



# IFDP Workshop

31 January 2008

---

**Energy, Technology, and Environmental  
Business Association**

**UT-Battelle**

**B&W Y-12**



# IFDP Workshop

31 January 2008

---

**“Single, Integrating Contractor”  
Approach**



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Global Advantages

---

- Creates Economies of Scale
- Provides a single point of accountability
- Designates a single interface with the regulators
- Creates one baseline
- Is less of a burden to DOE contracting
- Makes sequencing, cost, and integration easier
- Provides more effective workforce leveling
- Able to share of lessons-learned quickly
- Creates simplified transition



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Global Disadvantages

---

- Security – availability/retention of cleared workers through fluctuations
- Interface with M&O (relative to alt.3, M&O Contractor’s Approach)
- Duplication of infrastructure.
- Priorities may differ from site priorities
- Single failure mode



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Cross Cutting Ideas & Technical Solutions

---

- Take MEPP out of the picture, set clear requirements for workforce transition
- Involve unions early to negotiate streamlined approach
- Continue partnerships established during planning.
- Engage regulators early in process
- Streamline process with ability to hold/transfer clearances
- Reduce protected area or create islands of security
- Apply standard nuclear industry practices.
- Set subcontracting goals and tie performance to fee
- Challenging DOE policy regarding small business credit



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Characterization

---

- **Advantages**
  - Can implement systems approach for life-cycle across facilities
  - Single data management system
  - Consistent end product
- **Disadvantages**
  - Potential loss of historical and process knowledge the sites have
  - Significant physical/chemical differences between sites – default to most stringent requirements
  - Significant interface requirements with the M&O
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
  - Characterize early in the life-cycle (pre-RFP)
  - Subcontract facility activities with the M&O's that would be problematic (e.g. security)
  - ORNL build a by-pass around central campus



# “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Removal and treatment of industrial materials & "special case" wastes

---

- **Advantages**
  - More treatment options & ability to share resources/facilities
  - Broad waste profiling activities
  - Prioritization across sites based on risk
  - Trained pool of operators
  - Technologies/equipment match economies of scale
  
- **Disadvantages**
  - Different site issues/treatment
  - Logistics of technology and equipment deployment
  - Less diversity of approaches, ideas, innovation
  
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
  - Need early and innovative technology for special wastes.
  - Consider the time & evaluation for new technology



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Final Decontamination and Demolition of Facilities

---

- **Advantages**
  - Schedule and cost efficiencies
  - Sequencing the work based on risk and other factors rather than by site
  - Ability to shift to accommodate mission related activities
  
- **Disadvantages**
  - Potential loss of historical knowledge (vs. Opt. 3)
  - Balancing priorities between the sites
  - Interface challenges due to different priorities/objectives
  
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
  - Reduce EM project risk prior to the D&D (complete due diligence)
  - Transfer personnel to retain historical knowledge
  - Procure separate SB subcontract for EMWMF



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Soils & groundwater remediation

---

- **Advantages**
  - Single POC with regulators and FFA
  - Holistic approach to GW
  - Sequencing of D&D and soil remediation maximizes EMWMF and reduces cost
- **Disadvantages**
  - Security at Y-12 (as related to Alt. 3)
  - Interface requirements w M&O (e.g utilities)
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
  - Establish interim clean-up levels with regulators – to the point of having final RODs
  - More application of in-situ technology



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach

### Surveillance and maintenance of facilities prior to D&D

---

- **Advantages**
  - Prevents the M&Os from continuing to fill buildings with debris
  - Enables a larger pool of resources to respond to fluctuating requirements
  - Allows more control and appropriate expenditure of funds
- **Disadvantages**
  - Safety concerns due to potential loss of knowledge.
  - Demands utility management/interface with M&O's
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
  - Review/amend union requirements prior to procurement
  - Deploy SCADA systems, remote telemetry
  - Consider utility sharing



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Reconfiguration, design & facility new build

---

### ○ **Advantages**

- Integrated plan to execute D&D/WM/ER scopes
- EMWMF expansion holistically addressed with better estimate of waste volumes and types

### ○ **Disadvantages**

- Inclined to build the minimum system/facility necessary to meet the immediate need vs long-term mission objectives
- Design/build for facilities tied to enduring mission at the site

### ○ **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**

- Consider people moving with scope
- Clearly define scope – e.g. facilities transferred back to M&O at IFDP completion
- Consider privatization



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach

### Waste treatment, packaging and transportation

---

- **Advantages**

- Ability to negotiate rate structures based on volumes
- Cost efficiencies associated with minimizing waste profiles
- Single program interfacing with regulators
- Optimizes investment in equipment – physical waste treatment (shredders, compactors, etc.)

- **Disadvantages**

- Scheduling, Security, Logistics (Y-12)

- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**

- Dedicated shipping portal



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach

### Support contracts

---

- **Advantages**

- One procurement system, standardized contracts
- Fewer sub-tiers, more diverse suppliers
- Security clearances held in one pool
- Single set of overarching QA, ESH doc (compared to mult. Contractors)

- **Disadvantages**

- M&Os already have subs (approved QA, ESH plans, etc.) and suppliers, transportation, etc.
- Contractor adds layer of programmatic requirements

- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**

- Leverage use of existing subcontracts



## “Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Project Management & Integration

---

### ○ **Advantages**

- Consistency of application
- One baseline, PBS, EVMS, Streamlined reporting and performance measurements
- Single point of accountability
- Min. impact to ORO contracting office
- Single program (QA, ESH, NEPA, CERCLA, RCRA , etc.)

### ○ **Disadvantages**

- “All the eggs” in one basket
- Limits competing solutions
- Increased management layers and cost

### ○ **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**

- Require meaningful subcontracting with broad applications.
- Set high subcontracting goals and tie performance to fee.
- Require staff development/retention programs