

BCC Handout #4
3/5/13

From: Niles, Ken
To: Al Boldt ; Bob Suyama ; Art Tackett ; Gene Van Liew ; Earl Fordham ; Gerry Pollet 2 ; Gerry@hoanw.org ; gerry_pollet@hotmail.com ; HAB Facilitation Team ; Maynard Plahuta ; hheacock@tridec.org ; Harold Heacock ; Jerry Peltier ; Jeff Luke ; Keith Smith ; Ken Niles ; Laura Hanses ; Liz Mattson ; Mark Reavis ; Paige Knight ; Bob Legard ; Richard Stout ; Sarah McCalmant ; Shelley Cimon ; sueleckband@hotmail.com ; Todd Martin
Cc: Barbara Wise (E-mail) ; Cameron Salony ; Engstrom, Dale ; Dieter Bohrmann ; Dunning, Dirk A ; Dennis Faulk (E-mail) ; Jeff Frey ; John Price ; Emy Laija ; Madeleine Brown (E-mail) ; Heart of America Northwest ; scram@berkeley.edu ; Braswell, Sharon ; Susan Hayman ; steve.hudson1@comcast.net ; Tammie Gilley ; Tifany Nguyen
Subject: BCC meeting and draft budget advice
Date: Monday, March 04, 2013 9:19:03 AM

I'm sorry I will not be able to participate in the BCC meeting this week. It was scheduled on top of the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board meeting, so I will not be available to call in either.

Thanks Jerry, for offering draft budget advice for us to chew on and consider. We certainly seem to be in a completely new budget reality which does force some changes in how we address these issues.

However, I'm concerned that the advice, as written, seems to give up on using milestones as a driver to get work done. If the regulators just conveniently agree to roll back all the work to fit what is an artificial budget number, I believe that the work will suffer. As we commented on the most recent proposed Tri-Party Agreement changes, "We do not want to see the Tri-Party Agreement become irrelevant because milestones are too easily rolled back when funding is tight."

The advice also seems to suggest usurping the Tri-Party Agreement negotiations, and move those into the realm of a HAB workshop. I know DOE and the regulators would never agree to that type of change, so why advocate for it? I do support the idea of a workshop that clearly and objectively looks at funding priorities.

There are several statements as well in the background that I do not agree with:

"The HAB believes that current funding levels will be maintained for the next decade." None of us know that. We hope that's the worst case, but level funding at this point is a huge assumption.

"The idea of shutting down a project because of funding shortfalls is not acceptable." That depends on the project – perhaps shifting funds to another project to complete it sooner may be a better choice than having all programs limp along at inadequate funding levels.

"All current work can be maintained with schedule adjustments." Again, perhaps it may be better to shift funds to certain projects to get them finished, instead of having all programs limp along at inadequate funding levels.

Again, sorry I will not be able to participate in this week's meeting, but I did want to share with you concerns that we have with this draft in the hopes that they can be accommodated through the discussion and with future drafts of the advice.