

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE

*March 5, 2013  
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1

Primer to Hanford’s Cleanup Budget Development Process..... 2

2013 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report..... 6

Advice on Overall Budget Process ..... 9

Committee Business..... 12

Attachments ..... 12

Attendees ..... 13

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

**Opening\***

Jerry Peltier, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) chair, welcomed the committee and began introductions.

*Announcements*

Mark Coronado, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) spoke with BCC about the overall process and timelines of establishing budget levels. He also updated the committee regarding sequestration, but he was unable to provide a lot of information about sequestration. Information will become available through DOE’s Office of Communication and DOE Headquarters (HQ). Mark said that, in essence, sequestration will lead to a 7.7% reduction for all five control points at DOE- RL. The committee deferred further questions until Mark completed his presentation under the first agenda item.

\* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

### *Committee leadership selection*

The committee members present affirmed Jerry as BCC chair. There was some discussion about the vice chair position. Harold Heacock and Gerry Pollet had served as co-vice chairs in 2012 and both received nominations to serve another term. A concern was raised about Gerry's ability to make the required time commitment. Jerry and Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, noted that Gerry told them via email that he will be available after the current legislative session. Susan also noted that Harold will need to be consulted about a co-vice chair position because Harold was nominated to act as vice chair, not co-vice chair. BCC members agreed that both Harold and Gerry offer a great deal of experience and expertise to BCC and the co-vice chair option allows them each to continue in a leadership role without needing to make the full time commitment. Susan will send an email to the full committee asking if they affirm Jerry Peltier as chair, and Harold and Gerry and co-vice-chairs.

### **Primer to Hanford's Cleanup Budget Development Process\***

Mark gave a presentation on the general budgeting process for the Hanford Site (Attachment 2). He emphasized the following points in his presentation.

- This is an unusual budget year and the presentation reflects a normal budget year without sequestration and without a delayed presidential budget.
- DOE is acting under a Continuing Resolution (CR) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 with the same funding levels as the FY2012 enacted budget. The current CR expires on March 27 and Congress will need to take some sort of budget action before that date.
- The budgeting process for FY 2014 is behind schedule because the President's budget has not been released yet. That budget is usually submitted to Congress on February 1. Additionally, uncertainty around 2013 makes 2014 budgeting challenging because budget requests are based, in part, on work planned for the previous year.
- DOE is aggressively working on the 2015 budget, following the same process as the agency has in the past few years. DOE is determining what work needs to be accomplished to meet the regulatory requirements and both DOE-RL and DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) are preparing a budget request that will meet all commitments and be compliant with Tri-Party Agency (TPA) agreements<sup>†</sup>.

---

\* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

<sup>†</sup> Ecology noted after the meeting that verification of that assumption was not possible because no representatives of DOE-ORP were present at the BCC meeting. Ecology and HAB have been informed that DOE-ORP is proposing changes to its baselines; however, the changes are not final or approved by DOE-HQ.

- In the budget process that has been in effect since 1975, there are three FYs being worked on at any given time in the federal budget process: the execution year (current year), the budget year (the year following the execution year) and the planning year (the year following the budget year). For the execution year, Congress has provided an appropriation that the President signed to fund specific activities and construction projects. For the Budget year, after February 1, the Congress reviews the administration's requests then appropriates funds for work it supports. For the planning year, the local offices submit their requests to DOE-HQ, which reviews and prioritizes them, then provides the information to the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB). When OMB accepts the final requests in late summer, those totals remain embargoed until the President's budget goes to Congress in February of the following year.<sup>‡</sup>
- DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are identifying and prioritizing work that must be completed in FY 2015 to meet all regulatory requirements.

### *Regulator perspectives*

Melinda Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said the 7% budget reduction estimate is what the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) established. As Ecology states every year, they expect DOE to ask for sufficient funds to achieve cleanup goals. Ecology realizes that with sequestration the budget will be less and will require some adjustments in work planning, but the State's priorities have not changed.

