



July 15, 1996

John Wagoner, Manager
Department of Energy, Richland Operations
PO Box 550 (A7-50)
Richland, WA 99352

Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Mary Riveland Director
Washington Department of Ecology
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

RE: The Budget Development Process (HAB Advice #49)

Dear Messrs. Clarke and Wagoner, and Ms. Riveland:

Background

The Hanford Advisory Board has been involved in the DOE Budget development process with both DOE-RL and Headquarters for two cycles now. Although the process itself keeps changing, the agency is continually improving its involvement of and communication with the public. DOE has made great strides at opening the process and including stakeholders. For that we commend them. In the spirit of continually improving this process for both the stakeholders and the agencies, the HAB will continue to further review the process and work with the Tri-Party agencies to make suggestions for refinements. Following is advice adopted by the Board at its July 11-12, 1996 meeting on some specific issues that were present this year related to the Integrated Priority List.

Advice

1. The Integrated Priority List (IPL) should not reflect anticipated or hoped for changes in the Tri-Party Agreement until those changes have been negotiated.
2. The IPL should have some kind of reproducible or defensible criteria such as mortgage reduction, legal obligation under the TPA, worker safety, and reduction of exposure to chemicals or radiation, for where things appear on the IPL. The numerical ratings from the RDSs do not appear to provide this.
3. Stakeholders need a way to develop an understanding of what is actually represented in the priorities they are being asked to support. An addendum or another column should be added to the

IPL which will include a brief description of what is occurring in each project listed. This list should give anyone looking at the IPL an idea of “what they are buying”. The IPL needs to identify the workscope that is actually reflected in it.

4. All costs included in any overhead, indirect, management, and support categories should be clearly identified, defined, and visibly disclosed in the IPL. These figures should be disclosed early in the budget process.
5. The Hanford Advisory Board supports the comments of the Washington Department Of Ecology in Attachment 3 to its letter from Mary Riveland to Al Alm dated May 23, 1996 on the DOE Budget Process and urges you to consider their points in detail. (Attached)

The Board looks forward to your written response, as called for in our charter.

Very truly yours,

Merilyn B. Reeves, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board

cc: Al Alm
Alice Murphy
Cindy Kelly, Designated Federal Official
Linda Lingle, Site Representative
The Oregon and Washington Congressional Delegations

[Hanford Home Page](#) | [HAB](#) | [Advice Index](#)

For questions or comments, please send [email](mailto:Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov) to Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov
HAB Consensus Advice #49
Subject: The Budget Process
Adopted: July 11-12, 1996