Longworth, Ken Baker, and many others. Will's extensive national security experience includes serving on the National Security Council (NSC) staff under President Reagan and the first President Bush, where I worked with him closely. In this Administration, he has been at the NSC as Director of Counterproliferation Policy for the past four years, and has extensive knowledge of nonproliferation policy and programs and unmatched experience in the interagency process.

**DOE Oversight Order 226.1 (Implementation of DOE Oversight Policy).** After considerable internal discussion, the Department has begun to review and revise this Order. The initial focus of the revision effort is on environment, safety and health. I know that many of you have been working on this portion of the Order, which must be implemented by September 2006. Other components, such as Cyber Security, Physical Security, and Emergency Management will be worked on in the coming months. We've also decided that business practices are not suitable for this Order and will be dropped. I think these are good decisions that will help us strike the right balance between sound oversight and micro-management. I'll keep you informed on our progress.

**NNSA Oversight Policy.** Many of you will remember that when we reorganized NNSA in late 2002, I had hoped to shift to a more effective model of oversight in which we would depend heavily on contractor assurance systems and, except for physical security and nuclear safety, would focus our oversight on making sure that those systems were effective. We have taken longer than I hoped to move on this idea, but I am still committed to it. We are now looking at pilot projects at Kansas City (shifting to commercial standards; Kansas City is the easiest place to do this because it has no special nuclear material) and Los Alamos (taking advantage of the new contract and the new management team). We are also trying to get some of the promise of the model contract at Sandia back on track. All this is proving more difficult than we expected, in part because it is new territory that takes us out of our comfort zone and, in part, because it is simply hard. We remain committed to moving forward.

**Personal Information.** In recent months a considerable amount of personal information stored electronically throughout the Federal Government has been compromised. There have been problems at the Veterans Administration, IRS, Navy, Agriculture, the NNSA and, some others. As a result of these compromises, we will be implementing a variety of steps to tighten controls on personal information, especially personal information stored on laptops. The new procedures will also help protect other forms of sensitive information. Shifting to the new approach is likely to be a bit disruptive, but it is clearly the right thing to do in order to protect information with which we have been entrusted. We are going to try to make these changes in a sensible fashion, but I'm pretty sure there is going to be some inconvenience.

**Budget.** I wish I could give you some news on the budget, but I have absolutely nothing new to tell you and won't for several weeks. When the Congress returns to town in September, I expect them to complete work on the Authorization Bill (where the two Houses are close to each other and to the President's Request). However, on the Appropriations Bill, the situation is more difficult. I doubt that the Congress' work will be completed in September and thus we could face a Continuing Resolution. Typically this limits us to the lower figure where the two houses have taken different positions (as they have in many specific NNSA areas). This will present us with some challenges.

**History.** It is sometimes useful to remember where we came from. August 1, 2006, marked the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission. On that date in 1946, President Truman signed the first Atomic Energy Act. From this beginning grew the current Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the system of national laboratories, and many of the policies and procedures that continue to shape our day-to-day business. I wonder what our predecessors who helped create the Commission and worked in it during the early years would think about the modern Department of Energy. I know that whatever they thought of our organization, they would recognize in today's Federal and contractor employees the same dedication that they were used to.

This message is pretty short, but that's all I have to tell you for now. As we enter the last few weeks of summer, I hope those of you who haven't yet done so will be able to take some time to be with your families. I intend to take my own advice and spend a week in California with my wife next week. I'm looking forward to it.

Have a good August.

Linton

**Perez, Delilah**

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #57

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, September 11, 2006 11:59 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #57

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 11, 2006 11:58:36 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #57  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

I hope all of you had a pleasant summer and that you got to spend some time away from work with your families. In Washington, there is a persistent myth that August is a slow month. This year, for the first time since I've been at the Department of Energy, that myth turned out to be true, at least for me (although I know a lot of people were working very hard during August). I was able to get away for a week and do some catch up. With the Congress back in session, the Secretary back from his travels, and (based on the traffic this morning) most people back from vacation, I expect that the rest of September will be quite different.

**Congress.** The Congress returned from its recess the day after Labor Day and will be in session only until the end of the month. I expect the Congress will try very hard to hold to that schedule given the upcoming elections. There is a good deal of pending business and I'm not certain what will get done during this relatively short period. I anticipate that the Defense Authorization Bill will pass; the most important thing in the Bill for us will be the authorization to consolidate the NNSA and DOE counterintelligence operations under the Department's Senior Intelligence Officer.

There is no chance of a stand-alone DOE Appropriations Bill being enacted in September (the Senate hasn't yet acted on its version). I currently expect that we will be faced with a Continuing Resolution at least through November. Assuming that we have a Continuing Resolution, we will be limited to a spending rate that is the lower of either last year's spending or the smaller of whatever the two Houses have enacted. Since there are considerable differences in some areas between the House and the Senate, we could find ourselves in a position of having to dramatically slow down or even suspend some ongoing projects.

Complicating the situation is that we don't know for certain how long a Continuing Resolution will be in effect. Most people are guessing that the Congress will return around November 13, after the elections, and will seek to complete work on the Appropriations Bills at that time. They may enact an Omnibus Appropriations Bill dealing with multiple Departments, but it is also possible that they will provide a Continuing Resolution that

remains in effect until after the new Congress is seated next January. We will be working to keep the impact of any Continuing Resolution to a minimum, but our options are limited. I know this is frustrating, but, as a wise colleague of mine once said, "A problem with no solution is not a problem, it's just a fact." The "problem" of the Congressional Appropriations process isn't really a problem in that sense because there's nothing we can do to solve it. It's just a fact. I'll keep you informed, but I doubt we'll know much more before late September and probably not until November.

**September Business.** Congress isn't the only thing we'll be focused on this month. Tom D'Agostino and I, along with the Laboratory Directors, will be traveling to the United Kingdom for one of our periodic reviews of cooperation under the U.S./United Kingdom 1958 Agreement on Mutual Defense Cooperation. As most of you know, we have extensive interactions with the British. The 1958 Agreement is, in my view a remarkable success, and is one of the pillars of the so-called "Special Relationship" between the United States and the United Kingdom.