*R. [DOE] Every year there is something unusual about the budget process, but this year is especially challenging. There is a reluctance to conduct detailed planning at the sequestration level because the local DOE offices have not been directed to do so. Uncertainty around the 2014 budget adds another layer of complexity. DOE has a good set of priorities that can be altered depending on a multi-year understanding of what the federal budget will be. If operating under a scenario that 2014 will be a recovery year, DOE can plan to furlough some employees and put projects on hold that can be reinitiated the following year. Planning is very different under a scenario of multi-year budget cuts; layoffs and delays in planned work will result.*

*The 2015 budget also suffers from the uncertainty of the budget in FY 2013 and FY 2014. It is important for DOE to determine which projects and activities would be unacceptable to have slip. DOE will submit a compliant budget request for 2015 under the assumptions used for 2013 and 2014, which contain many unknowns.*

David Einan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said EPA is aware of the urgency of sequestration and that it is on the forefront of everyone's minds. He said that Mark's presentation is helpful in explaining what the budget process is supposed to look like during a normal year. EPA is mostly concerned with execution year funding because that is the work occurring right now. David added

---

<sup>‡</sup> Ecology added that the final totals are not available for regulatory or public review until the budget totals are sent to Congress.

that, in addition to sequestration, another source of uncertainty is whether DOE will receive an actual budget or another CR. There is an effort underway to get the FY 2015 budget cycle back on track.

### *Committee Questions and Response*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.*

Q. When can the Board hear about DOE's tradeoff decisions on cleanup work at the Hanford Site?

*R: [DOE] DOE always meets with the Board per TPA requirements. Once DOE receives final 2013 appropriations and the administration submits its 2014 request, DOE will return to the Board and discuss impacts of the budget after informing the regulators. Generally, DOE meets with the public during a budget workshop in mid-March. The workshop has not occurred yet this year because DOE-RL and DOE-ORP have not received directions from DOE – Office of Environmental Management (EM) concerning assumptions to use for planning in 2014.*

C. The Hanford Site receives budget year direction from DOE-EM. This direction used to come in March and the project offices submitted their requests in late April/early May. The Board usually does not receive any information on budgeting decisions until it is released to the public. There is a lot of activity and decision-making that the Board does not take part in. The Board would like more information about when public involvement opportunities fall on the budget timeline.

*R. [DOE] DOE provides information to the Board throughout the budget process and will meet with the Board to receive input on general budget priorities in accordance with what has been done in the past.*

Liz Mattson offered to provide a handout to BCC that shows public involvement opportunities from a budgeting standpoint. She noted that this year's handout has been delayed because the budget numbers are not available.

Q. Mid-June is the normal timeline for DOE corporate budget decisions. Is DOE-HQ on track for a mid-June date?

*R. [DOE] The local offices are being told that DOE-HQ would like to use the 2015 budget cycle to get back on schedule, assuming that 2014 will be a recovery year.*

Q. The Board was reassured previously that if the Board offers budget advice in June it will be in time to be considered for the 2015 budget submission. Can DOE confirm that they will accept budget advice in June?

*R: [DOE] The commitment that was made by DOE is that budget advice received in June would impact the budget development process. DOE-RL and DOE-ORP both submit budget requests to DOE-HQ, which then submits the request to Congress. DOE is unsure when the local offices will*

*need to make their submittals to DOE-HQ, but it will likely be in the early to mid-June timeframe. The pattern has been for DOE to submit Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) recommendations to DOE-HQ either with the local budget request or shortly after.*

Q. [Ecology] Sequestration will go into effect after almost half of the FY 2013 budget has already been spent. Will there need to be an increase in the 7.8% reduction to reach the total dollar amount that would be expected if the sequestration took place over the entire FY?

*R. [DOE] The total budget for the year will be reduced 7.8%, but half of the year will already have been executed by the time sequestration takes effect. This will be equivalent to a reduction of roughly 15% over the second half of the year. There are a few factors at the Hanford Site that will help mitigate the reduction. Local DOE offices have been conservative and are already spending below expected funding levels. Additionally, a lot of the work at the Hanford Site occurs over the summer through subcontracts. Some of these subcontracts will not be enacted.*

C. The Board should have a workshop sometime before offering budget advice to educate the Board on the budgeting process. This workshop should take place before the April BCC meeting to allow a more detailed discussion during the meeting.

