



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

Presentation to the DOE Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB):

Transfer of Excess Facilities, Materials and Wastes into the Office of Environmental Management (EM)

Mark Janaskie

Office of Strategic Planning & Analysis

April 28, 2010



EM *Environmental Management*

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

www.em.doe.gov

History of Excess Facility Transfers

- In December 2007, the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM-1) requested Department of Energy Program Offices (PSOs) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to nominate facilities, materials and wastes for possible transfer to EM.
 - This request was directed by the Deputy Secretary of Energy, under Program Decision Memorandum (PDM) EM-08-12, Rev. 1, August 2006.
 - In addition, FY2008 HEWD language directed DOE to produce a Report to Congress identifying the potential scope of new liabilities EM could assume in the future.

- In early 2008, three DOE organizations, the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE), the Office of Science (SC), and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), submitted candidates for possible transfer.



EM *Environmental Management*

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

EM Evaluation Process for Proposed Facilities, Materials and Wastes

- Approximately 340 facilities, materials and wastes were submitted by the three programs for possible transfer to EM. Eleven individual sites were represented.
- From April-September 2008, each proposed facility was assessed by an EM technical team/subject matter experts. Assessments included a comprehensive in-person facility walkdown to evaluate its current condition. Materials and wastes were inspected in a similar manner.
- Candidates were evaluated against established DOE Orders, Guides and policies to determine their suitability for transfer into the EM Program.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Excess Facility Transfer Criteria

- Criteria implemented by EM to determine transfer of an excess facility include:
 - 1) The facility is “mission contaminated,” defined as chemical and/or radioactive contamination resulting from mission operations, and not from construction activities and associated materials, such as asbestos, lead-based paint and PCBs;
 - 2) The facility must be certified as excess (surplus) to Departmental mission needs, not just the mission needs of the current owner (PSO or NNSA);
 - 3) The facility must be a stand-alone building, and not a room, wing or annex of a larger operating complex; and
 - 4) If a portion of an excess facility is proposed for transfer, a physical segregation of common systems (e.g. ventilation), utilities and infrastructure shall be accomplished and/or funded by the current owner requesting the transfer.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Materials and Wastes Transfer Criteria

- Criteria used to evaluate materials and wastes for possible transfer to EM include:
 - 1) Specific material or waste must be excess, and not a strategic asset that must be retained;
 - 2) Be defined as Transuranic (TRU), requiring disposition at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP); or
 - 3) Require specialized treatment and/or processing with no existing disposition path, thereby requiring EM expertise. Transfer of special nuclear materials (SNM) and spent nuclear fuel (SNF) are determined/negotiated on a case-by-case basis.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Assessment Results and Subsequent Transfer Agreements

- In February 2009, EM “**agreed to accept**” more than 70 excess facilities, materials and wastes from NE, SC and NNSA.
- EM-1 sent individual memos to each of the three programs identifying the excess facilities, materials and wastes EM agreed to accept.
- Transfer agreement mandates that current owner retains ownership of the excess item until funding is available to begin cleanup work. Until that time, current owner is responsible for all S&M costs.
- These 70 plus excess facilities are separate, and in addition to, the excess facilities EM has agreed to accept within the Integrated Facilities Disposition Project (IFDP) at Oak Ridge.
 - There are more than 200 facilities from SC, NNSA and NE included in the IFDP.
 - IFDP obtained CD-1 approval on November 17, 2008.



EM *Environmental Management*

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Assessment Results: Candidates Rejected for Transfer

- Some proposed candidates were rejected by EM because:
 - Facilities did not meet specific transfer criteria, as listed in DOE Order 430.1B.
 - Materials did not require EM technical/management expertise, i.e. they can be readily dispositioned by their current owners.
 - Other proposed items, namely SNM and SNF, present significant financial implications for both EM and the Department. High-level DOE decisions will be required to determine their final disposition.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Cleanup Achieved on Excess Transfer Scope Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)

- The ARRA funding has allowed EM to accelerate the safe and timely disposition of excess facilities and wastes.
 - Under ARRA, 55 excess facilities are undergoing D&D, and the disposition of RH-TRU at INL is being accomplished.
 - In addition, 6 facilities are undergoing legacy materials cleanout, in preparation for future D&D.
 - Five sites, ANL, BNL, INL, ORNL and Y-12, have ARRA funding for cleanup of excess transfer scope.
 - Completion of this ARRA work is expected at the end of FY2011.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Remaining Excess Facilities, Materials and Wastes Transfer Scope

- Post-ARRA, 47 excess facilities/materials/wastes remain in the scope EM agreed to accept from NE, SC and NNSA.
 - 42 of the 47 are facilities; 5 are material/waste cleanouts.
 - Three SC sites have remaining scope (ANL has 7, BNL 8 and SLAC 1).
 - Four NNSA sites have remaining scope (LANL has 1, LLNL 4, NTS 6 and SRS 2).
 - INL (NE) has 18 remaining excess items.
 - Please note that these 47 do not include the 200+ facilities within the IFDP.

- Given the existing cleanup priorities within EM's current budget profiles, the earliest EM can address any more of these unfunded liabilities is FY2017.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure

Next Steps

- EM continues to work with NE, SC and NNSA to determine how best to address the remaining excess facilities, materials and wastes EM has agreed to accept.
- Specifically, EM is working with the other programs to prioritize the remaining scope, based on risk and programmatic need. EM plans to raise these needs in the budget formulation process if certain facilities, materials, or wastes cannot wait until FY2017.
- EM welcomes any questions the SSAB may have on our transfer process and the current inventory of excess facilities/materials/wastes.



EM Environmental Management

safety ❖ performance ❖ cleanup ❖ closure