



IFDP Workshop

31 January 2008

**“Two Single, Integrating Contractors”
Approach**



“Two, Single-Site Integrating Contractors” Approach Summary

- Definition
 - One contractor each at the ORNL and Y-12 sites, each responsible for the entire IFDP scope at that site. Under this model subcontracts would be bid and awarded by each of the two Integrating Contractors, both that would be selected through a full and open (large business) procurement led by DOE
- Clarifications from Groups
 - Expect 80% “of the work” subcontracting subject to FAR make/buy analysis w/M&I focused on managing the subcontractors while integrating activities
 - Must consider reconfiguration of BJC staff w/ need for infusion of new staff to deal with new unique site challenges
 - Must consider transition of S&M staff from M&O to continue S&M on D&D facilities awaiting funding



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Cross Cutting Items

- Recommend PBI Contract form to allow for time-based phasing as you establish higher levels of confidence in baseline
- Procurement must address expectation of role of M&I and be more innovative in its structure
 - Revise T&Cs that include risk parameters that flow down
 - Define percentage of subcontracting
 - Define SB goals including method for selecting NAICS code
 - Incentives for meeting goals
 - Penalties for not meeting goals
 - Allow proposal assumptions to be negotiated/incorporated into subcontract (risk sharing and ability to refine inadequate SOW)
- If workforce transition is enforced, having 2 M&Is would complicate things



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Management and Integration

- **Advantages**
 - Best alignment with mission and unique site conditions at each site
 - Increased competition => incentive to perform
- **Disadvantages**
 - Requires more DOE oversight and involvement and conflict resolution
 - Loss of economies of scale
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - Pension planning, etc. be moved to central location w/in DOE (e.g., LM Office)



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Support Contracts

○ **Advantages**

- More subcontracting opportunities with more diversity of scope
- More opportunities for SBs (ability to handle a smaller scope)

○ **Disadvantages**

- Different subcontract flowdowns and requirements for each site
- Loss of economies of scale

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

- Establish a mandatory Contractor Interface Team to prioritize scope and schedule



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Characterization

- **Advantages**
 - Two very different sites with unique contaminants
=> each integrator can focus on that site's special characterization needs
- **Disadvantages**
 - Inconsistent level of characterization due to separate M&I approach
 - New M&I contractor may lack process knowledge
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - Pre-award characterization to develop a better baseline and improved cost estimates



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Industrial Material & Special Case Waste Disposition

- **Advantages**
 - Different skill sets to deal with the uniqueness at each site
 - Security requirements at each site very different
- **Disadvantages**
 - Technology innovation focused on one site w/o connection to deal w/ similar waste at the other site
 - Two different NTS certification programs
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - Expand Contractor Interface Team to include a Technology Council (integrate with EM Corporate Boards)



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Treatment & Packaging

- **Advantages**
 - Difference in waste streams is better addressed by two M&I contractors
 - Aligned with current “separate” waste operations at each site
- **Disadvantages**
 - Without good integration between the site will result in potential to overwhelm waste processors (capability and capacity)
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - Utilize critical resource contract direct with DOE to minimize logistic challenges (e.g., onsite landfill services)



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Reconfiguration of Facilities

○ **Advantages**

- Each integrator can focus on that site’s special reconfiguration needs with long-term site mission included

○ **Disadvantages**

- System upgrades & utility interface requires huge learning curve over M&O

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

- Utilize current DOE direct contract for the roads and grounds work
- Consider DOE direct A/E/C contract for new facilities



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Soil & Groundwater Remediation

- **Advantages**
 - Separate cleanup criteria driven by future land use which will be unique to each site
- **Disadvantages**
 - Resource and logistics issues associated with soil cleanup (trucks & landfill)
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - None suggested



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach S&M for Future D&D Facilities

- **Advantages**

- Y-12 functions differently due to security with the PIDAS

- **Disadvantages**

- Interface issues with deactivation greater than utilizing current M&O
- No ability to level work load across sites

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

- Capture process knowledge from retirees and current employees



“Two-Single, Integrating Contractor” Approach Final D&D of Facilities

- **Advantages**

- Difference in D&D requirements/constraints is better addressed by two M&I contractors
- Technology focused on uniqueness of sites

- **Disadvantages**

- Interface issues with deactivation greater than utilizing current M&O

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

- Consider Brownfield model at ORNL - Give contaminated site/area to private entity to clean-up and possibly inherit the land for future development