

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE MEETING
October 7, 2009
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Multi-Tier Pension and Benefits Program 1
Review of HAB Advice Response #213 and #220 5
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Workshop on Proposed Consent Decree and TPA
Modifications 9
Committee Business..... 11
Action Items / Commitments 12
Handouts 12
Attendees..... 13

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Gerry Pollet, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair, welcomed the committee, introductions were made, and the committee adopted the September meeting summary.

Multi-Tier Pension and Benefits Program

Doug Adyame, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), provided an update on the multi-tier pension and benefits program. The BCC identified three issues at its September meeting that needed follow-up, including whether DOE conducted a review of the pension and benefits program before proceeding with requests for proposals (RFPs), the cost of administering multiple pension and benefit plans for Hanford workers, and the cost of Hanford managing offsite pension plans, including the source of this funding. Doug said DOE-RL is currently working to address additional questions raised from the September 10 BCC meeting.

Doug provided an overview of the policy review that DOE conducted. In 2006, DOE issued Notice 351.1 on contractor employee pension and benefit policies. The House and Senate addressed Notice 351.1 through proposed legislation on May 11, 2006, and Secretary of Energy Samuel W. Bodman issued a letter on June 19, 2006 stating that Notice 351.1 would be suspended for one year while comments were gathered. Based on the public comments, DOE Notice 351.1 was not implemented. Doug said the formal review was not made public, and DOE-RL did not receive a copy of the review. Since

Notice 351.1 was not implemented, the contractor human resource management programs defined in DOE Order 350.1 remained in place.

Doug reviewed the cost of administering multiple plans, which is based on the volume of the assets in the plan. DOE examined the cost of its plans as compared to the industry standard and found that the Hanford Site plans have a fee less than the industry standard. The DOE fee is 0.5 to 0.6 percent, while the industry standard is a fee of 1 percent. The health and wellness industry standard is 3 percent, while the Hanford Site fee is approximately 2 percent. Doug said Hanford has multi-employer benefit plans, including the Hanford Site Pension Plan, Hanford Site Savings Plan and Hanford Employee Welfare Trust. There are at least 12 participating employers in each plan. Doug said some contracts, such as the Plateau Remediation Contract, the Tank Operations Contract, the Mission Support Contract, and the River Corridor Closure Contract, include clauses that require market-based plans for non-incumbent employees.

Doug reviewed the cost of managing offsite legacy plans. Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) and the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) have a contractual requirement to manage the benefit plans from three closed DOE sites. Doug said DOE – Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) cleanup funds are not used for the legacy plans, and Congress appropriates these funds separately.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry asked whether DOE-RL requested a copy of the review of DOE Notice 351.1. Doug said he does not know this, but can find out whether there is a record of this.
- Jeff Luke asked whether the review of DOE Notice 351.1 is available for the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) and the public to see. Doug said he will go to DOE – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) to find out whether it is possible to obtain a copy of the review.
- Gerry asked how it is decided which employees are incumbent or non-incumbent. Doug said he is not sure how this is defined in the contract, but he can find the definition.
- Gerry asked whether the staff administering onsite programs is paid for by DOE-HQ. He said BCC would like to know the overhead costs associated with administration. Joyce Gilbert, DOE-RL, said DOE-RL has researched this, and it is included in the contract that the administrative costs are kept completely separate and not part of Hanford funding. DOE-RL conducted a review of this when it was under the CH2M Hill Hanford Group and Fluor Hanford contracts, so as new contracts are brought in DOE-RL has already completed the initial review to ensure this funding is separate.
- Keith Smith asked what happens to corporate market-based plans when a contractor leaves and some employees stay at the site. Joyce said the policy is that if these employees are currently in the Hanford Site plan they continue in that plan. For market-based plans, it depends on what the employee offers.