We are also preparing the Secretary for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Annual General Conference. This is largely a ceremonial event in terms of the large-scale meetings but it is an opportunity for a great deal of work to be accomplished behind the scenes. We hope to advance the President's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership at this conference. Because this is the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the IAEA, I expect there will be a little more publicity than usual.

Closer to home, we will be working with the Site Offices to finalize Performance Plans for the plants, labs, and the Nevada Test Site. One new area of emphasis this year, as most of you know from Tom D'Agostino, is helping to improve the integration of the entire complex, both on the Federal side and with our contractors. We'll also be continuing to work toward the selection of a design for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), which we hope to make in late November, and we will continue to refine our vision for Complex 2030, our long-term plan for the weapons complex. Some of the discussions we have had recently with people inclined to be supporters suggest to me that we need to do some additional work to make sure everyone understands the validity of our approach. Once we've done that work, I'll try and make it available to all of you so that you can see where we're going. I remain convinced that the combination of Complex 2030 and RRW (which I see as completely dependent upon one another) will be something that we will all look back on at the end of our careers as a major step forward, comparable to the creation of the Stockpile Stewardship Program more than a decade ago.

**New Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.** Will Tobey arrived two weeks ago following his confirmation by the Senate to be the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. Secretary Bodman formally swore him in last Thursday. As I told you in my last Lintgram, Will has extensive experience at the National Security Council under three Presidents as well as experience in the Department of Defense and in international negotiations. He is already making it clear what a good choice the President made.

**Voluntary Early Retirement.** We have obtained authority to offer early retirement through September 30, 2007. Those eligible are individuals with 20 years service who are older than 50 and those of any age with 25 years service. Last week's NNSACAST on this subject contains the details on this authority in plain English. Please read it carefully if you are contemplating taking advantage of this program. Also, please understand that NNSA does not have to approve your request.

**September 11.** Everyone in my parents' generation could instantly recall where they were during the attack on Pearl Harbor, even decades after the fact. Everyone in my generation can similarly say where they were when they learned of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. For the rest of our lives, all of us now in the service of our country - indeed all Americans - will remember where we were five years ago this morning when a radical fringe element of a great religion declared war on the United States. As the Secretary's eloquent

message commemorating 9/11 states, while the terrorists destroyed much, "they did not destroy the American ideal, the spirit of liberty that has made this nation a beacon of hope for the world for more than two centuries."

As we pause to remember in sorrow and respect the many individuals who died that day, we also have an obligation to remain determined that, so far as it depends on us, this tragedy will never be repeated. We have a particular privilege and a particular duty because we are in the service of the people and the values of the greatest country in the history of the world. We best honor the memory of the men and women who died that horrible day by recognizing that privilege and embracing that duty. Once again, the Secretary said it best. We must "pay tribute to those whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001, by serving our Nation and its citizens with honor, humility and hope."

I am confident that with dedicated public servants like all of you, America will prevail.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #58

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 3:14 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #58

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 3:14:28 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #58  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The most important and enjoyable thing that I've done these last three weeks was to travel to London with Tom D'Agostino for an event called "STOCKTAKE," our periodic review of nuclear weapons cooperation with the United Kingdom. Many of you are aware of this effort and a few of you are involved. Most, however, are probably unfamiliar with it. We have been engaged in close cooperation, including the sharing of Restricted Data, since 1958. We operate under an agreement signed that year that is simply referred to as the "58 Agreement." It is a remarkable success story because it is one of the longest sustained technical cooperation efforts in an important military area with which I am familiar. I was tremendously impressed by the depth, closeness, and richness of our cooperation. I look forward to hosting our UK partners here in Washington for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of that agreement in 2008.

**The Budget:** The new fiscal year (2007) started on Sunday. As we expected, Congress did not complete work on an appropriations bill before adjourning last Friday. They will return on November 13, following the election. Before departing, they passed a Continuing Resolution (CR) providing a funding mechanism through November 17. The terms of the CR are the same as last year. Basically, we can spend at the lower of the FY 2006 rate or what has passed either House. Since the Senate has not passed an appropriations bill, funding will be based on the lower FY 2006 rate or the House Bill. If Congress is able to provide a final appropriation when they return in November (assuming that the appropriation is close to the President's request), I don't see any significant problems. If, on the other hand, Congress does another CR (as they might), we could be facing some difficult decisions. I'll keep you informed and we will be providing appropriate guidance.

**Physical Security:** Because the Department of Energy (DOE) has so many different sites around the country, it uses a concept called the Design Basis Threat (DBT) to ensure a consistent approach to physical security. The DBT tells the sites what kinds of attacks they must be prepared to deal with, including the numbers of attackers and the equipment and capabilities that we ascribe to them. While based on intelligence, it represents a management policy judgment.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Department went through an extensive review of the DBT and decided to significantly increase both the number and capabilities of the adversaries for which we would prepare. Because of the significant increases involved, we gave ourselves until last Saturday (the last day of fiscal year 2006) to make the necessary improvements, even though we made the decision in 2003 (which is why we refer to it as the 2003 DBT).

Bill Desmond formally certified that his organization has validated that we met the requirements of the 2003 DBT at all of the NNSA sites. As those of you who work in this area know, this has been a massive effort involving Headquarters, the sites, and the contractors. I am very proud of the accomplishment that meeting the 2003 DBT represents and I am extremely appreciative of all the hard work that went into our reaching this important milestone. I was asked once, following some Congressional testimony, what we were doing to counter the threat of a suicide terrorist. I said then-and I believe now-that any terrorists who attack NNSA facilities are suicide terrorists, they just don't know it yet. I'm grateful to all of those who work in security who make it possible for me to make such a strong statement with such confidence.

**People:** I am on travel this week to swear in a couple of senior managers within NNSA and to join Secretary Bodman as he tours Sandia National Laboratories and the Los Alamos National Laboratory. On Tuesday, Tom D'Agostino and I swore in Don White, the Deputy Manager of the Pantex Site Office, as a member of the Senior Executive Service. On Wednesday, Tom and I swore in Craig Tucker as the Assistant Deputy Administrator for Secure Transportation (NA-15) in Albuquerque. He is a retired Marine Colonel who recently served in Iraq and he will continue the high standards of security and performance in the Office of Secure Transportation. Recognizing career milestones is one of the most important things we can do, which is why I consider it an honor to be part of such ceremonies.

