6032 G-000-1013.62

TRANSMITTAL OF APPROVED MINUTES FOR JUNE 11, 1994 MEETING

09/16/94

APPLEGATE TASK FORCE
9
MINUTES

FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Chair:
John S. Applegate
Members:
James Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pam Dunn
Dr. Constance Fox
Guy Guckenberger
Darryl Huff
Jerry Monahan
Tom B. Rentschler
Robert Tabor
Warren E. Strunk
Thomas Wagner
Dr. Gene Willeke
Alternates:
Russ Beckner
Jackie Embry
Ex Officio:
J. Phillip Hamric
Graham Mitchell
Jim Saric

MEMORANDUM

TO: Task Force Members

FROM: John S. Applegate, Chair

DATE: September 16, 1994

RE: Transmittal of Approved Minutes for June 11, 1994 Meeting

I have enclosed the minutes of the June 11, 1994, Task Force meeting, as approved by the Task Force at its September 10, 1994, meeting.

I also have enclosed a fact sheet on the Integrated Project Execution System (IPEx) for your information.

If you have any questions, please call me at 556-0114 or Sarah at 648-6318.

Enclosures: As stated

C:PA:(FCTF):94-1003

P. O. BOX 544 ROSS, OHIO 45061 513·648·6478

INTEGRATED PROJECT EXECUTION SYSTEM (IPEx)[1]

IPEx, the Integrated Project Execution system, is the tool the Fernald Environmental Restoration Management Corp. (FERMCO) uses to manage and control work at the Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP). IPEx is considered an industry-leading, state-of-the-art tool. This fact sheet describes IPEx and its user interface, the Visual Information System.

IPEx has been in use at the FEMP since October 1, 1993. It serves as a common database that integrates the information in several, existing administrative computer systems. The existing systems are still in use, but IPEx is the link.

The existing administrative computer systems include Time Charge and Payroll, Funding, Procurement, Scheduling, Cost, Acquisition, Finance, Accounting, and Project Control. They are independent, stand-alone systems. Before IPEx, it was difficult for the control account managers (CAMs) to access the appropriate information in a timely manner in order to manage work. The information also was inconsistent among the systems. The result was a costly process that was paper-intensive and included redundant data entry, time delays, and inaccurate reports.

With IPEx, all these systems are integrated. This means:

- Information is entered one time
- Information is consistent
- Information is easily accessed
- Information may be shared

With the IPEx system performing as a single database, there is consistency of information, more timely access to information, improved communications, improved work force productivity, and the ability to transfer data across systems to reduce redundant input.

For example, now instead of entering the same data into two or more stand-alone systems, data are entered into the assigned system and IPEx transfers the duplicate data into other systems.

Integration occurs through a "bridge" program. For example, employee timecards list charge numbers that identify an employee's projects. This information is entered into IPEx, where control account managers may review and approve all charges. IPEx then passes the labor cost information to the Accounting system.

IPEx also is used for measuring performance and reporting status. Detailed schedule status information is entered into another computer program, the Primavera Schedule Module. IPEx then transfers the applicable information. Information about FERMCO labor, subcontractor reported costs, and material received is integrated and compiled into accurate reports. The control account managers may review people and total hours charged to their account for a particular week. If a charge needs to be reversed, IPEx will print the correction form to send to accounting.

Daily requisitions and purchase orders are prepared and entered into the procurement system. Control account managers may review the status of all purchase orders via IPEx, and their accounts are updated monthly with new actuals from accounting. IPEx passes the accounts payable information to the accounting system.

When the accounting system is closed every month, all the detail costed information is forwarded to IPEx so the control account managers may access the details of all accounting transactions. IPEx then summarizes the accounting

information by resource and passes it to the Project Control system. Using IPEx Cost Performance Reports, control account managers can bring budgets, actuals, and forecasts together. Control account managers may view the current period, cumulative to date, and estimate in order to complete the information. Control account managers know where they stand with their schedules and budgets -- in fact, they may view that information for the entire year. Furthermore, IPEx is able to smoothly incorporate changes to schedules and budgets as they are approved.

IPEx converts, processes, and transforms data so that summaries or detailed reports are produced, monthly figures are transposed into fiscal terms, information is quickly and accurately distributed to performing organizations.

