

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
BUDGET AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE
February 17, 2011
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Fiscal Year 2012 Budget & Planning for the Budget Workshop..... 1
Committee Business..... 10
Attendees 11
Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 12

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, Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC) chair, began the meeting by handing out a news release written by Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) titled “President’s 2012 Budget Request Relatively Good to Hanford, Tri-Cities despite election results, but inadequate as contamination continues to spread”. A second handout written by Sharron Ortiz, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), and titled “Hanford 2011 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report” was provided to the committee.

Gerry welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee agreed to adopt the November meeting summary. Gerry said that the budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 will be discussed as part of the FY 2012 discussion. He said there would not be agency presentations today and all the information they would be discussing lacks interpretations. He said they are using all the documents referred to by DOE.

Fiscal Year 2012 Budget & Planning for the Budget Workshop

Gerry said the links detailing the budget request and the presentation given by Dr. Inés Triay, DOE-Office of Environmental Management (EM), are available on-line.

Cathy McCague asked if the purpose of this committee discussion is to frame the issue with a goal to have advice prepared for the April Board meeting. Gerry said the discussion is meant to delve into what BCC is interested in exploring and to prepare for the budget workshop in March. The information presented at the budget workshop will help frame the policy points for budget advice for April.

Committee Discussion

- Jeff Luke asked why BCC is planning on developing advice in April when they offered budget advice in June the previous year. Gerry said developing advice by the April Board meeting would allow them to offer advice on FY 2011, 2012 and 2013 as well as the out years. This would have more impact on site development and budget submittal for DOE-Headquarters (HQ). Gerry said DOE has a mid-April deadline for sending their submittal to DOE-HQ for the FY 2013 budget request. He said the advice would go to DOE-HQ if the Board could not pass advice until June; it would just be delayed. Jeff said it would then be to their advantage to develop advice by April. Gerry agreed and said it would be a difficult challenge given the short time between the budget workshop and the Board meeting. He said the goal today should be to identify items that might feed into advice and items that require more information from the budget workshop. He said they would appreciate hearing any input or initial reviews from Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), although Ecology was not expected to provide input formally today.
- Gerry suggested they begin the discussion by looking at the FY 2012 Board Advice #234 adopted last June.
- Jeff said he appreciated Gerry's approach to consider the advice from last year along with the HoANW handout. He said he was unclear, but believed the itemization shows additional funding. Jeff said this is not base funding; it is the additional cost of each item. Gerry said this page is from the detailed budget request presented by DOE on Monday. He said it is the DOE-RL program baseline summary (PBS) line item budget. Gerry said the House or Representatives has proposed continued funding in FY 2011 at 100 billion dollars less for discretionary spending, which includes a large amount from DOE-EM.
- Al Boldt directed the committee to the third paragraph on page three of the HoANW handout. He wondered if the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding would have a larger impact if ARRA spending was going to continue into FY 2012. He said Hanford had a large sum of ARRA money in FY 2010. Gerry said the numbers presented today do not reflect ARRA funding. Al said funding for cleanup along the river will greatly decrease. He wondered what the true drop in funding would be. Al said the Board views the entirety of Hanford funding, not just funding from certain sources. Gerry said ARRA funding would continue to be available throughout FY 2011 when most of it will be expended. He said even if the budget request is accepted, there would be an overall reduction in Hanford cleanup funding.

