



**Closeout Presentations**

**Director's CD-2 Mini-Review**  
**of the NOvA Project**

**April 17, 2008**

This page intentionally left blank

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary ..... 5

1.0 Introduction..... 6

2.0 Charge Questions ..... 7

    2.1 Does the revised scope, cost, and schedule baseline fit within the revised funding profile provided by OHEP? ..... 7

    2.2 Does this revised baseline meet / respond to the Recommendations (those that are appropriate to address at this time) of the DOE/OHEP Lehman Review? ..... 8

    2.3 Does this revised baseline meet / respond to the Recommendations of the DOE External Independent Review (EIR) Recommendations? Including, has NOvA provided updated responses as applicable to the 17 Lines of Inquiry (where there are changes as a result of the Omnibus Budget)? Evaluate where NOvA stands on developing responses in the EIR CAP (Corrective Action Plan). ..... 9

    2.4 Is the Environmental Assessment on track for completion? As a minimum, has it been submitted for public comment?..... 10

This page intentionally left blank

## **Executive Summary**

The NOvA project team has updated their Baseline Documentation in response to OHEP funding guidance post the FY2008 Omnibus Budget which zeroed out construction funding for NOvA in FY2008.

This revised Baseline Documentation

- “fits” within the revised funding profile provided by OHEP; some fine tuning is still needed to get detailed balance between the cumulative obligations and cumulative BA – Budget Authority,
- responds well to Recommendations of the DOE/OHEP Lehman Review, and
- responds well to the EIR Recommendations; the response forms the basis of an EIR CAP (Corrective Action Plan).

The committee recommends fine tuning some of the NOvA written responses to the two reviews mentioned above to make them as constructively responsive to the recommendations as possible.

Also, the Environmental Assessment and NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) process seems well on the track for completion. The Draft EA was recently published for public comment.

The Director’s Review Committee believes that NOvA can be in good shape for a DOE/OHEP Lehman Mini-Review in approximately two weeks and an EIR follow-up.

## **1.0 Introduction**

A Director's CD-2 Mini-Review of the NOvA Project was held on April 17, 2008. This review assessed NOvA's baseline proposal, which has been revised to incorporate changes resulting from the recent budget cut and recommendations from the prior reviews. The committee evaluated if the revised cost and schedule baseline proposal to determine if it is appropriate and ready for a follow-up Lehman Independent Project Review (IPR) and an External Independent Review (EIR). The assessment of the Review Committee is document in the body of this closeout presentation with answers to the four charge questions and a few Recommendations. These Recommendations are actions that should be addressed by the NOvA Project Team.

## **2.0 Charge Questions**

### **2.1 Does the revised scope, cost, and schedule baseline fit within the revised funding profile provided by OHEP?**

Primary Writer: Peter Wilson

Contributors: Fran Clark, Marc Kaducak

The revised obligation profile and schedule fit the funding profile from OHEP with the following caveat. The funding profile by OHEP for 2008 includes \$2.3M for the Cooperative Agreement which was taken back. If this is not restored some tasks in FY09-10 will need to be deferred to match the funding profile.

The profile shown includes contingency within each of the level 2 tasks. There is an additional \$10.5M of overall contingency which is not shown explicitly in the profile.

#### **Recommendations**

1. Show the “additional contingency” explicitly in the obligation profile.
2. Ensure that the sum of the total of the funding and obligation is equal at the end of the project, and that the summed obligations do not exceed the summed funding through any year.

## **2.2 Does this revised baseline meet / respond to the Recommendations (those that are appropriate to address at this time) of the DOE/OHEP Lehman Review?**

Primary Writer: Mike Lindgren

Contributors: Peter Wilson

Yes, The project responded to all recommendations from the Oct. DOE review in a substantive manner. There were comments and recommendations on all level 2 sections, and all were addressed. Especially notable is the progress on the EA and UM MOU.

### **Recommendations**

3. Restrict the responses to the review questions to straightforward declarations of fact. Examples of responses to recommendations that could be condensed are:

DOE rec – 2.1 Consider decoupling the production of the commodities from the construction and occupancy of the Ash River detector building.

Example condensation:

**Done** - This is now a backup plan should funding be delayed. The suggested decoupling requires storage space to be rented, so there is a trade-off that has to be evaluated once the specific conditions are known.

DOE Rec – 4.3 - DOE/CH, the Fermi Site Office, and Fermilab/NOvA parties, in coordination with the University of Minnesota, need to provide all necessary and sustained effort required to ensure that the NEPA process is successfully completed. NOvA can then address any comments on the EA that may arise during the state/public comment period in Illinois, and move successfully on to the next stage.

Example condensation:

**Done/in progress** - Progress has been steady, and we are close to finally having a completed document. The EA was sent out for public comment on March 27, 2008. There are no comments from the public to date, but the project is prepared to address them when they are received.

**2.3 Does this revised baseline meet / respond to the Recommendations of the DOE External Independent Review (EIR) Recommendations? Including, has NOvA provided updated responses as applicable to the 17 Lines of Inquiry (where there are changes as a result of the Omnibus Budget)? Evaluate where NOvA stands on developing responses in the EIR CAP (Corrective Action Plan).**

Primary Writer: Bill Boroski

Contributors: Fran Clark, Marc Kaducak

The recommendations, finding and observations from the EIR appear to be adequately addressed in the revised baseline. In addition, the project has developed a complete EIR Corrective Action Plan and have completed the actions required in response to all major findings. Responses were presented for each Major Finding, Finding, and Observation, and documented in “Consolidated Review Recommendations and Responses” (NOvA-doc-3079). Some additional effort may be required to revise some responses to improve clarity and objectivity.

**Recommendations**

4. Review and where necessary revise responses in the EIR Corrective Action Plan to improve clarity and objectivity.

For example:

Slide 36: Risk Management – Acknowledge the potential existence of programmatic risks associated with the capabilities/performance of University of Minnesota, but note the low probability of occurrence and the manner in which this risk is mitigated (e.g., oversight).

Slide 37: Funding Profile – Revise the response to take credit for the fact that the project continuously evaluates opportunities for compressing the project schedule as part of the management review process.

**2.4 Is the Environmental Assessment on track for completion? As a minimum, has it been submitted for public comment?**

Primary Writer: Marc Kaducak

Contributors: Bill Boroski

Yes, the Environmental Assessment is on track for completion. A draft Environmental Assessment document was sent out for public comment on 27-March-2008 with comments due by 30-April-2008.

**Recommendations**

5. No recommendations related to the status of the Environmental Assessment.