C. Budget advice is typically initiated in BCC. Each of the other HAB committees is asked to consider issues that are particularly important for them and develop one or two paragraphs that could be inserted into budget advice. The subcommittees should start thinking about their priorities to be included in the budget advice during the April committee meetings.

Q. When DOE is preparing assumptions for the different budget scenarios, is there any consideration for unplanned events, such as the need to build more tanks if a leaking tank is found?

*R. [DOE] There is an assumed technical path forward. DOE does not generally set aside contingency funds for work outside of the anticipated scope. There is a confidence level associated with the defined assumptions because there are many unpredictable elements at the Hanford Site.*

C. The Board cannot develop effective advice without the proper information. For example, there has been a gap in the information flow regarding the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) since August 2 when there was a stop-work order. There should be a workshop to address these types of concerns and help the Board understand DOE's priorities.

*R. [DOE] DOE understands these concerns. Some of the information can be shared to help inform Board advice. DOE will be able to share when and how they develop their logic on work planning. DOE requests that the Board be specific about the information they would like from DOE. This year has a very unusual timetable, so some information may not be available when the Board requests it.*

C. The Board can develop the type of policy-level advice they are chartered with, in the absence of exact numbers. The Analytical Building Blocks (ABB) can provide some basic information for advice formulation.

C. The Board would like to know how much of the 2012 CR budget has been spent by the local DOE offices during the continuing resolution to help understand the true impacts of sequestration. The amount cut from DOE-RL and DOE-ORP would likely be around \$172 million based on the 2012 CR budget.

C. The Board would also be interested in hearing about what measures are being taken to reduce spending now. How is DOE asking the contractors to reduce spending levels? Also, what will be the effect of budget cuts on the Board and their ability to work going forward?

Liz Mattson said she has a helpful presentation that shows a flowchart of the budget process from initial request submittal to the President's budget and the congressional appropriation. She said this flowchart might be helpful even with the challenges of 2014 and 2015. Liz offered to update the flowchart with the information just provided and email it to Susan H. for distribution to BCC.

Jerry thanked Mark for his presentation. Potential budget advice related to the overall budget process will be discussed when the meeting resumes after the lunch break.

### **2013 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report\***

#### *DOE presentation*

Stephen Korenkiewicz, DOE-RL, gave a presentation on the 2013 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost (LSSC) Report (Attachment 3). He also read through highlights from the LSSC Report factsheet (Attachment 4) including what the LSSC Report does and does not do, major changes in the 2013 LSSC Report, and the Hanford Site remaining cleanup schedule. Stephen emphasized the following points in his presentation.

- The LSSC Report is updated annually on January 31. It details the scope, schedule and cost for completing the Hanford Site cleanup mission through 2090 based on all existing compliance requirements and agreements.
- Three lifecycle reports have been completed: 2011, 2012 and 2013. These reports and the factsheets are all available at [www.hanford.gov](http://www.hanford.gov). The 2014 LSSC Report is currently under development.

---

\* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

- There have been several major changes incorporated into the 2013 LSSC Report. Feedback on the 2013 LSSC Report will be accepted until April 12, 2013.

### *Regulator perspectives*

Melinda said Ecology appreciates the LSSC Report because it lays out the cost for a fully compliant Hanford Site cleanup over time using a variety of assumptions. Ecology regards the report as a tremendously valuable result of the settlement agreement. Ecology considers this report to be one of the most important documents regarding the Hanford Site. Melinda added that the numbers in the LSSC Report are far greater than the amount given in the President's budget.

David said EPA also finds the LSSC Report valuable, but what is even more useful is the work that has gone into developing the systems behind the document. The estimates and building blocks used to generate the report that do not actually show up in any document can be reworked to show various pictures of the Hanford Site cleanup in response to challenges. David said there have been many individuals working with these building blocks for long enough to have created an integrated priority list that can help determine what projects will be completed or not completed in response to budget reductions. He added that DOE and the other TPA agencies should consider whether the LSSC Report needs to be updated annually, since the tools will still be available regardless of how often the report is updated. David asked DOE if the tools show all the major dependencies.

