



IFDP Workshop

31 January 2008

“M&O Contractors” Approach



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Global Advantages

- In depth knowledge of sites, missions, interfaces
- Able to sequence IFDP scope around ongoing operations
- Able to provide infrastructure/logistics at lower costs with fewer conflicts
- Single point of accountability to control interfaces, resolve conflicts – less risk to DOE
- Site ownership will leave well designed facility.
- Easier/faster to add EM scope to existing M&O contracts
- Efficient/flexible capability for subcontracting
- Enhanced security, safety, compliance & accountability
- Short learning curve and transition time
- One decision point
- Positioned to handle union issues – costly for others
- Pension issues – M&O process in place
- Relationships built with DNFSB and regulating agencies



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Global Disadvantages

- Not core competency of current contractor. Clean-up personnel resources do not currently exist.
- Primary mission will always take precedence
- M&O contracting model is not the ideal contracting vehicle for EM scope. (i.e. Could be more expensive using existing overhead)
- Less new subcontracting opportunities if IFDP is rolled into existing subcontracts
- No integration/sharing between the 2 M&O contractors (plans, practices, procedures, lessons learned and resources)
- Risk of less commitment for Congress and DOE to fund IFDP



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Global Ideas & Issues

- Establish appropriate IFDP performance goals and small business contracting goals that are enforced.
- Incentivize M&O to get IFDP work done cost effectively and on time
- Require incentive goals to be flowed down to subs
- Establish mechanism to share resources, lessons learned, commodity providers such as BOAs, ID/IQ
- DOE to have IFDP integration between M&Os (integrated project team)
- Redefine mission to include IFDP to preclude self performance or mission precedence



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach Characterization

- **Advantages**
 - Historical Knowledge / experience at the site – ready access
 - Access to research for new technology
 - Can do the characterization – peculiar isotopes and contaminants (classified)
 - Access to onsite lab easier under existing M&O (priorities)
 - Establishing a new lab would be easier under an M&O (permits)
- **Disadvantages**
 - Lack specific skill set for cleanup purposes
 - Potential to be close-minded or PhD study “to death”
- **Ideas and Issues**
 - Shipping and peculiar isotope issues – 2nd lab may be needed
 - Can the M&O lab achieve throughput needed for D&D and WM activities
 - Incentivise S/C to develop new methods for sampling/analysis
 - Leverage scientists core competency for technology development
 - Bundle characterization with related scope



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Industrial Material & Special Case Waste Disposition

○ **Advantages**

- Economics of scale from M&O combining waste streams
- Institutional and historical knowledge
- Easier logistics
- Existing property management and reuse
- Availability of hot cell facilities – access to M&O facilities
- Effective to fight “pack rat” and historical attitude early on

○ **Disadvantages**

- Current M&O focus on S&M of facilities and waste material rather than D&D

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

- Current contract vehicles could take care of “special waste” issues (multiple DOE Contractors could take care of specific problems everywhere)
- Establish “gold chart” for IFDP - Tie fee to metrics



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Final D&D of Facilities

○ **Advantages**

- Integration with the ongoing mission (scheduling of utilities) – less integration required by DOE
- M&O’s are responsible for the Risk Management
- Risk and process knowledge at the site
- Easier to motivate site workers

○ **Disadvantages**

- M&O’s may tell you exactly what to do (rigid inefficient work procedures)
- M&O lacks D&D experience (scale/contamination issue)
- Who operates the EMWMMF is a big deal

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

- All specialty contractors – in any event
- Bring on EM partner
- Transition existing EM workers (especially management)
- Evaluate the need for bonding



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach Soils and Groundwater remediation

- **Advantages**
 - Ready access to site, locations, facilities
 - Integrate with existing ongoing monitoring
 - Could write a better RFP if M&O could manage the characterization
 - Lifecycle perspective – more of a lifecycle cost benefit view of remediation actions
- **Disadvantages**
 - Competition between sites for disposal facilities
 - Two M&O’s interfacing with regulators
- **Ideas, innovations, or technical solutions**
 - Establish reservation-wide surface and groundwater capability



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach S&M for Future D&D Facilities

○ **Advantages**

- Existing programs & contracts in place
- Tie S&M to D&D prep
- Duplicate effort if not under M&O
- Can take advantage of lifecycle cost/benefit and M&O operations
- Incentive to reduce “hotel cost” – enable to use money for other work

○ **Disadvantages**

- Hard to prioritize most urgent risk reservation-wide
- Existing programs too prescriptive? New approach for IFDP
- Reticence for workforce to work themselves out of a job
- “We’ve always done it that way” – leaving with current M&O, does that come into play – do we need a fresh look?

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

- Subcontracting S&M with characterization and removal of materials



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach

Reconfiguration of Facilities

○ **Advantages**

- Easier to integrate with ongoing and future mission and existing infrastructure
- Easier for M&O to get permitting or to incorporate into existing permits
- Leveraging of resources for capital construction management efforts going on across site
- Better adaptive reuse of facilities to support mission

○ **Disadvantages**

- New contractor could bring new concepts
- Funding EM – more difficult to prioritize between Y-12 and ORNL (not as simple as doing the hardest thing first)

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

- Lack of innovation to date – third party may be able to do it differently – culture is no “out-of-the-box” thinking
- Use value engineering to make decisions



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach Treatment and Packaging

○ **Advantages**

- M&O Contractor has working group – new contractor would have to interface
- Established work plans and procedures already in place
- Beryllium programs experience
- Responsible from generation through disposition
- Economies of scale using existing resources and regulatory framework

○ **Disadvantages**

- Separate M&O's and managers of disposal facilities
- M&O's have different site specific Waste Treatment Plans (innovative techniques required to handle mercury issues)

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

- Regulators prefer the EMWMF management be independent - less cost if outside contractor ran treatment facility with price/ pound or gallon
- Integrated contractor could handle special waste handling – could work under single or under two contractors separately



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach Support Contracts

- **Advantages**

- Economies of scale for M&O
- M&O has experience with subcontractors
- M&O could offer cross-training opportunities for displaced workers

- **Disadvantages**

- Burdensome flow-downs
- M&O tend to use the same contractors – doesn’t allow new technologies or ideas – fewer competitions for new subcontractors

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

- Share site-wide support contractors



“Current M&O Contractors” Approach Project Management and Integration

○ **Advantages**

- Project Management and Structure currently in place
- One less level of management for M&O
- Better ability to obtain cleared personnel
- Integrated IFDP and mission execution (e.g. NNSA D&D program)
- Opportunities to leverage across M&O activities

○ **Disadvantages**

- Institutional inertia
- Multiple reporting requirements (NNSA, OS, EM, and NE)
- This could compete with other existing priorities
- IFDP would be implemented differently between the two M&O's
- Conflicts between sites

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

- Demonstrate Competency in Re-Compete