

---

# Waste Management 2011

## Emerging Issues

Session 27

**Bob Warther**  
**Vice President, Environmental Management**  
**B&W Y-12**



# Topics for Joint Discussion

---

- Contract requirements and implementation
- Integration between EM and ORNL/Y-12
- Programmatic/Contract Lesson Learned

# Contract requirements and implementation

- Graded approach for scope and execution requirements
  - Application of design standards during D&D construction ranging from a small contamination control tent to a processing capability for a waste stream
  - Ensuring waste disposal standards are used rather than free-release standards
- Implementation of new requirements can pose a challenge to effective D&D management. In particular, the comments to the Be regulation issued on December 23, 2010 may be difficult to implement for D&D.

Current Rule	Proposed Rule
Action level no greater than 0.2 mg/m <sup>3</sup> , 8-hour TWA exposure	TBD
Dry wipes	Wet wipes
Dispose in sealed containers to prevent the release of Be dust during transportation. Label according to § 850.38.	Warning labels . . . to transfer items with surface areas free of removable surface Be but may contain surface contamination inaccessible or sealed

# Integration between EM & NNSA/Science Sites

- EM sites will be substantially complete by 2015. Other sites that are not uniquely EM merit additional considerations.
- EM and mission priorities can differ
  - EM generally motivated by cleanup requirements and regulatory considerations
  - Science and NNSA driven by mission requirements
- Impacts the following
  - Prioritization of work scope
  - Integration of cleanup scope into operational considerations
  - Funding sources for activities, e.g.,
    - Utility reroutes and isolations
    - Hazardous waste removal
- As EM mission advances from existing EM sites to program sites, additional considerations
  - Expanded IPT concept that involves both EM and Program counterpart
  - R2A2 for safety and contract performance
  - Expectations regarding other considerations, e.g., small business goals
  - Project execution requirements (e.g., EVMS, other performance metrics)
  - Contractor(s) provide personnel with experience in both EM and mission Program

# Programmatic Lesson Learned

- Smaller projects with a CPAF or CPFF structure and multiple PBIs are more common compared with the first decade. Generally perceived that
  - Less uncertainty, risk
  - Better reporting and control
- This approach contrasts with key EM (and other) successes: Rocky Flats and Fernald CPIF with one PBI
- Consider returning to a simple, but large scope, flat-funded, CPIF structure to repeat the DOE's successes
  - DOE clearly define scope; the “what”
  - Contractors avoid change orders even if they change “how”
  - Both identify GFS/I and ensure it is in the baseline
  - Establish other desired outcomes in the prime contract regarding delivery and quantify the desired outcome, e.g.,
    - Small business goals
    - Safety goals
- The funding moving forward will not be as reliable as funding in the past decade. The model must be adjusted to meet new realities. However, that should not be a reason to abandon a successful model.