*R. [DOE] DOE models according to risk. There are procedures to work backward whenever there are discrepancies with some element not appearing to have an impact when DOE knows it should. There are many critical dependencies included in the LSSC Report.*

### *Committee Discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members, unless noted otherwise.*

C. Some of comments on the 2013 LSSC Report were based on System Plan 4. There were concerns about secondary waste treatment cost estimates using System Plan 4 numbers. System Plan 6 has the most recent information and is now the basis for 2014, so that should be the basis for the LSSC Report. System Plan 7 will be coming out in a few years and that will have significant changes affecting compliance.

*R. [Ecology] The LSSC Report uses System Plan 4 because it is the approved baseline and is compliant. System Plan 6 and 7 are different planning cases. The LSSC Report only contains information that is compliance with current TPA agreements.*

C. As a cost-saving measure, the Board could advise DOE to consider consolidating the DOE-RL and DOE-ORP offices. DOE-RL funding will decrease significantly after about 2020. The Hanford Site will not need two DOE Offices after 2020. DOE-ORP is useful for capital projects, but once cleanup is completed along the Columbia River, the offices will only be duplicating efforts.

*R. [DOE] DOE has discussed the optimal timing of consolidating the two offices, but has not made any decisions.*

Q. The Board decided for budgetary reasons and a lack of information that there will not be an April Board meeting, which is when the Board usually offers LSSC Report advice. Since DOE is requesting input on the 2013 LSSC Report by April 12, The Board requests an extension until June to offer LSSC report advice.

*R. [DOE] Board advice received in June can be used in preparation of the 2014 LSSC Report.*

C. Obtaining reasonable cost estimates has been a challenge over the years. Work completed today will impact work tomorrow and beyond. Costs change over time so projects that are delayed into the future can lead to strange comparisons when taking interest into account. The Board has not seen a good comparison between alternative cleanup paths. System Plan 6 handles information differently than System Plan 4. Capital investments decrease available funding for other work so these investments should be considered.

*R. [DOE] DOE has analysis capabilities for those sorts of considerations. DOE looks at cleanup from the 30,000 level and up. There are different scenarios for work planning over the remainder of the year at DOE-RL. DOE-ORP has a different system planning process.*

C. It would be useful to incorporate some of DOE-RL's approach with DOE-ORP since that is where a lot of massive changes are taking place.

*R. [Ecology] Ecology's understanding is that a new baseline is under consideration that outlines where DOE is in the system with reasonable upper bound alternatives. The LSSC Report is literally a record of compliance, which is what Ecology appreciates most. The LSSC Report tracks work that has been completed and what still needs to be done to achieve compliance.*

Q. How is the LSSC Report updated to include changes in cost? For example, how would the assumed increased work scope in 2014 be reflected in the LSSC Report?

*R. [DOE] The LSSC Report includes information from the previous year. DOE can examine any elements that have changed. Some of the uncertainty and risk is incorporated in the baseline.*

*R. [Ecology] If the Record of Decision (ROD) and remedy are different, the new figures can be captured in the risk calculation and incorporated in the range. If the numbers are higher, DOE can do a contract modification. Decisions will likely need to be changed because of the budget, but the TPA agreements have not been changed and only the official milestones are included in the LSSC report.*

C. The most important components of the LSSC Report should be clear to potential readers, including members of Congress who may only look at the factsheet. The Hanford Site has a very complex project model that can act as a tool for use in future budget proposals. It would be helpful to include a few

sentences at the top of the report stating that this represents the compliance case for Hanford Site cleanup. The wording could be simplified.

Q. Is there an automatic factor built in to reflect inflation?

R. [DOE] There is an automatic assumed inflation rate of 2.3%.

Jerry thanked Stephen for his presentation. He said that he will work with Harold on development of draft LSSC advice for subsequent review and discussion by the committee in April.

### **Advice on Overall Budget Process\***

#### *Issue Manager introduction*

Jerry, Issue Manager (IM) for the overall budget process topic, said he has been considering what might be a more realistic budgeting process in view of sequestration and delayed budget information. Jerry provided a document with some background information and potential draft advice points (Attachment 5).