All of this adds up to numerous benefits:

- the need to distribute 150 labor reports to the control account managers is eliminated
- double-key data entry is eliminated
- information is available in days, not weeks
- information is available in one database
- the number of process steps is dramatically reduced
- mock closings of the accounting system may be performed
- requisitions may be entered by control account managers, eliminating a bottleneck in procurement
- Material accruals may be accurately calculated from the time an item is received until it is paid
- ability to audit and trace charges is improved
- communication is improved
- the information on IPEx is easy to access via the "drill-down" approach

With IPEx, employees work smarter. There are no superficial fixes. New processes are developed and implemented for improved production and dramatic cost savings.

Control account managers are empowered by having easy access to all the information they need to manage and control work. IPEx is available on the CAM's own computer and the Visual Information System is the user-friendly interface between IPEx and the end-user.

The IPEx Visual Information System uses the drill-down approach; that is, summary information is presented and the user, via a mouse, may "drill down" into more detailed information.

---

[1] Prepared by Sue Arentsen, Project and Information Control Division, FERMCO

FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Chair:
John S. Applegate
Members:
James Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pam Dunn
Dr. Constance Fox
Guy Guckenberger
Darryl Huff
Jerry Monahan
Tom B. Rentschler
Robert Tabor
Warren E. Strunk
Thomas Wagner
Dr. Gene Willeke
Alternates:
Russ Beckner
Jackie Embry
Ex Officio:
J. Phillip Hamric
Graham Mitchell
Jim Saric

Minutes from June 11, 1994 Meeting

Members Present:

John Applegate
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pam Dunn
Constance Fox
Guy Guckenberger
Phil Hamric, DOE
Darryl Huff
Gene Jablonowski, U.S. EPA
Graham Mitchell, Ohio EPA
Tom Rentschler
Warren Strunk
Bob Tabor
Thomas Wagner
Gene Willeke

About 27 spectators, including members of the public, DOE and other agencies, and FERMCO representatives.

1. Approval of Minutes:

- The draft minutes of the May 14, 1994, meeting of the Task Force were approved without amendment.

Lisa Crawford and Pam Dunn had questions about the minutes because they did not attend last month's meeting. Lisa asked the status of the effort to comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and DOE's plans to establish an umbrella committee. She also asked about the impact of Ohio's interest in economic development on the Task Force's decision for the site. She also asked for about the status of the roundtable on waste siting.

Applegate said that he hadn't received information yet on who would be on the national board. Graham Mitchell then explained that Ohio EPA's interest would not override any decision the Task Force made

P. O. BOX 544 ROSS, OHIO 45061 513·648·6478

about the site. Huff said that they haven't decided on when to have the roundtable.

2. Remarks:

Applegate suggested that members decide at the end of the meeting whether to hold meetings in July and August. If it is decided not to hold the meetings, the September meeting would require a full day.

Applegate also reminded members about the DOE Future Use meeting, which is scheduled for July 19-21. He also reported that all the chairs of DOE site-specific advisory boards (SSABs) will meet June 21-22 in Washington, D.C., to discuss issues of concern. Applegate said he intended to discuss waste transportation with Nevada representatives.

The chair said a demonstration of the IPEx System for tracking work and costs at the Fernald Environmental Management Project was scheduled to begin right after the regular Task Force meeting adjourns. Guy Guckenberger asked if IPEx could be accessed by the public over the telephone. Phil Hamric said public access would be available by July or August. A fact sheet with an overview of the IPEx system will be distributed to Task Force members with the draft minutes from the June 11, 1994 meeting.

Applegate introduced Gene Jablonowski from the U.S. EPA, who attended on behalf of Jim Saric.

3. Report on MPN meetings in Washington, D.C.:

Applegate asked Crawford and Dunn to report on meetings they attended last month with other Military Production Network (MPN) representatives in Washington, D.C., last month. Crawford said there were about 100 activists from 18 states who attended the series of meetings. Citizens from Southwestern Ohio met with Senator Howard Metzenbaum's aide, Rep. John Boehner's aide, Rep. Rob Portman, and officials from DOE and other governmental agencies.

Dunn said the House only cut the EM budget by 10 percent and that the Senate Committee didn't make any cuts. The current funding level for environmental restoration at DOE sites is $5.2 billion. The budget still has to go to the Energy and Water Committee, she added.

Crawford said they were told there will be no budget increases for the next four to five years.

Crawford and Dunn said they were going to be in Washington, D.C. for a meeting and planned to talk to Senate officials.