**Intelligence and Counterintelligence:** Although Congress has not yet completed work on the appropriations bill, they have completed work on the Defense Authorization Bill which accepts the Administration's recommendation to consolidate all counterintelligence in DOE. The Bill also provides for DOE direction and control of all personnel who are engaged in counterintelligence or intelligence activities. What this means for us is that those NNSA personnel engaged in counterintelligence and/or intelligence activities, both in Headquarters and the field (primarily contractors at the labs and plants), will now be under the direction of the new Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence. I support this consolidation because it has become clear that we will be better off with a seamless counterintelligence organization throughout the Department. At the same time, it is important to understand that while the counterintelligence program will be the responsibility of the Department's Office of Counterintelligence, good counterintelligence practices are an inherent line responsibility and we will need to continue to be vigilant to make sure we are carrying out our responsibilities. We have not yet established a specific date for implementation, but I expect it to be soon. I will keep you informed.

**Moving to a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Nuclear Weapons Enterprise:** Over the next few months, starting right now, we will be taking a number of steps as we continue to try to meet the vision of the President's Nuclear Posture Review with its concept of a truly responsive infrastructure. Among the things we will be doing:

- We are starting pilot projects at Kansas City and at Los Alamos to provide a new model of oversight in areas other than nuclear operations and physical security. We will depend heavily on Contractor Assurance Systems and oversight from contractor parent organizations. At Kansas City, we will make a major effort to use industrial standards and third party certification rather than DOE Orders. This will let us -- I hope -- begin to implement one aspect of the "NNSA of the Future" that we decided on almost four years ago, but which has proven very difficult to implement; namely, a more effective model of oversight based on having the Federal Government decide what needs to be done and having the contractor decide how to do it.



- In late November or early December, we will choose between the two competing designs for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) and make some decisions on what to do next. Both competing designs will provide remarkable improvements in safety, security, reliability, and ease of manufacture. I am extremely excited by the prospect that the RRW will let us make a major transformation in the stockpile and the complex.
- With the start of the fiscal year, we begin the annual performance cycle for our contractors. This year we will include a performance objective for which the contractors will be judged (and rewarded or not rewarded) based on the overall success of the complex. This idea, which comes from Tom D'Agostino, should help us encourage greater integration between the plants and the labs.
- Finally, we will be preparing a clear and detailed statement of our vision for Complex 2030, due to be submitted to Congress on February 1 (essentially with the budget). This will be more difficult than it sounds since there are so many elements of our vision that finding a way to articulate them all in a clear and coherent way will take some skill. George Allen and the Office of Transformation are leading this effort; they will have the opportunity to present our vision and hear from the public at a number of hearings in the next few months.

I'm excited by all of these. I think a few years from now we will all look back and realize that the combination of the RRW and Complex 2030 was a major turning point in our approach to maintaining the nuclear deterrent. I'm also hopeful that it will allow us to take further steps towards the President's vision of reducing the total stockpile to the lowest level consistent with our national security strategy.

That's all I have for now.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #59

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, October 30, 2006 9:24 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #59

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 30, 2006 9:24:13 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #59  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

As you can tell from reading the papers and watching the news, this has been a very busy time for many of us. We have had an extremely serious security breach at one of our laboratories. Because there is an ongoing law enforcement investigation, I don't want to provide a lot of details. While the Secretary and I are expecting the laboratory to take the lead in identifying and correcting any weaknesses, the Inspector General and NNSA are also involved in determining what happened. In particular, we are looking to see whether there are steps that the laboratory or we should have taken to prevent the incident. I suspect there will be significant lessons learned for the entire complex once the investigation is completed. I'll keep you informed.

**North Korea's Nuclear Test.** On October 8, North Korea announced that it had tested a nuclear weapon, becoming the eighth state to conduct such a test and the first state that did so following withdrawal from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The United States is working through diplomatic channels to reverse this decision. It is not clear what role there will be for the Department of Energy with regards to North Korea in the future. Secretary Bodman is, of course, participating with other Cabinet officers in policy deliberations. At a minimum, this action intensifies the importance of the work we do under Second Line of Defense and Megaports to counter nuclear smuggling. In the longer term, there may be other important calls for detection technology associated with nuclear weapons and nuclear materials. Such technology is the unique province of NNSA. Above all, this test should remind us that we are in an inherently complicated and dangerous world. That is why the work we do is so important.

**Milestones.** Someone once said that half of life is just showing up. I get to show up from time to time to help mark important milestones. Two occurred recently. On October 18, I took part in a ceremony where Naval Reactors handed over the former site of the S1C Nuclear Prototype. S1C was built in the 1950s and was used to train thousands of officers and enlisted personnel in nuclear power. It has been restored to the point where it is suitable for completely unrestricted use. This is the first time a former government-owned nuclear power plant has been restored to this degree. It is a solid accomplishment by our Naval Reactors colleagues.

On October 20, I took part in groundbreaking ceremonies for the National Museum of Nuclear Science and Technology (formerly called the National Atomic Museum) in Albuquerque. The new quarters for this well-known museum will help preserve the legacy of the first 60 years of the atomic age. The museum has always been an excellent one, covering both the defense and non-defense aspects of nuclear energy. It will now be even greater. We expect it to be open to the public in about two years.

**Accomplishments.** I am delighted to congratulate several NNSA senior executives on their designation by the President as Meritorious Executives. They include: Bill Brumley, recently retired Site Manager at Y-12; Dave Crandall, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Research Development and Simulation in DP; Dan Glenn, Manager of the Pantex Site Office; Karen Henneberger of Naval Reactors; and, Kathy Izell, Chief Counsel at the Nevada Site Office. Meritorious Executives are recognized by the President as the very best of the Nation's civil servants. There is, however, one Presidential rank that is even higher. This year, the President named Tyler Przybylek, NNSA's Acting Chief Operating Officer, as a Distinguished Executive. This is the highest honor a career civil servant can receive. It is well deserved, as anyone who has ever worked with Tyler would agree.