- Keith asked whether there is a break in pension service every time an employee changes contractors, and how DOE takes responsibility for this. Joyce said DOE does not dictate what contractors offer. DOE ensures they fulfill their contracts.
- Harold Heacock asked how many retired and currently working employees are covered under various types of site plans. He said this information would help understand the magnitude of the issue. Joyce said she currently does not have this information on hand because it would require examining the contracts of the prime and sub-contractors. Doug said DOE-HQ requires teaming partners to disclose this information so their financial statements include a line for pension liability. He said this is only for prime management and does not include sub-contractors. Doug will work to get this information to the BCC.
- Jeff asked whether an employee who was previously employed by one contractor and retained by a new contractor would start a new pension plan with the new contractor. Joyce said this would depend on the contract the employee was originally hired under, since all of the contracts are different.
- Jeff asked whether employees who have retained their pension and years of accrual under the same pension plan are better off financially than those who have been covered by multiple plans. Doug said this would depend on the plans because different plans are at different percentages per year. He said different plans have different high-three or high-five years, so it may be better to have been charged over all of the years of service rather than a short period of time with the last employer. Jeff asked if all the subsequent years are taken into account for employees who have changed plans. Doug said this would depend, and for employees who are under the Hanford Site pension plan this would not make a difference. Jeff asked how this would affect employees not under the Hanford Site pension plan or those who became outside-the-fence employees in 1996. Joyce said for these employees the loss of service years would be from the time they left the company and went to a new company.
- Jeff asked whether employees who were outside-the-fence are now inside-the-fence. Peter Turping, Lockheed Martin, said some outside-the-fence workers have not been brought back into the Hanford Site plan. Jeff asked DOE's rationale for not bringing those employees back into the pension plan. Joyce said DOE is working on a response to this question. Doug said this depends on what is considered incumbent or non-incumbent.

Worker Perspectives

- John Bongers, Lockheed Martin, said an incumbent employee is defined as an employee who is active in the Hanford Site pension plan or welfare site plan and accrues service credits. John said the part of the definition about accruing service credits excludes enterprise employees. John said employees who were classified as enterprise outside-the-fence employees in 1996 did not voluntarily leave DOE but do not meet the definition of incumbent employees.

- John said the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) contract currently has seven different plans, including incumbent employees, bargaining employees, new MSA employees, enterprise employees, new employees, enterprise employees who moved to the MSA, and corporate employees.
- Glynn Stevens, Lockheed Martin, said DOE does not dictate market-based benefits but does dictate when contracts change and approves contractor proposals. In this way, DOE has control over what happens to employee benefits, especially the new market-based plan. Glynn said employees earn benefits such as vacation and pension based on the number of years of service, and when DOE is required by law to change contractors it has a direct effect on employees' ability to earn continuity of service.
- Dick Cartmell, Lockheed Martin, asked whether there were public comments on the 350.1 Notice. Glynn said there were more than 400 public comments, which are obtainable online.

Committee Discussion

- Harold said the HAB needs an idea of the scope of the issues and their impacts. To consider the issue from a policy perspective, the HAB needs to know the structure of the plans and the number of employees covered by different plans. Harold said at the September meeting the BCC asked for the number of affected people and number of plans, and it has not yet received this information.
- Gerry said the BCC's goal is to understand whether there would be a significant cost savings for the Hanford Site if there were one or a smaller number of plans, which was not answered by the relative percentage. He said the committee would like to know the overall cost of administration in real dollars and whether there would be a cost savings for reducing the number of plans.
- Gerry said an important issue is DOE's decision to change the system with new contracts. He said the BCC would like to understand the basis of DOE's decision-making when it rejected the notion of bringing all employees back into the plan, as advised by the HAB in November 2006. He said DOE should respond to the HAB in a public manner regarding the basis for rejecting this advice.
- Jeff said he would like an explanation of the rationale for not extending pension benefits to employees who were previously inside-the-fence. He said he thinks pension benefits should be extended to these employees and the lost years of pension service should be given back to them.
- Gerry commented that the enterprise-company concept was a failure, but the question is the rationale for not rectifying this. He said the BCC should focus on the policy issue by looking at the magnitude of the problem, including the number of employees per plan, whether there would be cost savings for reducing the number of plans, and determining whether simplifying and bringing employees back into the plan would benefit the employee work force by creating continuity on the site. He said having employees working side by side with different plans is an inequity that hurts work being completed and a rationale for this is needed.