Guckenberger asked Applegate for a review of the Task Force's progress and plans to date. Applegate reported that the purpose of the *FutureSite* exercise is to develop lots of information that can be compiled in order to develop future use scenarios for evaluation. The resulting short list of future use options will be examined in more detail by the group. Then the criteria will be applied to the scenarios at September's meeting. Applegate also explained that the Task Force is on schedule to deliver its future use recommendation in November.

4. *FutureSite* exercise:

Applegate said the Task Force was going to play the *FutureSite* exercise at the more conservative 10^{-6} risk level. He asked Doug Sarno to explain some changes to the exercise. Sarno said the changes include new numbers for volumes of contaminated soil. These new figures include volumes of material from Operable Unit 2 and Operable Unit 3. Sarno also said that the treatment option has been eliminated because under current interpretation of the regulations, the "clean" fraction of soil would still have to be handled as waste.

5. Results of *FutureSite* at 10^{-5}:

Applegate reported that FERMCO Managers and the public played *FutureSite*, and he asked Sarno to report on the preliminary findings.

Sarno said there were two basic variables analyzed:

1. Use of Property
   Restricted
   Undeveloped Park/Greenspace
   Developed Park
   Commercial/Industrial
   Residential/Agricultural

2. Disposition of Waste
   On-Site

Off-Site (limited to one million cubic yards)

He reported that the following strategies have emerged from playing *FutureSite*:

1. The Buffer Strategy
   Many groups were concerned most with cleaning up the edges of the property as much as possible and leaving the more contaminated materials in the center of the site at the location of the former processing facility.

2. The Incremental Land Use Volume Strategy
   Some groups approached the problem from an incremental cost-benefit approach by removing successively less contaminated material to achieve a higher level of allowed use and stopping after each iteration to calculate total cost.

Sarno said that regardless of the strategy employed, the result was to clean up to allow for two uses: less restrictive on the borders and more restrictive in the center. In each case, the location of the disposal facility coincided with the more contaminated center.

There are three preliminary scenarios that have resulted from the initial rounds of the exercise:

1. Residential Border, Commercial Center
   100 percent on-site disposal: $662 million (127 acres)
   With 1 million cubic yards off-site: $1.262 billion (50 acres)

2. Residential Border, Park Center
   100 percent on-site disposal: $661 million (127 acres)
   With 1 million cubic yards off-site: $12.61 billion (50 acres)

3. Commercial Border, Park Center
   100 percent on-site disposal: $459 million (88 acres)
   With 1 million cubic yards off-site: $1.006 billion (11 acres)

Sarno said the approaches used by players include:

A. Clean To, But Do Not Allow
   Several groups sought residential cleanup levels, but did

not wish to see the property to be used for anything other than green space.

B. Prevent Ecological Destruction
Some groups were concerned with the ecological damage that would coincide with large-scale removal of soil and vegetation.

C. Limit Off-Site Transportation
Some groups were highly concerned with the number of trucks or trains that would be required for large volumes of off-site waste disposal.

D. No Physical Sign of Contamination
One group raised concern about uses that would result in physical access restrictions to property.

E. Adjacent Property at Same Use
Several groups were concerned that the property immediately at the border of the site was cleaned to the same use as that off-site.

6. New Information for the Toolbox:

Applegate asked Sarno to discuss the new additions to the toolbox. Sarno said the additions are a chemical inventory and reporting requirements for the site, as well as corrected information on radionuclide contamination at the site.

7. Opportunity for Public Participation:

A member of the public asked how quickly contamination is migrating off site. Applegate said that migration has slowed virtually to a stop. Under the South Plume removal action, extraction wells are removing contamination groundwater from the aquifer for treatment.

8. New Business:

Members agreed not to hold their regular monthly meetings in July and August. Instead, the Task Force would participate in other activities, such as the Future Use Workshop scheduled for July 19-21 in

Cincinnati. Sarno will use the summer to develop detailed alternatives for future use, based on the scenarios from playing *FutureSite*. Applegate also asked members to think about some issues during the summer, including:

- Cleanup levels for soil
- Cost of dealing with wetlands
- Level of detail to be captured in the cost estimates for site Remediation once excavation has occurred
- Information on groundwater contamination
- Location of the on-site disposal cell
- Budget concerns
- Land use criteria

9. Materials Distributed at Meeting:

- Table of Key FEMP Contaminants: Radionuclides
- List of FEMP Chemical Inventory and Reporting Requirements
- *FutureSite* Model Instructions and Information
- Military Production Network information

10. Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the full Task Force is scheduled for September 10, 1994. The time and location will be announced prior to the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Approved September 10, 1994