

WM2016 Conference Panel Report

PANEL SESSION 22: **US DOE – Excess Facilities Decontamination & Decommissioning (D&D) Implementation Plans**

Co-Chairs: **Cathy Hickey, CH2M**
Andrew Szilagyi, US DOE

Panel Reporter: **Shannon Farrell, CH2M**

Panelists:

1. **Andrew Szilagyi**, *Director, Office of D&D/Facility Engineering, US DOE*
2. **Deborah Couchman-Griswold**, *Deputy Director, NNSA, US DOE*

About 30 people attended this panel session which focused on the US DOE Office of Environmental Management's actions taken in response to the January 2015, Inspector General's Audit Report on the Department of Energy's Management of High Risk Facilities. Each panelist's presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

Summary of Presentations

Andrew Szilagyi presented on the history of the excess facilities in the DOE complex. Historically, all the DOE programs owned their own facilities. The Environmental Management (EM) organization was formed in 1989, and became responsible for billions of dollars of clean-up effort across the United States. Significant issues evolved with excess facilities, therefore the Surplus Facility Inventory & Assessment (SFIA) was initiated in 1992. Teams were put together and deployed to all the DOE sites to account for excess facilities. The SFIA identified 6,000 excess facilities in the EM program and projected 1,500 non-EM excess facilities. In June 1993, the GAO issued a report stating DOE did not have an accurate estimate of the excess facilities' scope and costs over the next 30 years. Between 1992 and 1995, additional facilities were accepted into EM. In 1995, EM "closed the pipeline" for the first time in history. In 1996, the DOE Undersecretary, requested the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) document. The NAPA recommended DOE retain responsibility for management and funding of the D&D. EM started engaging and working at a staff level and started a \$50M campaign. External forces appeared in 2015. Three reports said DOE needed to get a better handle on their excess facilities. However, EM didn't have the budget to get the work done. Today, the Pipeline is not really open, but not really closed.

Question: How do you make a decision on the number of years and cost of excess facilities?

Answer: 25 years is used when there is not a planning date.

Question: Does it make sense to have one large organization of excess facilities versus splitting it up into EM and NNSA?

Answer: No.

WM2016 Conference Panel Report

Deborah Couchman-Griswold presented on the current DOE Disposition Activities and Collaborations. The Excess Contaminated Facilities working group was chartered in 2015. EM and NNSA have successfully collaborated together to understand DOE's excess liability. Together, they collected data from approximately 2,600 facilities around the complex and analyzed their carrying costs and impacts to the environment. Ms. Couchman-Griswold showed a video of the Alpha 5 facility at the Y-12 complex to demonstrate the "worst of the worst" in excess facilities. Current NNSA efforts set money aside from operations for D&D and risk reduction. The D&D budget increased from \$17M - \$58M in FY2017, primarily due to the bannister road complex at Kansas City. Going forward NNSA will continue to maintain coordination between programs to understand priorities.

Question: How does NNSA prioritize D&D projects?

Answer: NNSA uses the System Data Collection tool to measure risk and determine which projects will be D&D'd based on that risk. There is an ongoing active "top 10 list" called the Sequencing Integrated Priority List.

Question: When do you report to Congress?

Answer: Every 2 years.