- Keith said a single plan was proposed in the 1980s, and at this time DOE made it clear that there was a cost savings to going to a single plan.

Review of HAB Advice Response #213 and #220

Gerry said the Board and BCC spent a great deal of time developing budget advice specific to DOE on their budget and encouraging the regulators to focus on certain issues. Gerry said DOE's response to the advice lacked specificity, with the exception of the wiped film evaporator. He said the response to Advice #220 from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) said the advice would help in terms of the fiscal year (FY) 2010 response but did not address the advice.

Gerry said the Board expressed its concern that DOE defined a budget for DOE-HQ based on its expectations rather than the expectations of Ecology and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the work that needed to be done, such as retrieval and treatment. He said DOE has not responded to or discussed this with the HAB and he would like a management-level discussion on the HAB advice with all of the agencies. Gerry noted that key issues on the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Consent Decree relate directly to the HAB advice.

Regulator Perspectives

- Paula Call, DOE-RL, said DOE did respond to the advice. She said ideally DOE would provide a point-by-point response, but in this case its response was drafted when the details of what DOE was submitting were embargoed. She said this may be an issue for DOE's responses to budget advice each FY, depending on timing. Paula said the HAB's point is well taken and DOE will consider this in the future. Regarding the memo from the committee, she said she understands that BCC is interested in the specifics of funding for each project, and at the September meeting DOE-ORP and DOE-RL provided the proposed work scope for each project. The memo stated that the BCC has not heard about the characterization of waste sites, which is a River and Plateau Committee (RAP) issue that will be covered during the October 9 RAP briefing on the Central Plateau (CP) Strategy.
- John Price, Ecology, said there is usually a couple of months between HAB meetings and Ecology understands that it is helpful to have a response before the next Board meeting.
- Lori Gamache, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said she will take the Board's comments on the response to HAB Advice #213 back to DOE-ORP. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, noted that the agencies are responsible for responding to HAB advice, and there was an issue that it needs to be clarified who the advice goes to and which agencies need to respond. She said DOE-ORP considered this advice as DOE developed its budget request. Lori said she understands that it would be easier for the HAB and the public to see how DOE responds to advice, and as DOE develops responses in the future they will be mindful of this. Lori

commented that it is helpful for her to hear the dialogue between HAB members and DOE-ORP project staff at committee meetings, and the importance of this should not be overlooked.

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said he thinks the Board and the agencies have faltered in having a dialogue about how the agencies are responding to HAB advice and what that really means. He said EPA has approached advice by choosing to highlight the importance of specific points, and he thinks writing line-by-line advice would make it difficult to understand what is important to the agencies. For the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) advice, Dennis said EPA chose to point out the important issues.
- Dennis said EPA tends to provide brief responses to budget advice, since this advice is meant to be an important tool for DOE-ORP and DOE-RL to use.
- Dennis said the agencies have been in negotiations on CP characterization since February and EPA's response to the HAB's advice was written to indicate that this process is still underway and the September 30 CP Strategy document from DOE is very important. Characterization is completed initially, during and at the end of a project to ensure it has been done correctly, so Dennis said determining whether additional characterization is needed is complicated. He said he thinks it would be helpful if the Board agrees with the premises the agencies are laying out because that will be the template for future decisions. Gerry said the Board issued specific bullets on characterization in support of EPA by stating that funding was not adequate to characterize Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) sites in 2010. The HAB also issued specific advice on 618-10/11. He said a response indicating that it is still under negotiation is inadequate, and the Board needs to hear whether EPA agrees or disagrees that the funds will do the work EPA expects. Dennis said work at 618-10/11 is ongoing, and EPA could have responded by saying it supports this work. For sites around PFP, EPA has been focusing on PW-1, 3 and 6 and CW-5, and believes these are well characterized. He said EPA did use the advice on 618-10/11. Gerry said that is great to hear, but he has not been updated on progress at 618-10/11 except at the RAP meeting, and this discussion did not include funding issues. Dennis said this type of dialogue should take place the month after the agencies receive the advice. He said he cannot provide an answer on whether there is enough money to finish the CP work, but suggested the Board look at the CP Strategy document.
- John Price, Ecology, said Ecology issued an apology for not responding to Advice #220 more quickly, and found that there was a flaw in its system, which they are working to fix. John said Ecology decided that it will respond to all advice, whether it is issued to Ecology or not. Moving forward, each time a piece of advice is issued Ecology will determine whether the Tri-Parties will respond, whether two parties will respond, or whether Ecology will respond independently. He said this process takes more time, especially when the agencies collaborate and need consensus, but they are mindful of the importance of responding in a timely manner. John said Ecology wants to provide thoughtful responses, and while the agency may not respond in a point-by-point manner, it needs to put the time in to respond in a substantive way. He said it would be helpful to receive feedback on Ecology's response. Regarding Advice #220, John said when issues are under negotiation it does influence how the agencies can