Jerry said DOE-RL has received approximately \$1 billion dollars for as long as he can remember, except in a few rare cases. He suggested DOE consider flat-lining that number for DOE-RL and potentially for DOE-ORP as well. There is an agreement that DOE-ORP will receive \$690 million every year for WTP construction and operations, which has been met every year except for last year.<sup>§</sup> Jerry said the budget seems to be fairly consistent for the Hanford Site cleanup and at this point there is a general understanding of what work remains at the Hanford Site.

Jerry said this high-level piece of advice can also include other considerations for work scope that do not appear in any schedule, such as mitigating leaking tanks. He noted the relative consistency of budget requests and said that according to the FY 2013 LSSC Report, DOE-RL is asking for 1.2 billion dollars for full compliance, although they may not receive that amount. Jerry estimated DOE-RL will actually receive around \$919 million based on an 8% reduction in the 2012 budget. He noted that amount is approximately \$260 million less than what is needed to accomplish the goals as defined in the LSSC Report.

Susan H. provided handouts with comments on the Jerry's draft document from Ken Niles (Attachment 6) and Jeff Luke (Attachment 7).

---

\* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

<sup>§</sup> Ecology noted after the meeting that the US Congress establishes WTP funding annually because budget law requires the Congress to appropriate specific funds for each capital funded project.

*Committee discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.*

C. There has been a vacuum in pretreatment since August, and the start up of WTP will be pushed out if DOE makes modifications to pretreatment. There are many complications that will delay the milestones. Some of these complications have been known long enough that they can be built into the budget. The Board should issue multi-year budget advice through the 2020 pretreatment startup timeframe. The Board could state what work should be completed by 2020, regardless of budgetary concerns. There are certain projects that the Board does not want to slip.

C. The general budget process advice has too many points and it may not be effective for the Board to offer advice on a budget process where DOE has no control. The budget process is directed by OMB and Congress. The advice could be reframed where the Board is offering advice such as “we think DOE would be effective if the agency worked more closely with Congress.” It may be valuable for the Board to go on record with its thinking, even if it may not have an impact on the budget process.

C. The Board has been reluctant to identify priorities for Hanford Site cleanup because prioritizing actions could appear as though the Board were urging DOE not to complete work that is low on the Board’s priorities list.

C. The Board could develop a white paper based on HAB values that considers the risks for each project and what work might be delayed by budget reductions without getting into too much detail. This white paper could provide background to help inform advice. The agencies would also benefit from seeing some of the thought process that goes into advice development.

C. Prioritization can be based on risk and hazard. The Plutonium Finishing Plant and keeping contamination away from the Columbia River are the two highest risk projects at the Hanford Site. Prioritization could include consideration of what projects would promote continued funding from Congress and receive public support. For example, the contamination under Building 324 could be classified as a high priority project because of public concern.

C. There appear to be five categories that might be helpful in capturing the different pieces to include in advice: systematic issues like the DOE-RL/ORP budget division, overarching risks and hazards, concerns over schedule delay and costs, public involvement/acceptance, and Board prioritization values. The Board might be able to find a middle ground between prioritizing work that should be completed without implying that other cleanup projects can be abandoned. The categories would be part of framing the advice.

C. [DOE] The 2015 Vision was valuable for DOE-RL as a goal to define specific desired accomplishments. Some people used the 2015 Vision as a marketing tool, but that was not the original intent. Doug Shoop will be giving a presentation on post-2015 during the March 6 River and Plateau

Committee (RAP) meeting. Hearing Doug's presentation might be helpful as BCC develops budget advice.

C. If the two local DOE offices are integrated and the work prioritized, the WTP and pretreatment would receive priority attention. A lot of other work would suffer if the risk factor is not high enough to make that work a priority action.

C. The Board could issue a policy statement that includes recommended work scope based on risk and hazard with a general statement on cleanup priorities. This type of advice would be consistent with HAB values.

C. There are a number of Board members who do not believe DOE can count on receiving the same amount of money over the next decade because of the variable economic circumstances. Board members would likely be willing to identify their priorities but would have a hard time identifying work that can be delayed when decisions have to be made.

