WM2016 Conference Panel Report

PANEL SESSION 33: **Responding to Current Challenges**

Co-chairs: **Susan Cange,** *US DOE*
Betsy Child, *Restoration Services, Inc.*

Panel Reporter: **Ray Parrish,** *Restoration Services, Inc.*

Panelists:

1. **Laura Ortiz Wilkerson,** *Acting Director, Planning and Execution Division, US DOE Oak Ridge Office of EM*
2. **Charlie Anderson,** *Executive Vice President, Wastren Advantage, Inc.*
3. **Alan Stokes,** *Associate Director, Planning and Execution Division, US DOE Oak Ridge Office of EM*
4. **Ken Harrawood,** *Senior Director, Consolidated Nuclear Security / Y-12*
5. **Lance Mezga,** Consultant
6. **William McMillan**, *Project Manager, US DOE*
7. **Michelle McNutt,** *Nuclear and High Hazard Operations Manager, URS | CH2M Oak Ridge LLC*

This session examined many of the challenges that are faced within DOE's Oak Ridge Environmental Management program (OREM). Some challenges occur because of circumstances elsewhere in the DOE Complex; others stem from issues on the Oak Ridge Reservation. OREM's responses involve complex technical evaluations, communication with its partners, and a clear vision of the progress to which we are committed. Topics included Transuranic Waste Processing, Excess Facilities, and Deferred Maintenance.

Summary of Presentations

Laura Ortiz Wilkerson and **Charlie Anderson** discussed the steps taken and progress made in the disposition of Transuranic waste inventory at the Transuranic waste Processing Center (TWPC). This waste originates from Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). The inventory is divided into two categories: contact-handled and remote-handled. 94% of the total Contact-Handled inventory of 1579 cubic meters has been processed, and 66% of the inventory has been shipped to permanent disposal. The remaining inventory includes most of the difficult to process waste streams. Of the Remote-Handled inventory, 76% of a total of 671 cubic meters has been processed to date and 25% permanently disposed. The remaining inventory includes the most difficult to process waste streams. Due to a shipping moratorium and the WIPP events, a backlog of waste at TWPC began to create storage issues. The solution was to suspend high dose remote-handled waste cask processing and utilize additional waste storage areas at ORNL. Additionally, new specialty storage overpacks were developed for the remote handled material. These allowed for safe storage at ORNL. The Oak Ridge response actions to the WIPP events identified effective solutions for safe extended storage of TRU waste.

Alan Stokes, Ken Harrawood, & Lance Mezga led a discussion on excess facilities at the Oak Ridge Reservation. FY 15 IG and GAO reports raised concerns about the management of DOE excess facilities. Oak Ridge was in a good position to respond to the working group that was established due to a previously developed comprehensive cleanup plan addressing similar issues.

This plan was developed for all facilities in Oak Ridge, regardless of which DOE program owned the facility. Additional funding has been appropriated to EM and NNSA to begin work in FY16. Facilities at Y-12 include: the Biology Division facility, Alpha-4, Alpha-5, Beta-4, and Building 9206. Numerous facilities are located at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, including: Fission Products Lab, High Level Chemical Lab, Homogenous Reactor Experiment Building, the 3026 Hot Cell Facility, and the Radioisotope Laboratory Facility.

William McMillan and Michelle McNutt discussed the hard decisions associated with deferred maintenance at Oak Ridge Reservation. This refers to when day-to-day work needed to sustain property in a suitable condition is put off or delayed beyond its optimum period. Recent issues across the DOE complex called for DOE to take action on deferred maintenance needs. This including developing a risk-based facility ranking process. There are over 350 shutdown facilities at ORNL and Y-12. The perception of deferred maintenance can be misconstrued. The key component is to conduct & evaluate maintenance activities. Some of the higher risks urgently needing maintenance may not appear in bad condition, while some issues may look bad, but not pose as much of a risk.

Question and Answer

A question was asked to which DOE organization (NNSA, EM, Science) excess facilities money was allocated at ORNL. Answer from **Ken Harrawood**: EM

Is Alpha 4 roof work being contracted specific through NNSA? For other buildings, will all roof work be done under one or separate contracts? Answer from **Ken Harrawood**: the Roofing Asset Management Program through NNSA in Kansas City. This shortens the procurement cycle. One contract will be let for 9206, and a separate contract for the other 2 facilities. EM will also have access to the roofing program for Alpha 4 work.

On the Risk Based Ranking, what percentage of facilities will have work performed? Answer from **Bill McMillan:** 40 projects are on the risk matrix and $5,000,000 have been allocated. The top projects that fit into the budget will probably be 15%-20%.

How often is the engineering evaluation priority list updated? Answer from **Michelle McNutt**: More building inventory condition reports have been performed, than engineering evaluations. This is a living spreadsheet, constantly being fed data.