respond to advice. He said once the agencies have signed the TPA Consent Decree and that legal process is completed they could provide a more detailed response to Advice #220. John said Ecology felt that its budget letter was consistent with Board advice and covered the same subjects.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry said the Board has repeated several advice principles in multiple pieces of HAB advice since the Board has not received a written response to these issues. Paula said characterization is a RAP topic, and asked whether the RAP communicates with BCC if these issues are addressed in DOE presentations to RAP after HAB advice is issued. Susan Leckband suggested that when DOE makes presentations to technical committees that include funding information it would be helpful for DOE to point out any reference to budget advice.
- Susan said the Board issued Advice #213 on February 6 and received DOE's response on August 28. She said she would like to see less time for responses, as the issue loses its timeliness during this process.
- Harold said the Board is looking for a more detailed response that includes whether the advice is a good idea, whether there are plans to implement it and whether there is funding to implement it. Gerry agreed with Harold, and for advice that deals with inadequate funding for an item to meet a specific deadline it would be helpful to get a response from the agencies on whether they are taking action to resolve the issue.
- Keith said the problem with responding through presentations is that it is not in the advice response record. Susan said Board members often suggest that members of the public look at the HAB Web site, and those people are not privy to discussions in committee meetings. She said responding to advice in presentations does not give the public a clear idea of how the agencies are responding, so providing a written response is positive for the agencies as well as the Board.
- Gerry said DOE-ORP responded to Advice #220 with discussion of the Board's advice about wiped film evaporators. He said the main issue for the TPA Consent Decree is that there is not a commitment in the negotiations to look at this evaporator and expand retrieval capacity until after 2015. Gerry said early low-activity waste (LAW) is a related issue, and the Board made an effort on this in response to Ecology's discussion about the need to fund supplemental treatment. He said the Board did not hear back on its budget advice, thus leaving the Board to presume that the statements on projects not funded are accurate. Gerry recommended a discussion about these DOE-ORP items take place, and asked whether Ecology has a response to why it is not asking for the deployment of wiped film evaporators if this technology is proven. John said Ecology would be happy to talk to the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) about any of these items. As far as budget, the agencies have been consistent with Board advice in the TPA Consent Decree. He also said the Consent Decree will drive the budget through 2022 for DOE-ORP. John said the overall budget, including American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding, is positive, and the big challenge is that the same level of funding is needed for a few additional years in

order to reach that date. Gerry said the HAB's budget advice focuses on ARRA funding running out, and a more detailed discussion with the regulators is needed.