C. Tank waste was the number one priority of the Board when it was formed and tank waste is still the top priority.

C. The BCC should develop framing questions for the other HAB committees. What are your priorities for accomplishing what is left in the Hanford Site work scope? What items need to be accomplished even if funding is reduced? The Board has been reluctant to do that in the past and has been especially reluctant to put cleanup projects in any sort of order.

C. There is an important distinction between a risk and a hazard. This distinction could be laid out in the background section of the advice.

C. [DOE] DOE is considering holding a 2015 budget workshop during April committee week.

*R. A workshop at that time could impact committee week because several committees will be meeting. The workshop could be held Monday or Tuesday evening and the BCC meeting could be scheduled later in the week.*

Susan H. said that on next week's committee calls, people should be made aware of the upcoming budget advice development process and that each committee needs to identify someone to be part of this advice development group. Jerry will write out a set of questions that can be distributed to BCC for comment. After the budget workshop, interested Board members can meet to determine a process for establishing priority issues/topics and discuss conversations held in each of the committee meetings.

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of developing the overall budget process advice, given that the budget process is fairly inflexible, and Committee members were not convinced that Board members would accept the budget "flat-line" scenario depicted in Jerry's draft document. Jerry expressed interest in reworking the draft advice framework based on today's discussion, and the Committee agreed to consider a subsequent draft.

Jerry recapped that the intent is for BCC to develop three pieces of advice for the June Board meeting: advice on the 2014 LSSC Report, priorities that would tie into the 2014/2015 budgets and advice on the overall budget process. The overall budget process advice is not time sensitive and can be delayed to allow the other two proposed pieces of budget advice to move forward, if need be.

### **Committee Business\***

BCC reviewed the Three Month Work Plan (Attachment 8). Many of the questions identified for April will be addressed during the workshop. April is tentatively set for advice development and BCC will not be requesting any presentations. DOE is required to hold a public workshop within 30 days of the Presidential budget release. That workshop can be held sooner if it will help the Board process, provided briefings to the regulators are complete. There might be more budget information in time for the April Board meeting. Susan H. noted there might be an agenda item concerning new budget information if it is available.

There will be a joint call between BCC and the Public Involvement Committee (PIC) to discuss the public budget workshop. BCC members noted the challenges in preparing for the workshop when there seems to be less information available every year. The Board would like to know the requested budget amount for DOE-ORP in 2014.

BCC noted that since April will be a busy month with three committees likely requesting three full day meetings, there might be a need to hold the BCC meeting either on Friday or Monday. Other meeting options will also be considered.

Susan H. reviewed the follow-up items from the flipcharts. Susan H., Jerry and Susan Leckband will work on developing the process for budget advice development prior to next week's committee calls. Susan H. will forward the handouts from Liz on the budget process. Liz requested the 2014 budget number requested from DOE-ORP. That number had not been made available because of the DOE-ORP re-baselining effort but DOE-RL will check if it is available yet. The number might be available for the public workshop. The BCC would also like to know how much of the 2013 budget is left for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to help understand sequestration impacts.

BCC confirmed they will not have their own committee call on Tuesday, but will join the PIC call on Thursday to discuss the public workshop. Susan H. said the call time has not been determined, but committee members will be notified.

### **Attachments**

Attachment 1: Transcribed flipchart notes

---

\* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

- Attachment 2: DOE budget process presentation
- Attachment 3: 2013 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report presentation
- Attachment 4: 2013 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report factsheet
- Attachment 5: Potential framing for budget advice
- Attachment 6: Ken Niles comments on potential framing for budget advice
- Attachment 7: Tracked changes on potential framing for public advice (Jeff Luke)
- Attachment 8: BCC – 3 month work plan

**Attendees**

Board members and alternates

Al Boldt	Susan Leckband	Dick Smith
Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson (phone)	Keith Smith (phone)
Steve Hudson (phone)	Jerry Peltier	

Others

Mark Coronado, DOE	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Dave Einan, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Stephen Korenkiewicz, DOE-RL		Sharon Braswell, MSA
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Drew Butler, MSA
		Ken Moser, MSA
		Barb Wise, MSA