- Gerry said DOE-RL total activity would decrease as ARRA funding is expended. Susan Leckband said it would decrease by eight percent. The president's budget requested \$418 million for ORP in FY 11 but is dependent on the outcome of Resolutions. The FY 12 Request for ORP includes \$523 million for the Tank Farm Project. Gerry said the debate on FY 2011 funding is complicated. There are some who would like unexpended ARRA funds to be returned. He said that was unlikely to occur.
- Melinda Brown, Ecology, said there are both an appropriation and an obligation with ARRA funding. The funds people are talking about rescinding are those that are unobligated. She said the portion of money which has not been spent is less important than whether that money has been obligated for specific projects. She said DOE-RL and DOE-ORP do have plans for all the funding and will be spending it.
- Gerry said the activity under DOE-RL will be subject to a \$474 million dollar drop in cleanup activity. Al asked whether the Board should consider issuing advice against such a large funding drop. He is concerned about potential lay-offs and not being able to continue all the progress that has been made over the previous two years.
- Pamela McCann, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) asked about additional line items on security and regulatory support that were not included in the handout. Gerry said regulatory support was included. Pamela said an additional \$70 million for security was another line item. Gerry said that reflects something they have been advising, but is not reflected in the current documents.
- Melinda said technology development is unlike other line items at the site. She said DOE-EM details show approximately \$60 million set aside for tank development. It is part of a short DOE-EM published sheet. She said there is extra money for technology development for groundwater and the vadose zone.
- Al said Dick Smith communicated with the individuals working on iron phosphate. Their funding was cut off. He said the Board should be aware that funding was not set by DOE-RL. Funding is set by DOE-HQ. Gerry said the Board could offer advice that DOE-HQ should continue funding the iron phosphate program. He said that money was in the DOE-ORP budget. The technology deployment budget is overseen by DOE-ORP and is not a part of the technology development budget. Jeff said the money had been cut at one point, but they do have money to return to the iron phosphate program.
- Jeff said the Board supported a funding increase of \$500 million in the past advice. He said they should review past advice to determine whether it was followed or not. He wondered whether there was an increase of 500 million above the previously approved target level. He said if DOE-RL and DOE-ORP did not receive the funding, the committee should consider Al's comments and whether they are going to lose ARRA money as part of the advice. Gerry said this is why they need to examine each line item and consider regulatory requirements. He said the short answer is there was not a \$500 million increase. Al said the funding for the previous year showed a significant total increase if they include ARRA funding, but they are losing those funds. Pamela said that

is a different pot of money. Al said all the funding appears the same to him. He questioned whether they want to continue the level of effort at Hanford if funding is lost.

- Gerry said the \$500 million increase was above the target necessary to be on pace for Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) work. He said there has been a lot of discussion about the request to meet the TPA milestone by 2012, which is a DOE-HQ assertion. He said a number of milestones were changed to goals. Gerry said the \$500 million was meant to keep pace for milestones due in 2016 or 2018, not necessarily those in 2012. He said they would need to request \$1.6 billion to keep pace at DOE-RL, but the actual request is far short of the levels needed. The funding request from DOE-ORP is fairly close to what the necessary compliance level is.
- Sharon Braswell, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), said DOE did request the appropriate funding level the previous year. Gerry said they were talking about the funding request to Congress. Sharon said that was beyond the control of local offices.
- Gerry said the requested increase in funding for solid waste stabilization and disposition appears to be inadequate given their concerns. Al said DOE-RL was requesting a large drop in funding from \$98 million to \$56 million. Jeff thought a question to ask DOE-RL is if they believe the funding is adequate. Gerry said they need to ask what funding level will support transuranic (TRU) waste and low level/mixed waste retrieval for 2012.
- Keith Smith said there will be an estimated 1,660 employees laid off at the Hanford Site at a cost of \$100 thousand for each employee, which equals \$166 million. He asked whether that tracked with the funding losses. Jerry Peltier thought the number of lay-offs is closer to 2,000. He said not all contractors were reporting their lay-off numbers.
- Gerry said there previous advice had emphasized TRU retrieval. He said the Board may need to offer advice specifically on retrieval and treatment based on the stated goals. He is concerned about that because the milestone has changed to a goal. It is difficult to convince Congress to fund a goal. Cathy asked whether this is an overarching theme that should be captured at the beginning of the advice. Al said it should.
- Susan L. said there was nothing mentioned in the budget request for waste buried before 1970. Gerry said he knows from the burial grounds workshops that the investigation plans are due at the beginning of the next fiscal year. He said the big question is what will be included in the budgeting for remedial investigation.
- Liz Mattson questioned what the Board will be allowed to discuss and who it should advise on budgetary matters. Gerry said the Board is allowed to advise DOE-EM. Gerry said they often ask themselves whether the Board is allowed to advise Congress on the pending budget request from DOE. He said the Board does not advise Congress and Congress does not respond. He said they are able to advise DOE if they do not feel the budget request is adequate, which DOE might send to Congress. Liz said she is unsure what the April advice would be. Gerry said the advice would cover how DOE should prioritize the FY 2013 budget request. The Board would phrase the advice for DOE and the regulators.

