



**EM Budget & Prioritization  
Committee Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, January 6, 2011, 4 p.m.  
DOE Information Center**

---

<b><u>Members Present</u></b> Jenny Freeman Norman Mulvenon Ron Murphree Bob Olson	<b><u>Absent</u></b> Steve Dixon Ed Juarez Lance Mezga
<b><u>Others Present</u></b> Dave Adler, Department of Energy (DOE) Spencer Gross, MCH Corp. Pat Halsey, DOE	

The Environmental Management (EM) Budget & Prioritization Committee had its first meeting on Thursday, January 6, 2011, at the DOE Information Center. The committee was formed at the December 8, 2011, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.

Mr. Adler, the DOE liaison to the board, charged the committee with its task of providing DOE a recommendation on its FY 2013 budget request to DOE EM Headquarters by April 2011. He said the committee's objective also is to help build consensus on cleanup priorities for the Oak Ridge Reservation. The job is complicated because the Oak Ridge EM program has about 200 individual projects. Mr. Adler said it would not be practical to discuss priorities for each project, but to focus on program areas.

The general timeline for the committee's work begins at this meeting, have its recommendation drafted by the end of February or first of March, submit the recommendation at the March board meeting, and if the recommendation is approved by the board, forward it to DOE.

Ms. Halsey said she thought the committee could submit two recommendations – the first on the FY 2013 budget request and then later a second recommendation on the long-range lifecycle of cleanup work. Mr. Adler agreed saying the minimum the committee should do is send a recommendation on the FY 2013 budget request and a more comprehensive recommendation on the long-range program.

Mr. Adler proposed a sequence of events leading up to submission of a recommendation. He said everything needs to be done 'in parallel and interwoven with' the same process DOE is using with the regulators, the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation and the Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Adler said the regulators will likely want to participate in some of the committee meetings.

The sequence of events Mr. Adler outlined included:

1. This initial meeting and establishing a path forward.
2. Provide the committee a full summary presentation on the EM scope of work that needs to be done in years to come. He said he would invite some of the federal project directors to talk to the committee about the areas for which they are responsible. They will provide

perspectives on priorities and insights. He said similar input should come from the regulators. He said that meeting should happen soon.

3. The committee should define a workable number of scenarios to evaluate. Mr. Adler said DOE has a software program that can provide useful information on baseline scenarios. He said the committee could spend time formulating different scenarios for the software to run. He said the regulators would likely want to be present for those discussions.
4. Begin to develop a recommendation. Part of the discussion in developing the recommendation will be if fits what DOE EM Headquarters sees as priorities for Oak Ridge. The committee will have to identify what can be done under those constraints, but it could also identify things it feels should be done.
5. Recommendation drafted by the committee and sent to the board for consideration.

Mr. Olson said he concurred with Mr. Adler's proposed sequence. He said his idea was to enumerate what the committee and the board would like to have done, but also identify what can be done with available budget.

Mr. Murphree said all agree on trying to get as much funding as possible. He said the only disagreement might be on how the money is spent. He said some projects are 'hard wired' but once in place there could be some discretionary funding for other projects.

Mr. Olson said he sometimes has a difference of opinion with the regulators on some projects. For example he said he prefers elimination of contamination from areas in Oak Ridge National Lab rather spending too much time and money on mitigating contamination emanating from Bear Creek Burial Grounds. He says a release of contamination from the lab would shut down lab operations, which would have a major impact on lab operations and would carry a significant cost. Contamination leaving Bear Creek Burials is minimal at the reservation's boundary. He said it should be stressed to DOE Headquarters that Oak Ridge is an ongoing mission site and any releases would affect the site's mission. Mr. Adler said those ideas help shape the thoughts of the regulators.

Mr. Adler said some circumstances will have bearing on the development of the FY 2013 budget. One, the federal government has not approved the FY 2011 budget and is operating under a continuing resolution using FY 2010 budget figures. Another issue is what the president's proposed budget for FY 2012 will be when he presents it to Congress in February. Another element that could affect the FY 2013 budget request is DOE's EM guidance to field offices on preparing budget requests. That will include how much money is expected to be available to DOE sites and how DOE EM Headquarters would like to see the funding used. Mr. Adler said that information cannot be shared with the public, but he said he would provide the committee what information he could within the constraints of the embargo.

Mr. Olson said specific figures are not as important as developing a process for prioritization. He said the process is independent of the budget.

Returning to the discussion of scenarios, Mr. Olson wondered if the software Mr. Adler described can determine averted costs or determining savings realized by addressing projects that could have long-term costs. He also wanted to know if the projected costs of accidents could be built into a project cost. Mr. Adler said work is being done to address those concerns. He thought a summary discussion on the software could answer those kinds of questions. He said the software can capture some interdependencies of projects. It can do a first level of operations, but people analyze the results.

Mr. Adler proposed not having a set meeting time and date, but to set meetings as needed. The group agreed to meet again on Wednesday, January 12 at 4 p.m.

Mr. Adler said he would try to have some federal project directors at the next meeting. He also said he would develop a work plan for the committee. The committee chose not to have a chair.

Mr. Adler asked the group to start thinking about scenarios to run.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

**Action items**

1. Mr. Adler will develop the presentation for the next meeting and invite federal project directors to participate.
2. Mr. Adler will develop a work plan for the committee.

rsg