Finally, an honor of a quite different kind came to Secretary Bodman. He was recently elected to the National Academy of Engineering. This recognition by the engineering community of Dr. Bodman's technical and leadership capabilities is extremely well-deserved. As most of you know, one cannot apply for membership in the National Academy of Engineering, as nominations are submitted by one's peers. This election reinforces what all of us know, how fortunate the Department is to have someone with such strong technical credentials as Secretary.

**Safety.** I want to spend a fair amount of this Lintgram talking about safety. I meet periodically with the Laboratory Directors, usually with Tom D'Agostino and Will Tobey taking part. In our last meeting, we discussed some possible confusion over safety. It got me to thinking about my own experiences as I travel around the complex. As I talk to people, I hear some disturbing myths about safety. First, I hear that safety is in conflict with mission. People assert that safety rules keep them from getting the job done efficiently. Second, I sometimes hear people speak of safety in terms of making sure that we are complying with the Code of Federal Regulations or with DOE Orders or with laboratory and plant directives. With this attitude, some feel that as long as we check all the boxes, we have achieved "safety."

I think both of these attitudes represent a serious misunderstanding. Safety is very simple. It means that the same number of people who walk in the door in the morning walk out of the door that night and do so without getting hurt. That sounds obvious, but we sometimes lose sight of it. That is why we keep emphasizing that safety is everyone's responsibility, because we are trying to prevent everybody from getting hurt.

The claim that safety is in conflict with mission accomplishment is simply wrong. Quite the reverse is true. Working safely is the best way to get our mission done. The time we use taking steps to prevent injury is small compared to the time lost if injuries occur. Further, paying attention to safety often makes the job easier. One example of this is Seamless Safety for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century at the Pantex Plant, where tooling designed to improve safety also makes production tasks easier. More generally, I believe Integrated Safety Management (ISM) improves both safety and productivity. That's why we are encouraging efforts to improve the implementation of ISM throughout the Department.

Viewing "safety" as synonymous with rule compliance is another serious error. We require things like hazard analysis, lock-out and tag-out procedures, and proper work authorization because years of experience throughout the DOE complex and throughout industry have shown that these are the best ways to keep people from getting hurt. Smart people learn from their experiences. Really smart people learn from the experiences of others. That is what we try to do when we put safety practices into effect through formal directives and through ISM. The first safety course I ever attended (several decades ago) was on ammunition safety for Navy guns. On the first day, the first chart we saw contained the words "Ordinance Safety Regulations Are Written In Blood."

So are many other safety regulations. We want compliance with safety procedures, not because compliance is a particular virtue but, because it is the best way to ensure safety. If we find that there are procedures that we have imposed on ourselves that don't add to real safety, we need to get that word up through the chain of command and we will get them changed.

A wise friend of mine once said that the most common form of stupidity is forgetting what you are trying to do. Don't let that happen to you in the safety area. The tools that we promulgate through regulations and directives are means to an end, but the end is simple. It is to make sure we all get to go home at the end of the day.

**Combined Federal Campaign (CFC).** On October 16, the Department held the formal kick-off of the Headquarters CFC. I suspect that most of you in the field have begun your campaigns as well. Filling out my pledge card and thinking about how I want my contribution distributed always makes me feel like a philanthropist. I know it is no substitute for the hands-on volunteer work that so many of you do, but contributing to CFC is something all of us can do. Participating in the CFC is truly voluntary. But it is a great way to help people. I hope all of you will take advantage of it.

**Voting.** On November 7, you will have an opportunity that has been denied to most individuals throughout human history. You will have the chance to vote for the leadership of the country and, in many cases, for your state and local leadership. The United States has always taken the view that voting is a voluntary act (unlike some countries in which it is a legal obligation). I am forbidden by law from seeking to coerce anyone to vote or not to vote. I am not, however, forbidden from encouraging you very strongly to vote. All elections are important. We choose the representatives who will establish policy that will affect all Americans. It is easy to assume that one person's vote doesn't count, but there are many counter examples, particularly in state and local races. Decisions are made by those who show up. Decisions about our government are made by those who vote. I urge you to take advantage of this special privilege.

That's all I have for now. Don't forget to vote.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:52 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #60

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2006 10:23 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #60

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2006 10:22:53 AM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #60  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

For me, as for most Americans, the biggest news in the last three weeks was the election. Because for much of my adult life I was a military officer who voted by absentee ballot, I still get an irrational thrill from going to a polling place early in the morning and standing in line to cast my vote. It is striking to think that the ability to participate in a meaningful election has been rare in human history and remains limited even in today's world.

Whatever your view of the election results, this election is further confirmation of the importance of voting. As I write this, there are still several Congressional races that are too close to call and others that were decided by fewer votes than the size of our average site office. Keep that in mind for the next election.

While the change of control in Congress is obviously important to the country, it is not yet clear what it will mean for our work in NNSA. While there are some obvious philosophical differences between the two parties on nuclear weapons issues, in most cases, support for or opposition to specific NNSA programs does not break down on partisan lines.

Congress, however, does much of its work in committees. We could, and probably will, see some new faces on the relevant committees and in important chairmanships. In many cases, those new leaders will bring new staff members with them. We won't know the final lineup until January, and it will take a little while for us to establish relationships with the new players. Thus, it could be some time before we have a good sense of the degree to which things will change under the new Congress. Fortunately, most of our programs have strong support from both Republicans and Democrats for the excellent reason that they are clearly seen as important to the security of the country. Until we know more, I think we should just keep on doing our jobs and not worry very much about things we can't control.

**Budget.** Congress came back in session briefly the week after the election. As predicted, however, they did not deal with Appropriations bills. One reason is that the Congress was focused on organizing itself to reflect the

elections. Therefore, we will continue to operate under a Continuing Resolution, which will carry us through December 8. There will probably be an attempt to enact Appropriations for the rest of the year when the Congress comes back for the December lame duck session, but I don't know whether that will actually happen. I'll keep you informed.