- Liz said the Board is trying to influence the pathway from the request of money to the actual receipt of money. Gerry said this advice is for the formulation of the budget at the local DOE offices, which will be sent to DOE-HQ. Jeff said only the budget request from DOE-HQ really matters. He said this can be confusing because the local offices did request everything they were legally obligated to request. The funding was subsequently cut at higher levels.
- Susan L. explained the point further. She said the local DOE offices determine what they need in order to meet obligations. That dollar amount is submitted to DOE-HQ on a specified schedule. DOE-HQ is legally required to request the needed amount of money from all the local offices. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) receives all the requests from the different field offices and OMB prepares a funding request for the President who then gives the request to Congress.
- Gerry said the State of Washington's view and his view since 1989 is that the only request that counts in terms of TPA requirements is the request directly to Congress from DOE. He said in recent years, DOE has claimed this thought as well. Gerry said this has been apparent in past Board advice and presentations when Ecology claims the requests from local offices are what matter.
- Liz asked whether they could ask for a draft budget and offer advice informally before the local offices make their requests to DOE-HQ. Gerry said they will be trying to do that for the FY 2013 budget request. The budget workshop will focus on this. The TPA agencies will share their planning figures for each line item and the Board will offer advice based on the information provided.
- Liz asked how much opportunity the Board has to plan for the workshop. Gerry said BCC assists in the development of the workshop agenda. DOE-HQ does not tell the field offices what information they should present. He said both DOE-ORP and DOE-RL have a tradition of trying to work with BCC on developing the agenda. Susan said the field offices are given parameters for how to share the information. The offices are typically as cooperative with the Board as they are allowed to be given DOE-HQ directives.
- Gerry said Defense Authorization Act Section 4202a will change. He said the Act requires DOE to submit a five year line item examination on projected funding with a comparison to compliance agreement targets. He said the Board would want that integrated five year priority list from each field office available at the budget workshop to incorporate cleanup work at the Hanford Site. Jerry said there is declining funding over those five years. Gerry said the requirement is for DOE to plan for the actual funding level.
- Gerry said the workshop presentation should track the budget plan that Congress is going to require. Gerry suggested that the workshop provide the first example of how DOE-RL and DOE-ORP would present five years of projected funding. DOE can point to the workshop as a template. Jerry said many agencies do authorizations, usually for five years. The authorization spending is not related to actual appropriations.

The committee discussed the DOE-RL funding request levels.

- Gerry said the FY 2010 appropriation for the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) was \$85 million. He said more money was actually being spent at PFP because of ARRA funding, which will decrease. The Board would like to find out from DOE-RL how much work still needs to be done after the stimulus funding is expended. Jerry said the nuclear materials will be gone and PFP will be a vacant building. Susan said there are many nasty materials in there that they are attempting to remove.
- Al said the funding request from DOE-ORP increased by \$200 million and DOE-RL decreased their funding request by \$330 million. He said the Board receives assurances from DOE-RL at the workshop that the spending level is adequate to meet the milestones. Gerry said whether DOE is able to meet the milestones is a fundamental question and they should ensure funding is adequate to keep pace with future milestones.
- Gerry asked whether the reduction in funding for spent nuclear fuel is adequate. Harold Heacock said he was not sure. He said that DOE-RL was receiving a large amount of money to fund work that was completed or near completion. He said they should expect funding levels to decrease as projects are completed. Harold said there was progress both in the burial grounds and along the river. He said he was not surprised to see a funding reduction with the tight budget, since they are pretty well funded for work to be completed over the next five years.
- Gerry said the Board advised DOE-RL that approximately \$500 million above the target was needed to begin work on the Central Plateau to meet those milestones in addition to River Corridor milestones. He said a big concern as work is coming to a close along the river is whether they are funding efforts to ramp up the milestones for the Central Plateau. He said the Board would like to see those five-year targets.
- Harold said budgets are normally based on the work that needs to be accomplished. Once funding needs are determined, the constraints are examined and priorities established.
- Gerry asked if the River Corridor Closure project needed funding for the remediation work as part of the final Records of Decision (RODs). He said there was a question of whether they would conduct further cleanup work given risk levels stated in the risk assessment. Harold said they also need to know how much carry-over funding is available. Cathy said that information was provided in November at the BCC committee meeting. Pamela said they could find out if anything has changed.
- Jerry said the unspent ARRA money could be noted in a third column and be added to the calculation for total numbers to be spent the following year. Harold said they should examine how much ARRA money was received, how much was spent and how much has yet to be spent. Pamela added that it would be useful to find out whether the lifecycle cost of any project was reduced and by how many years. Gerry said DOE's presentation indicated approximately \$20 billion would be saved in lifecycle costs from ARRA work

and investment in transformational tank waste strategy. If PFP is finished, the mortgage of that will also reduce costs.