- Susan commented that she thinks the BCC needs to work more closely with the technical committees, since all of these issues are intrinsically linked. Gerry said this is often done before the HAB issues advice, and suggested a dialogue about the response to the advice could also take place. Dennis said dialogue is needed after advice is issued at the same level as the up-front discussion, and he thinks this has been a weak point for the Board and the agencies. John said the Board's workload is so heavy that there may be reluctance to revisit issues that the Board has already issued advice about. He suggested that the HAB could focus on fewer issues so there is time to go back to them once advice has been issued. Harold said BCC advice includes issues provided by RAP and TWC. He suggested that BCC advice could have closer scrutiny from the technical committees when it is in draft form before it goes to the full Board meeting.
- Gerry said the BCC has been disappointed by discussions regarding an integrated priority list (IPL) for DOE-ORP. He said he would like a discussion and response from Ecology on the lack of a meaningful IPL for DOE-ORP. John said he thinks ARRA funding highlighted issues like infrastructure upgrades, which is a huge problem, but ultimately that list is not substantial. Gerry said DOE-ORP's priority list only showed work for which funding was being requested. He said the Board has criticized this and Ecology has expressed concern, but the HAB did not receive a response to this advice. He said this is an issue because DOE-ORP committed to hose-in-hose compliance for transfer lines going through the cement walls of vaults seven years ago and Ecology agreed that this was an important compliance issue. Gerry said since this was not in the IPL he assumed it had been funded, but there are now plans to upgrade it using ARRA funding. Dennis said the current IPLs at Hanford are less detailed than IPLs in the past, and EPA finds out what is funded from individual remedial project managers because the IPLs do not include detail about what is funded. He said it used to be that the details of what was below the line was clear from the IPLs, but the workforce structure to create IPLs like this no longer exists. Gerry said the inadequacy of the IPL is an important place for Ecology and EPA to respond to Board advice. He said this advice is intended to encourage regulators to require a more substantial IPL. Dennis said the regulators can and do get enough information to understand whether DOE is meeting its compliance case or not, but it is not as easy as it used to be. He said the last time the agencies tried to revise TPA paragraphs 148-149 it was a difficult process. He said the agencies still receive the information they need, but the IPL is not as detailed as it used to be.
- Harold commented that the HAB is a policy advisory board and should issue advice on the cleanup work it would like to see funded and general priorities, but he does not think it is the Board's function to get into specific detail issues. He said he thinks the Board sometimes puts itself into a management role rather than a policy role.
- Gerry said the Board needs to integrate a system of having advice responses as part of the committee agenda. He suggested scheduling a discussion with the agencies to evaluate the three pieces of budget advice and their responses from the past year. Sharon Braswell, MSA, said she would also like to look at how the agencies have

responded through presentations to committees. Susan said she would bring this issue back to the Executive Issues Committee (EIC).

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Workshop on Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications

Gerry said the workshop on the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications took place in order to for the Board to give advice at its November Board meeting He asked the BCC for feedback on the workshop.

Committee Discussion

- Jeff said Tom Carpenter made a comment at the workshop regarding whether the Tri-Parties will respond to comments on the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications. He said the BCC should consider framing advice asking the Tri-Parties to provide responses to the public comments and the Board as an extension of the comment period in order to better understand the process and resolution of comments. He said the last time the Tri-Parties formally addressed this issue was in October 2007, and a couple of months is not an adequate amount of time to have a dialogue about activities that will affect Hanford cleanup for years to come. He suggested advising that DOE respond publicly in writing to comments so the public can see the responses and possibly create an iterative process.
- Harold said the Tri-Parties have reached an agreement, which they presented at the workshop. He asked whether the agreement is subject to re-negotiation based on public comment. Jeff said a comment has to be one that the agencies had not considered and must be of some consequence for the agencies to re-open negotiations. He said the Consent Decree includes the provision that DOE is obligated to follow its requirements until it is in place, and he thinks they should wait to finalize the agreement until responses to questions and comments are provided.
- Susan asked whether the potential advice would ask the Tri-Parties to delay final negotiations until an iterative comment process has taken place. Jeff said this is correct.
- Gerry said the Tri-Parties signed their agreement on the TPA Change Package on August 11 without responding to public comments, and sent a mailing a few weeks ago that advised the public that the responses were available online from August 11. Jeff said asking for a response to comments before an agreement is signed is important in case comments have been misinterpreted.
- Susan asked whether the Proposed Consent Decree has been signed. Pam Larsen said the agreement is subject to public comment.
- Gerry commented that two governors must sign the Proposed Consent Decree, and he is not sure they agree with the characterization of what is needed to re-negotiate it. John clarified that there are two separate Consent Decrees, and the governor of

Washington will sign the decree discussed in the workshop, while the Governor of Oregon will sign a separate decree.