**Delayed Award Payments.** One result of operating under a Continuing Resolution is a need to manage specific accounts more closely. Because of uncertainty over final budget levels, the Secretary has decided to defer payment of performance-based awards and discretionary pay adjustments. I know this is disappointing to many of you, but it is the right thing to do. If we go forward and guess wrong about the final appropriations levels, we could find ourselves facing the need for draconian measures like furloughs or layoffs. DOE employees are paid from many different appropriations and the seriousness of the shortfalls varies across the Department. That is why we concluded that the only fair thing to do is to apply the deferrals uniformly. I hope Congress will act quickly in December so we can resume these payments.

**Project Management Excellence.** On November 15, the Department held a Project Management Conference for approximately 300 contractor project managers and Federal project directors. I had the pleasure of being there as the Deputy Secretary presented several awards, including two to NNSA. Herman LeDoux of the Los Alamos Site Office accepted an award for the National Security Sciences Building at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, while Anita Zenger stood in for Sam Brinker of the Livermore Site Office to receive an award for the Terascale Simulation Facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

It is always important and enjoyable to see excellence recognized. Because so many people in NNSA perform so well, I get to do that a lot. But it may be particularly important in the area of project management. Probably no single thing hurts the Department's overall reputation more than the persistent belief that it cannot manage (and in some cases cannot even complete) large-scale projects. One measure of the importance we place on improving project management is that both the Secretary and Deputy Secretary addressed the Project Management Conference. In the nearly two years they have been here, this is the first time they have addressed the same internal conference. They did it because they wanted to stress how important they believe project management is. Thus, it was particularly gratifying to me to see two of our projects cited in this important area.

**Complex 2030.** As we move forward with our vision of a transformed nuclear weapons complex, one important step is to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act. We are about a third of the way through a series of public meetings on this initiative. Ted Wyka, under George Allen's overall leadership, has been doing an excellent job chairing these sessions. In general, comments have included support from community and business leaders coupled with a larger number of objections from those who oppose the retention of nuclear weapons at all. In addition to meeting our legal obligations, these meetings help promote an understanding by the public of what we are planning. In a democracy, such understanding is particularly important.

**Thanksgiving.** This week, Americans throughout the land will once again celebrate Thanksgiving. Most will gather with families for this particularly American holiday, which is tied to history and rich with family traditions. I hope that all of you will be able to be with your loved ones. We have much to be thankful for. Most of us are in good health and all of us have the privilege of living in and serving the greatest country in the history of the world. As you gather for food, laughter, and conversation, I hope you will remember two groups who face the holiday in more demanding circumstances. One is our military men and women who are far from home on this holiday, serving their country in Iraq, in Afghanistan, at sea, and, at bases around the globe. Among the many things we should be thankful for is their service. The second group I hope you will remember are the less fortunate among us. Fortunately, we can do something about this second group through the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC). If you've not already done so, I hope you will take some time this Thanksgiving to consider making a contribution to the CFC.

That's all I have for now. I hope you and your families have a wonderful Thanksgiving.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:52 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #61

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Monday, December 18, 2006 1:44 PM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE FEDS ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS FEDS ; (DL) SO-SANDIA FEDS ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 FEDS ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER FEDS ; (DL) SO-PANTEX FEDS ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Lintgram #61

---

**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 18, 2006 1:43:58 PM  
**Subject:** Lintgram #61  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

One of the most important things that NNSA has been doing in the last few weeks is reshaping the Nuclear Weapons Enterprise and the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile for the long-term future. The twin vehicles for this reshaping are the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) and the modernized weapons complex we call Complex 2030. We have moved forward on both fronts in the past few weeks. On Complex 2030, we have finished a series of public hearings on the scope of the legally required programmatic environmental impact statement, a massive analysis of the consequences of different options. This analysis will let us formally make the decision on the aspects of the new complex including, for example, where the proposed Consolidated Plutonium Center might be located.

An important feature of the new complex will be to eliminate the need for environmentally difficult materials such as beryllium and for dangerous forms of conventional high explosives. Our vehicle for doing that is the RRW. Recently, the Nuclear Weapons Council formally concluded that this is a feasible concept and that we should move forward with it. I expect in the next month I will be providing you with some additional details on how we are going to proceed. The RRW will improve safety and security, assure reliability over the long haul, ease manufacturing and repair, and be capable of being certified for deployment without underground nuclear testing. The two excellent competing designs by New Mexico and California teams (Los Alamos and Sandia-New Mexico, Livermore and Sandia-California) both offer major improvements. Already, the experience of creating these preliminary designs has reinvigorated the weapons design community.

We have a long way to go both technically, programmatically, and in ensuring Congressional support, but I am very optimistic that we are on a path that will actually deserve that overused Washington word "transformational." You will be hearing a lot more about this from me in the coming months.

**Budget.** In almost every Lintgram, I tell you that the budget situation is unclear but that I hope it will clarify soon. This one will be no exception. As you know, the Congress adjourned without passing any of the



Appropriations bills other than Defense and Homeland Security. It provided a so-called Continuing Resolution to allow us to keep operating until February 15. The leadership of the new Congress has announced that it will not attempt to pass the remaining Appropriations bills but will act quickly to extend that Continuing Resolution for the entire year.

This sounds like a clear plan, but there are a number of loose ends. The Congressional leadership has indicated that it will seek to deal with "anomalies" in the current situation (for example, where there is a dramatic change between last year's spending level and the spending level passed by one house or where new starts have not been formally authorized). Thus, we do not yet know just how much "tweaking" there will be on this year long Continuing Resolution. We could find ourselves operating under exactly the same rules we're operating under today or operating under similar constraints but with more flexibility or with something that, while called a Continuing Resolution, has some of the features of an Omnibus Appropriations bill. The strategy of the new Congressional leadership is to get this one behind them quickly; I hope that we will know the answer to these questions relatively soon after the first of the year. Predicting Congress, however, especially a new Congress and especially in areas involving money, is not particularly easy. My assessment right now is that we aren't facing any major problems through January and I think that we are very likely to have a resolution of some kind by then. As always, I'll keep you informed.

Meanwhile, we are in the final stages of preparing the budget that the President will submit in early February for the fiscal year that begins October 1, 2007. I'm generally satisfied with what I think will be the final outcome, although there are obviously going to be individual programs facing significant challenges. In general, the Office of Management and Budget accepted our priorities for spending but, for a variety of reasons, I think we will find some aspects of this budget reasonably austere. Since there is no budget until the President gives his final approval, I'm going to follow my practice of past years by not talking about details until the budget is released on February 5.

**Pay Banding Pilot Project.** Some of you may have heard about an NNSA/Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Pilot Demonstration Project to modify and waive parts of the Government's Title 5 personnel laws and regulations with respect to pay banding and performance-based pay increases. In a very broad sense, this initiative is going to set up an alternative personnel system that includes pay banding and pay for performance for all of NNSA's GS employees.

We are currently waiting for OPM to approve the final project proposal and publish a notice in the Federal Register. Once we have approval, we will officially announce the effort and provide introductory information in an NNSACAST. Next, all of NNSA's employees will be invited to participate (in person, by video-conference, or by teleconference) in a jointly-led NNSA/OPM public hearing in which employees and the public at large can provide questions and comments on the project. Following the public hearing, we will respond to the questions and comments, make any necessary changes to the project proposal, and publish the final Demonstration Project regulations in the Federal Register. After all of these important steps have been taken, the Demonstration Project Team will begin holding the first of many briefings introducing NNSA's employees to the Demonstration Project. Employee briefings are likely to occur in the spring and summer of calendar year 2007, with implementation expected no later than October 1, 2007.

We need to complete all of these steps before employees receive any formal briefings or training because changes may continue to be made to the final project proposal until it is published in the Federal Register. I want to keep you informed, but I don't want incorrect information floating around. Thus, to ensure consistency in communications, I've asked NNSA's senior leadership to limit any formal discussion on the Demonstration Project until we are ready to begin briefing employees. This is an exciting project and I think it will help improve management of NNSA. You'll hear lots more in the next few months.

**Combined Federal Campaign and Toys for Tots.** Once again, we have shown how generous the men and women of NNSA are. We had spectacular participation in the CFC and handily met our goal, exceeding the Department's average for both participation and average gift. Last week I watched as boxes after boxes of Toys for Tots were turned over to the Marine Corps for distribution to less fortunate children. We've had similar results in the field. I'm really proud of all of you.

That's all I have for now. Next week is Christmas. For some of us, this is a day with important religious significance. For others, it is a day for family and fellowship and fun. For still others, it's just another day. Whatever Christmas may mean to you, I hope the peace and happiness traditional to the season embrace you and your family. As you enjoy your holiday, remember the service men and women deployed around the globe far from their families protecting America - protecting us - this Christmas season. Thanks for making 2006 such a productive year for the NNSA and best of wishes for a happy, successful, healthy, and prosperous New Year.

Linton

## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Brooks, Linton  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 07, 2002 9:11 PM  
**To:** Andrew Bieniawski (E-mail); Aoki, Steven; Byrd, Phyllis; 'Cindy Lersten' (E-mail); DL-NN ALL; Fitzgerald, Cherie; Jonas, Dave; McCarthy, Maureen; Przybylek, Tyler; Baker, Ken; Barker, William; Beckner, Everet; DeGrasse, Robert; Erickson, Ralph; Haeckel, Ronald; Kuckuck, Robert; Lane, Anthony; Aleksey Vladimirovsky (E-mail); Anatoly Dianov (E-mail); Christine Buzzard (E-mail); Elena Spitskaya (E-mail); Elena Thomas (E-mail); Irina Aksanova (E-mail); Karina Paredes (E-mail); Looney Heather (E-mail); Marina Gladilina (E-mail); Masha Bazarkina (E-mail); Mikhail Tsiklauri (E-mail); Nicholas Carlson (E-mail); Sergey Kolistratov (E-mail); Sonya Shefer (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Lintgram - 7/7

Obviously, everything else I have to tell you pales beside the news of General Gordon's departure. As you know, last week, the President asked the Secretary of Energy to release General Gordon so that the General could become the Deputy National Security Advisor for Counterterrorism. This is a hugely important job involving both the National Security and Homeland Security sides of the White House. General Gordon, with his broad experience at the White House, in the Intelligence community, and throughout government, along with his collegial approach to decision making will be a superb choice. That said, his departure leaves a significant hole at NNSA.

As many of you know, the Secretary of Energy, with White House approval, has designated me to be the Acting Administrator of NNSA. I have no idea how long I will be serving as the acting NA-1. Because General Gordon's departure was both sudden and unexpected, there has not yet been a serious look yet at the permanent replacement. Given the time consuming nature of the confirmation process, I expect I will have to hold down the front office fort for several months, probably until early spring. Once, a new Administrator is named, I expect to be back full time at NA-20.

I have an advantage that General Gordon did not: I have a knowledgeable full-time Deputy already in place in the person of Ken Baker. (One of the reasons it was necessary to designate me to act as NNSA Administrator is that, although Congress has approved a full-time Principal Deputy to General Gordon, no one has yet been named and confirmed for that post.) I expect to turnover much of the day-to-day running of NA-20 to Ken. Ken and I are still working out exactly what the appropriate arrangements will be. We are fortunate to have someone with Ken's knowledge and experience able to step in. Because I expect to be back in NA-20 on a full-time basis in a few months, I intend to stay plugged in as much as I can. Since the Administrator's job is a full-time one (especially given that I have not been paying as much attention to other parts of NNSA as I have been to NA-20), I am not yet completely sure how I am going to do this. I'll try to keep you informed. Meanwhile I can move down the hall temporarily secure in the knowledge that we have an extremely strong NA-20 organization moving in the right direction.

**Retirement Ceremonies.** While General Gordon's departure is the most important thing I have to talk to you about, it isn't the only thing. I was pleased so many of you were able to join us for the retirement ceremonies for Bob Waldron and John Rooney. I am told that DOE does not have a tradition of conducting formal retirement ceremonies. I think that attitude is a mistake and I hope, over the years that I am here to change it within NA-20 (and perhaps within NNSA). Retirement ceremonies are important for two reasons. First, they give us an opportunity to recognize a lifetime of accomplishments. We ought to honor people who have done difficult work well simply because they deserve to be honored. But retirement ceremonies also are an opportunity to remind those of us who are left of the importance of our work and the fact that by spending a

lifetime in National Security and Nonproliferation, we are doing something that important in service of a larger purpose - the security of our country and the stability of the world. Because our work - like anyone's work - has its share of frustrations and its mundane aspects, it is important to remind ourselves of that fact from time to time.

