Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Boards Hanford Nevada Oak Ridge Savannah River Idaho Northern New Mexico Paducah

November 29, 2007

Assistant Secretary James A. Rispoli EM-1/DOE-HQ Forrestal Building U.S. Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Rispoli,

Recommendation for EM SSAB Participation in the EM Budget Process

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) would like to express our gratitude for your active participation at our recent Chairs' meeting. The EM SSAB recommended that it have the opportunity for input to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management budget planning process for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008. We appreciate your acceptance of our recommendation and the opportunity to participate last spring. The EM SSAB was asked to provide comments on changes to guidance for the sites working with the EM SSAB for input on the FY 09 budget; with lessons learned from participating in the review and input process for the FY 08 budget, we wish to provide the following comments and recommendations.

In order to advise the DOE EM, the EM SSAB needs sufficient budget planning information by project breakdown structure (PBS) at the target level and over-target level and decrement level for the current planning year and for four out years. The DOE may inform the EM SSAB of the uncertainty with out year planning and the inability for DOE to make commitments for those years, but at the same time, we expect to see the Five Year Plan numbers adjusted to reflect validated Project Baselines and the "cradle to grave" costs of each project.

For the EM SSAB to be able to provide useful review and advice, we need access to a detailed, validated Baseline for each site together with a critical-path schedule at a level showing the status of major projects within each PBS. Without a comprehensive understanding of the whole picture, we cannot be expected to address potential trade-offs in light of limited budgets.

The EM SSAB expects that DOE EM will request budgets that are compliant with existing regulatory agreements and commitments. The validated Baselines should reflect these commitments. The DOE EM briefings to the EM SSAB and the public should include validated baselines and the additional markups required to meet consent orders.

The EM SSAB realizes that environmental cleanup projects require long-term planning and funding which must be managed by each site and the EM budget process. It would be illuminating to see calculations showing the potential cost of deferring work to future years. The EM SSAB believes that those numbers could be compelling enough to propel the DOE EM and Congress to fund, in the near-term, and comprehensively, more work now in support of risk reduction to protect human health and the environment.

Mr. James A. Rispoli November, 29, 2007 Page 2

Lastly, the EM SSAB believes that the breadth of representation on our Boards, our institutional knowledge and recommendations are of benefit to our individual sites and to the DOE complex as a whole. The EM SSAB looks forward to providing continued advice to and support of DOE's environmental cleanup activities at each site.

Susan Leckband, Chair Hanford Advisory Board

Susan Lukhard

Bill Flanery, Co-Chair Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens' Advisory Laboratory Site EM

Richard L. Buxton, Co-Chair, Idaho National Citizens' Advisory Board David Hermann, Chair Nevada Test Site Advisory Board

J.D. Campbell, Chair Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Lance J. Mezga, Chair Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

Allen Burnett, Chair Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Advisory Board

Karen Patterson, Chair Savannah River Site Citizens' Advisory Board