- Pam said the state did not get everything it requested, but it did get a great deal of its request. She said the Board has an obligation to define its concerns, but she thinks the site is in a better position than it was previously and the HAB must be realistic. She said because the agencies have negotiated the agreement they cannot discuss all of its details so the Board should have patience. Gerry said if there is an item they hoped to get and only got part of, they may welcome a push from the public. Pam agreed that they may welcome this.
- Al Boldt said the Tri-Parties are not going to respond to comments if the document is still subject to negotiations. He said the positive side of the agreement is that the old TPA was broken and this creates a new one. He said the negative is that the schedule is not as aggressive as the Board would like, but this does not mean that cleanup could not be accelerated and completed before the end date. Al suggested that the Board could advise that the work scope be accelerated in order to complete certain items earlier than their end dates. He said the Board could influence future actions rather than being reactive.
- Gerry asked whether Jeff's suggested advice principle should be brought forward. He said this should also be brought forward to the Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Susan said it seems like the agencies should respond to comments, but it took two-and-a-half years to reach an agreement on realistic dates with the potential to be moved forward. She said she is struggling with asking the Tri-Parties to delay finalizing their agreement. Jeff said he recognizes reality, but the issue is that the public has been excluded from the process and this is the only opportunity the public has to weigh in on the agreement. He said he does not think allowing the public the opportunity to see responses to comments would harm the process. He said this is more a moral issue than a technical issue. Jeff said he thinks the public should receive meaningful responses to their comments. John said there are two parts – the Consent Decree and the TPA Modifications. The TPA changes go into effect only upon entry of the consent decree, so they are dependent on it. He said there is motivation to get the Consent Decree entered into court because it is a lawsuit in which the agencies have reached agreement. He said there is not an obligation to take comment on the Consent Decree but the Tri-Parties have said they will. He said there is a legal requirement to take comments and prepare a response to them on the TPA changes. Gerry said he does not think a Consent Decree that states that the TPA is being changed can be adopted unless public comments on the TPA are accepted first. Jeff said saying the Tri-Parties have limited time on the Consent Decree is a way to push the Board to not request offering an extended comment period and require responses. He said it should be clear whether the comments will influence the TPA Change Package and/or the Consent Decree.
- Al suggested that the Board issue advice that the Tri-Parties should accept comments on the revisions to the TPA as stated in the agreement.
- Gerry said one major item of the Consent Decree negotiations and TPA modifications is the lifecycle cost and schedule report. He said at the September Board meeting Ken

Niles commented that the description of this in the proposal does not reflect the intent of the Board's comment, since the HAB urged that it be adopted. Gerry said specific items the HAB requested be in this report, such as retrieving more transuranic (TRU) waste and accelerating cleanup of CP soil sites, are not reflected in the cost and schedule report. He said the agencies committed to responding in November. Gerry said when the HAB issued advice it expected that the lifecycle report would reflect the intent of allowing consideration of whether work could be accelerated if budget were not inappropriately constrained and to allow examination of whether all work is planned and budgeted. He said the lifecycle report presented in the Consent Decree and TPA Change Package includes detail at the project baseline summary (PBS) level, so for DOE-ORP all of the tank work is included in one PBS, and the Board has been critical of this. Gerry said detail is only provided at the lower levels of the two-to five-year window, which the Board already has. Dennis said it would be helpful for the Board to give advice that includes a simple explanation of what it wants the report to accomplish. Dennis said EPA and Ecology will submit comments so this is an opportunity for the Board to clearly articulate its values of what the report should cover.