**Russians.** Ten days ago we had two days of successful and productive discussions with a high level team from the Russian Federation. General Gordon and I led discussions on disposing of additional plutonium and uranium. I was pleased by the seriousness with which the Russians took the whole exercise, although there are both technical and political obstacles to overcome. Under Secretary Card and Bill Magwood (from the Nuclear Energy shop) led parallel discussions on the potential for cooperation in Advanced Nuclear Fuel Cycles. They too found the Russians interested and eager. We will be following up on these discussions in a few weeks and hope to have some interim report for Secretary Abraham when he travels to Moscow at the end of July.

**Training.** I sent out a note on some NA-25 training that is also available to others. As I look ahead I see little chance of getting a major increase in our funds for external training either this year or next. That means we are going to have to grow our own. This is an excellent example.

**Hill fellowships.** One thing we have been able to do in the training area this year is have Michelle Dash and Sarah Lennon spend a few months as Congressional fellows. Sarah and Michele have agreed to talk about their experiences on July 24 from 12PM to 1PM in room GH-027. We'll get more information out closer to the event, but you might want to mark your calendar now.

That's all I have this week. It's been a while since I sent one of these; I have been delaying sending you anything on this awaiting a formal designation as acting NNSA administrator. That designation appears to be hung up in the paperwork mill. Since General Gordon's departure is Monday 8 July (i.e. today) I thought I had better get something out.

Hope you all had a nice Fourth of July.

Linton

**From:** NNSACAST HQ  
**Sent:** Friday, August 30, 2002 9:35 AM  
**To:** NNSACAST; nnsa-concast; nnsa-fedcast; NNSAAL; NNSAALCON; allcontrnnsa; allnnsafedemp  
**Subject:** Lintgram NNSA#1, Ambassador Brooks Thoughts august 30, 2002 Recorded

## Lintgram NNSA#1

As I told you in my opening remarks upon being appointed Acting Administrator, I place a lot of value on communication. I think it is easy for rumors to get started in large organizations and that communication is particularly important in time of change. Therefore I am instituting a device I have used before -- periodic, informal e-mails from me to the entire NNSA family. I have called these e-mails "Lintgrams" in the past and will continue to use that name now. It is meant to stress that these are personal communications from me (I write them myself) and that they are informal in nature.

No one is required to read these messages. There will never be formal policies in a Lintgrams that aren't officially promulgated elsewhere. The title will always use the word Lintgram, so if you don't find these kinds of communications useful, simply delete them. I expect to use them to tell you what's on my mind, what I'm worried about, what I see us facing at NNSA, what I want to make sure you know about. As a practical matter I can't get into a one-on-one dialogue with 2000 people, so this is an opportunity to at least share some of my thinking. I will be sending them out somewhere between every 3 to 4 weeks, but my track record suggest that I'm not always precise in the timing.

**Re-engineering and Rumors.** I know that there are a number of rumors floating through the complex about re-engineering, downsizing, etc. Here's where we stand:

- There is a wide-spread view both inside the executive branch and on the Hill that NNSA is too large and too bureaucratic.
- As a result, we are engaged in a reengineering exercise to try to streamline the organization and consolidate functions where appropriate.
- That effort has already resulted in the decision to remove a layer of management by having Site Offices (formerly Area Offices) report directly to headquarters and eliminating OPS offices from the chain of command.
- The OPS offices will be transformed into new Service Centers providing support to the whole complex for those things which need not been done individually at each site. We don't know yet how many service centers there will be.
- Now we are looking at functions to decide where each function should be conducted. The object is to eliminate duplication where we can. Right now, we are doing this purely on a functional basis; we haven't gotten to the question of individual jobs or individual people.

- We are resisting any attempts to set a pre-determined outcome for this process. Still, everybody believes that re-engineering will result in a smaller NNSA.
- We have based our upcoming budget on the assumption of at least a 20% personnel reduction over the next five years. We don't, however, know where that reduction will be taken. The whole logic of re-engineering suggest that we won't simply apply some mandatory uniform reduction. Instead we will figure out what we want as a complex to look like in a few years and then work towards that.

**What does this mean for individuals?** The honest answer is I don't know yet. Almost certainly some people will find that the function they are performing is still crucial but now is performed in another place. While we will try to work things out considering people's preferences, we may need some directed re-assignments. As a practical matter, since moves cost money, any such reassignments will take place over a few years. Other people may find that the function that they have been performing is one we have decided is redundant. We will try to deal with the consequences of eliminating positions by offering inducements to encourage higher than normal attrition. A number of you have already expressed interest in a potential buy-out in FY 2003.

A complicating feature involves money. In the long run, re-engineering will make NNSA more efficient, more effective, more dynamic and less expensive. It will let us free-up money for areas like training that we have been under-funding. Unfortunately, in the short term moving people and buying out people costs money. The cost are always in the current year the savings are frequently in future years. That means that will be hard for us to implement this and realize immediate savings. Yet the Congress is looking to see those savings in the near term. I don't know exactly how I'm going to square this particular circle yet.

The situation is still further complicated by the uncertain state of next year's budget. The House reduced Program Direction (which pays for all federal salaries) by a significant amount. The Senate accepted the President's budget. Obviously I hope that the Senate position will prevail when the House and Senate Appropriations Committees meet in conference. Unfortunately, I have no idea when that will be. This means that we will need to think about how we approach all this if we are forced to live with the lower House level.

By now you will have concluded that we have a plan (which is true) but we don't know whether funding will support that plan (which is also true). I wish that I could tell you that I am certain that we will get the funding to do all of this in an orderly manner. Unfortunately, I can't. If we are forced to live with the House mark then we may need to look at more drastic ways to cut funding. I simply don't know yet.

I was tempted to simply ignore this topic in my first message to you. After all, I know I haven't quieted any of your concerns. I have decided, however, that I would prefer to let you know what is happening even when there is uncertainty involved then to simply be

quiet and let multiple rumors abound. I'll try to keep you informed as we work through this difficult issue.

**Homeland Security.** Although the final legislation creating the new Department of Homeland Security has not yet been enacted by the Congress, there seems little doubt that it will be passed in September. The Administration expects to stand up the new department on January 1, 2003. Therefore, the Administration has formed a transition team without waiting for passage of the legislation. The NNSA chief scientist, Maureen McCarthy, is the Department of Energy representative on this team. One of her important responsibilities will be to help work out the details of the relationship between DOE/NNSA and the new department. Although the standing up of the Department of Homeland Security is tremendously important to the country, most of us will see little change day-to-day. The new department will establish standards and provide direction for the operational employment of our emergency response assets. Some specific research and development, now conducted under the Nonproliferation program, will move to the new department. But overall most of us will see no change. In the longer term, I think that the intention is to have the new department have equal standing with DOE/NNSA as a customer for the laboratories. That could have some implications that we have not yet fully addressed. I'm relatively relaxed about this whole process; it's good for the country, the approach preserves NNSA equity, and we have an extremely strong representative on the transition team.

**Management Council.** Well before I got here John Gordon established a Management Council consisting of the two Deputy Administrators (Defense Programs and Nonproliferation) and the two Associate Administrators (Facilities and Operations and Management and Administration), chaired by the Principal Deputy. The idea was so that the council would discuss and resolve cross-cutting issues and, where they couldn't solve them, would forward issues for discussion to the Administrator. Because I don't have a Principal Deputy, I have decided to chair the Management Council myself. Further, in order to insure as candid a process as possible, I've decided to limit attendance fairly severely. Our approach will be to reach consensus where we can and to give me pros and cons for decision where we can't. I'll try to find a way to communicate what we have and haven't decided, perhaps in these Lintgrams, perhaps through some other mechanism.

**Overall Situation.** Overall, despite the turbulence inevitable in re-engineering, I think that we are doing very well indeed. We appear to have very good credibility with the Secretary. We are increasingly working well with the rest of the Department (although there will always be some tension associated with our semi-autonomous, separately-organized status). The first true Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Evaluation (PPBE) summer programming process was widely praised as a success and, I hope, will over time let us get a better control of our out-year destiny. And of course I continue to be hugely impressed by the knowledge, competence, professionalism, and enthusiasm of all NNSA people, both Federal and contractor. I am convinced that we will get through re-engineering with as little disruption as possible and that the improvements that we are making will result in an even stronger NNSA.

That's all I have for you this week. I hope all of you were able to take a little time off during the so called "August lull." I got away for a week with my family and enjoyed it immensely. Even workaholics like time off!

More later. Have a nice Labor Day weekend.



## Perez, Delilah

---

**From:** Stotts, Al  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:53 PM  
**To:** Stotts, Al  
**Subject:** FW: Final Lintgram

---

**From:** NNSACAST Federal  
**Sent:** Friday, January 19, 2007 7:33 AM  
**To:** (DL) SC-EMPL FEDERAL ; (DL) SC-TENANTS FEDS ; (DL) SO-LIVERMORE Feds ; (DL) SO-LOS ALAMOS Feds ; (DL) SO-SANDIA Feds ; (DL) DOE-NTC ; (DL) SO-Y12 Feds ; (DL) SO-SAVANNAH RIVER Feds ; (DL) SO-PANTEX Feds ; (DL) EMFederal  
**Subject:** FW: Final Lintgram

-----  
**From:** NNSACAST HQ[[SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV](mailto:SMTP:NNSACAST@NNSA.DOE.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 19, 2007 7:33:03 AM  
**Subject:** Final Lintgram  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Final Lintgram

At the end of the day today, I will step down as Administrator and turn over my responsibilities to Tom D'Agostino. Within a few days I will leave Government service, probably for the last time. During my tenure, I have sent a number of Lintgrams to all of you. In those messages, I have provided you as much information as I could. People deserve to understand what is going on and perform better when they do. Far more importantly, however, I have tried to convey to you my vision for NNSA, the values I want the organization to embody, and my pride in all of you.

Management experts say the head of an organization should focus on establishing a vision, picking the top leaders, and allocating resources. My interests are too eclectic for me to limit myself to those alone, but I have tried to focus on all three. I am especially proud of the leadership team we have assembled. Tom is one of the best of those leaders. I know he will do a wonderful job until the President selects a permanent Administrator. I am pleased to be leaving NNSA in such good hands.

I have been gratified, overwhelmed, and humbled by the number of you who have expressed your best wishes as I depart. I thank you. If you really want to honor my service, keep working toward our common goals. I had planned to leave in 2009, and hoped that by then: the RRW and Complex 2030 would have been firmly established; we would have completed our scheduled nonproliferation work; our plants would be more efficient; Los Alamos would have solved its current problems; the Livermore transition would have gone smoothly; the Sandia Model Contract would be effective; our oversight model would be accepted and effective; and, above all, that we would have continued our progress toward making the "NNSA of the Future" the best place to work in Government. You can still do all of that. Nothing would make me happier than to look at NNSA when the President's term comes to an end and know that you had done so.

Early in the morning on June 8, 1959, under a brilliant blue sky, I stood on the steps of the great Gothic Chapel at Duke University in my new Navy dress whites and promised to "Support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies...and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same." I thought then that I was embarking on three years of military service before returning to a life of research. Instead, I spent 47½ exciting years serving America, culminating in the incredible privilege and joy of leading NNSA and working with all of

you. It would be foolish to pretend that this is the way I wanted that service to come to an end, but if I had known from the beginning that it would end this way, I would not have hesitated a minute.

Thank you for all you have done for me, for NNSA, and above all for America; which, with all the challenges she faces, is still the greatest country in the history of the world. I will miss you more than you can imagine and I am prouder of you than words can tell. God bless you all, God bless NNSA, and above all may God continue to bless America with dedicated public servants like you.

Good-bye.

Linton