The committee moved on to discuss the budget request for DOE-ORP.

- Gerry said DOE-ORP requested increased funding for tank farms and vitrification plant construction. He said the money would be for tank farm infrastructure upgrades and waste feed delivery systems. DOE could potentially support early start-up of low activity waste (LAW) treatment by 2016. He asked whether the current funding request included money for that because it was not listed in the information DOE-ORP gave the Board.
- Susan said she heard a lot in the budget presentation about the number of jobs created. She is more curious about the number of jobs lost, especially starting in FY 2012. Liz asked if there was a comparison of jobs created to jobs retired. Harold said some of that information is available on-line.
- Al said DOE-ORP is requesting an addition \$150 million to fund the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and asked the reason for this funding increase. Shirley Olinger gave a presentation that morning where she said construction of WTP would be complete in 2016. Al asked whether more funding is needed to complete the milestone. Al said the funding increase is because the milestones are being met. It is not a situation where cost is increasing. Gerry asked if this was an acceleration increase. He is concerned about accelerating construction when some construction and design questions have not been addressed. Al said he has assumed the 2016 completion date implied acceleration, but Shirley did not say that.
- Gerry said for the LAW 2012 funding request DOE will complete the design of the facility. It does not appear there will be acceleration in construction to have the plant operational in 2014 or 2016. Al said it might be more useful to represent milestones. He asked whether LAW was in the 2012 budget. Gerry said the answer to that is found in the total amount of money requested for 2013. The target amount would increase by \$970 million for vitrification plant construction. Gerry pointed out an interesting footnote in the President's budget, which he had never seen before. The anticipated funding for the vitrification plant is said to be "notional and do not represent policy". The footnote implies that if there is a spending freeze, the vitrification plant would resume at the original funding level.
- Gerry said they would like to find out how much funding is required for an early start-up of LAW and how the 2020 vision compares to prior funding schedules.
- Gerry asked about funding for the System Plan Rev 5 and 6. He said there are different scenarios being tested. Gerry wondered about the dollar amount being considered to analyze those scenarios for FY 2014-2015. Harold said there is very little being spent in the current FY 2012-2013 time frames. DOE does not yet have decisions made on what they want to do in the next few years. He said he is sure the Board will support the early start-up of LAW. Gerry said this point needs more explanation; if the budget request does include money for an early LAW start-up, how can they not have an approximate number

for the cost? Susan said there might be money available after the down select on some aspects from System Plan 4. Harold added that they are required to support initiatives in the current System Plan 5. Al said DOE already asked Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) for their estimated work scope.

- Gerry had another question on the DOE budget presentation. He said there was an item about FY 2012 money for steam reforming. Harold said that is a dead issue in his mind. Susan said DOE did not think it was a dead issue. Liz said the System Plan scenarios and 2020 vision are two entirely different things. Harold said he heard from the discussions that steam reforming is not a viable candidate right now. Gerry said he saw an item in the presentation that accelerated steam reforming by seven years. Pamela said the waste was accelerating by seven years, not just steam reforming.
- Liz asked how DOE decided to invest spending when there are differing technologies. Gerry said there is only \$39 million in technology development from headquarters. He said there is a \$60 million request for DOE-ORP technology development and he wondered what that would fund, especially the amount that would be spent on steam reforming. He wondered why \$30 million of technology development is being invested into something that is considered a dead technology. Harold said steam reforming is currently not in the system planning, but there is a provision in the budget planning for steam reforming because it has been considered a viable alternative.
- Liz said DOE-EM could do the research at Savannah River if they are really interested in steam reforming. Those development dollars would not be captured in the Hanford budget. Pamela agreed with Liz and said those lessons learned from Savannah River could be applied to Hanford.
- Harold said he would also be interested to hear what the TPA agencies' timeline is for developing the concept on how to evaluate options in the baseline. Al said the decision would be made in FY 2014. Gerry said some of these additional questions could be addressed at the workshop in breakout sessions.
- Jean Vanni asked why items such as remote testing operations are not considered a capital cost. She said these costs are a part of the tank farm budget. Pam said there is a disconnect where the committee needs more specific answers.
- Gerry asked if Bechtel was responsible for plant commissioning. He said the original contract for WTP, which included commissioning, had a total cost of \$3.3 billion in 2001. He said that was capital costs. Gerry said now the cost of WTP was approximately \$12.263 billion. Bechtel costs are included in the WTP construction line item and operation costs are not. He said Bechtel currently splits the \$12.263 between construction and commissioning. Gerry is concerned about potential additional costs from commissioning, such as serious problems that require extensive engineering and equipment fixes. He asked where that funding would come from. Gerry said normally that type of issue would be included in a program contingency fund from the capital line item. He said there is a significant chunk for contingency in the \$12.263 billion funding

budget. Gerry said he is concerned about where the budget will exist if commissioning is moved into another budget area and commissioning is known as a major source of potential contingency. Susan said based on her experience, commissioning is always included in the construction dollars.

- Harold said Bechtel is under contract to demonstrate the start-up process, which is called cold commissioning. He said whoever takes over the contract after Bechtel will repeat the process for its own training and demonstration. After this is complete, they will start introducing hot materials. Al said Bechtel will operate with hot material for six months, although this may change.
- Melinda said the acceptance test procedures are capital costs, but operational test procedures are expense funded.
- Gerry said DOE references the \$12.3 billion figure when he asks what the total cost of the vitrification plant is. DOE says this cost has not increased. Gerry wonders what the additional cost of commissioning the vitrification plant will be. He said the committee has been able to look at what contingencies were in the past, but they are no longer able to see those. Melinda said there has always been the split between acceptance and operation.
- Jerry said not having the contractor identified leaves a major gap in the program. He expressed concern about where the knowledge base will go when Bechtel engineers who have been working on the plant leave for other projects. Keith said they were supposed to bring in the people who would be operating the plant during cold commissioning. Gerry said the operators will be brought on in 2016 and the Request for Proposals will go out in 2013.
- Gerry said they normally have a DOE-ORP breakout session. He said it would be useful to have a session on WTP, system planning, and the vitrification plant budget. Jerry asked if the intention of the workshop was to have agency representatives explain details of the budget to the workshop attendees. Gerry said that would occur during the second half of the day. Jerry said DOE should have a breakout of the money to help the Board submit substantive advice. Gerry said they may be able to put together a proposal through email for DOE-ORP and DOE-RL. He said the TPA agencies should have that level of detail. DOE will not have enough time to discuss each item in detail so the committee should identify those items needing discussion.
- Sharon said they are proposing to maintain the same workshop format as last year. One of the offices would present in the morning and the other in the afternoon. If there are specific line items the Board would like to discuss, it would be helpful to have people knowledgeable about that in the room. Gerry said he would like to be able to spend more time on specific PBS detail for FY 2012 and 2013. He said they need figures for both years, even though there will be some uncertainty.
- Liz asked if the intention was for the general public to understand the workshop. Gerry said they have had members of the public participate in workshops and he thinks it is

understandable for them. Susan said they usually get a more educated group than the general public when the workshop is held in the Tri-Cities.

- Liz asked about making the meetings available through GoToMeeting. Sharon said they were hoping to broadcast the presentations over the web. Their other intention is to stream the evening session to facilitate dialog back and forth. She said that would require looking at the larger budget picture and not the details. She said they hoped to have two parts, but were still getting the cost estimates. GoToMeeting is the minimum.

Committee Business

The committee completed their mid-year check-in on the committee priorities. They also discussed the six-month work plan.

The committee agreed not to meet in March because the budget workshop will be happening the following week. They also decided not to have a committee call in February.

Gerry requested that the flipchart text be sent to the leadership of other committees to hear their input on additional questions. Jerry said it would be helpful to have cost breakdowns and other information to be presented at the workshop in advance. Sharon said they are formulating the budget until the last minute. Gerry said they may be able to get presentations prior to the workshop.

Handouts

- Presidents 2012 Budget Request Relatively Good to Hanford, Tri-Cities, Despite Election Results, but Inadequate as Contamination Continues to Spread, Heart of America Northwest, February 14, 2011.
- Hanford Advisory Board: Hanford 2011 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report, Shannon Ortiz, November 5, 2010.
- Environmental Management FY 2012 Budget Request, DOE-EM, 2011.
- The Budget for Fiscal Year 2012: Environmental and Other Defense Activities, DOE, 2011.

Action Items / Commitments

- Cathy will also update the committee's six month work plan and meeting topics table for distribution to committee leadership.
- Cathy will also complete the mid-year committee evaluation table.

- Cathy will send out the transcribed flip chart notes to TWC, RAP, HSEP and BCC leadership for the review and to seek additional priorities for the budget workshop that were not addressed today.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Allyn Boldt	Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet
Tom Carpenter	Jeff Luke	Keith Smith
Earl Fordham	Liz Mattson	
Harold Heacock	Jerry Peltier	

Others

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Melinda J Brown, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Sharon Braswell, MSA

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Budget Workshop Topics & Questions

1. Update on FY 2011 continuing resolution and its impact(s)
2. Have available 5 year IPL for both field offices
 - a. Work with field offices on how this information is presented
 - b. Defense Authorization Act 4402.A – start tracking budget plan approved by Congress
 - i. Use as a template
 - c. Need to see/review 5 year targets/guidance

Page 1

3. DOE-RL
 - a. Reduction in spending levels for FY 2012 & 2013 - will DOE be able to meet TPA milestones?
 - b. River Corridor Contract – what additional funding is needed for final RODs (RL-0041)
 - c. RL-100 – why the \$100 million drop?
 - d. Does ARRA funding spent off-set out-year funding? (e.g. decrease in lifecycle by how many months/years)
 - e. How many jobs lost/created – including ARRA funding

Page 2

4. DOE-ORP
 - a. Is the funding increase for early LAW a part of the Presidential budget request?
 - b. How many jobs lost/created – including ARRA funding
 - c. Discuss \$150 million increase to accelerate milestone to complete WTP (ORP-0060) by 2016
 - i. Accelerating or behind the milestone?
 - ii. Why the increase?
 - iii. Does it include LAW?
 - d. Where is early start-up of LAW funded and completed?
 - i. Is it in FY 2012 budget?

- ii. How much money is needed for early start-up of LAW?
- iii. What is the difference between funding profile in past and new information in 2020 vision and appropriation levels in next few out-years?

Page 3

-
- e. Additional funding required to support initiatives in System Plan Rev 5
 - i. Is early LAW and other activities to support early LAW included in FY 2012 budget request?
 - f. What is included in \$60 million technology development and deployment?
 - i. Include breakdown of each technology funded
 - g. How does System Plan integrate with out-year planning and 2020 vision?
 - h. Are the out-year budgets based on 2nd LAW?

Page 4

-
- i. What is ORP's timeline for developing/evaluating options in baseline?
 - i. Where will the money be?
 - j. Review of moving funds from ORP to WTP e.g. capital costs
 - k. Where is the contingency funding? Total cost of vit plant & commissioning?
5. Break-out session on both ORP & RL for FY 2012 & 2013

Page 5

FY 2012 Budget Advice Policy Points

- 6. Review of total projects reductions
 - a. What is the reduction in level of work activity for each project given the end of ARRA funding?
 - b. Need to figure out figure/number
- 7. Continue funding technology development and deployment including funding for iron phosphate
- 8. Clarification of decrease of funding for RL-0040

Page 6

-
- 9. What level of TRU retrieval and waste retrieval information – does it support FY 2012?
 - 10. \$100K/employee for 1660 layoffs due to ARRA ending
 - a. Is this tracked with RL & ORP as part of losses?
 - 11. Change of language/terminology and impact of funding requests when “milestones” changed to “goals”
 - 12. Keep in advice point on burial grounds (from Advice #234)

Page 7

-
- 13. Request funding to meet TPA milestones
 - a. Use carryover ARRA money to not jeopardize missing TPA milestones
 - b. Ask about PFP at budget workshop – is money already obligated?
 - 14. Provide 5 year IPL
 - a. Work with site on how it is presented (FY 2013 budget request)

Page 8

Committee Topics

- 15. Presentation by WTP contractor (Bechtel) on pre-commissioning plans and funding of WTP (operational funding)