- Jeff asked what the Board's advice would be on this subject. Gerry said the lifecycle cost and schedule report should reflect the intent as presented to the HAB in 2007, which was to allow consideration of whether work could be accelerated if budgets were not constrained and to allow examination of whether old work is planned and budgeted. Jeff said Enclosure E of the report includes statements about not assuming limitation of future funding and taking into consideration future resource availability and the practical limits of project acceleration when developing an execution plan. He asked whether these accomplish what the Board wants. Gerry said the language regarding the intent of the document is encouraging, but it is also important to see what the report will include after the five-year window, since these items are only at a PBS level with an appendix one level below it. Dennis said it would be helpful to have advice on what should be included and what the report should accomplish. He said the intent has not changed since the HAB saw it in 2007, but that information would help put the document together. John said the level of detail included is from two to five years, and if the HAB wants a higher level of detail then that should be included in its advice. He said examples such as pre-1970 TRU and early LAW are listed as priorities, and if the Board has six to 10 items it would like to be accelerated it would be helpful to list those in the advice.
- Susan suggested that, as advice bullets are formulated, the HAB should look at the list of what the report should accomplish.
- Gerry and Jeff will work on developing a draft of this advice.

Committee Business

The committee reviewed its next steps and potential November meeting topics.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry and Jeff will work on advice regarding the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications.
- Keith suggested conducting a follow-up discussion on pension and benefits in November, if the additional information the committee requested is available.
- Gerry said a November BCC meeting is needed to discuss lifecycle cost.
- Gerry said reviewing all of the budget advice from the past year with the agencies could take place in December or January. Sharon asked whether the BCC will identify major themes and issues, and committee members said they would do this.
- The next BCC meeting will take place either in November, outside of committee week due to the TPA Workshop, or in December. November 17 and 18 were suggested as possible dates for a November BCC meeting. Tentative topics for the next meeting are lifecycle cost, the DOE-ORP baseline and pensions and benefits.
- The committee will have a call on Tuesday, October 13 at 10:30 a.m.

Action Items / Commitments

- Doug will determine whether it is possible to obtain a copy of the review of DOE Notice 351.1 and will provide the BCC a copy of this, if possible.
- Doug will follow-up with how incumbent and non-incumbent employees are contractually defined.
- Doug will work to find out how many current and retired employees at Hanford are covered under different pension and benefit plans.
- Gerry and Jeff will work on advice regarding the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications.

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tgilley@enviroissues.com

- HAB Consensus Advice #194: Multi-Tier Pension & Benefits Programs, Hanford Advisory Board, November 3, 2006.
- Response to HAB Consensus Advice #194: Multi-Tier Pension & Benefits Programs, Keith A. Klein and Shirley J. Olinger, March 19, 2007.
- HAB BCC Briefing, Environmental Management Richland Operations Office, October 2009.
- HAB Consensus Advice #213: Priorities for FY 2010, Out-Year and Economic Stimulus Budgets, Hanford Advisory Board, February 6, 2009.

- HAB Consensus Advice #220: FY 2010 Budget Request & Stimulus Funding, Hanford Advisory Board, June 5, 2009.
- Response to Hanford Advisory Board Consensus Advice #220, Dennis Faulk, July 29, 2009.
- Hanford Advisory Board (Board) February 6, 2009, Advice #213, “Priorities for Fiscal Year 2010, Out-Year and Economic Stimulus Budgets” and June 5, 2009, Advice #220, “Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request and Stimulus Funding,” David Brockman and Shirley Olinger, August 28, 2009.
- Re: Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Consensus Advice #220, “Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request and Stimulus Funding,” dated June 5, 2009, Jane A. Hedges, September 30, 2009.
- Re: United States Department of Energy (USDOE) Federal Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Impacts at Hanford, Jane A. Hedges, July 14, 2009.
- Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Workshop on Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Modifications Lifecycle Report Key Policy Questions, October 6, 2009.
- Budget & Contracts Committee – 6 Month Work Plan, October 2009.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet
Laura Hanses	Susan Leckband	Keith Smith
Harold Heacock	Jeff Luke	

Others

Doug Adyame, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Molly Jensen, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP (Phone)	Dennis Faulk, EPA	John Bongers, Lockheed Martin
		Dick Cartmell, Lockheed Martin
		Glynn Stevens, Lockheed Martin
		Peter Turping, Lockheed Martin
		Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald