

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
March 30, 2011
Portland, OR**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Great than Class C Environmental Impact Statement (GTCC EIS)..... 2
Debrief the March 16, 2011 Budget Workshop..... 4
Issue Manager Updates 8
Committee Business 11
Attendees..... 12
Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 13
Attachment 2 – PIC 6-Month Work Plan 14

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

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch, and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. The committee adopted the January meeting summary.

Steve suggested including a hyperlink to advice and background reading in future committee and Board agendas. Steve said this will encourage better preparation for all meetings, as well as help members stay up-to-date on what the different committees are doing.

Steve reminded the group about the State of the Site meeting taking place the following evening, March 31. Steve said all HAB members are invited to attend and provide feedback to the committee. He noted that it is important for HAB members to see the new format of the meeting. The meeting format is as follows:

- 6pm – Open House
- 7pm – Presentations
- 8pm – Questions and Answers

Great than Class C Environmental Impact Statement (GTCC EIS)

Steve said the purpose of the discussion is to provide an update on the GTCC EIS. Steve referenced a booklet that provides a summary of the GTCC EIS and recommended the committee spend time reviewing it. He said the summary is well written and provides ample background information and material incorporation. Steve thought the summary could be used for those unfamiliar with the document to develop a margin of understanding.

Steve said the scope of the GTCC EIS goes beyond Hanford. Steve noted the importance of understanding how DOE makes their decisions, as it should underline how the Board writes advice.

Agency Briefing

Arnie Edelman, DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM), provided the agency briefing for the GTCC EIS. He pointed out that this document is not new to the PIC or the Board; they've been tracking it for at least four years. Arnie said that currently, there is no disposal capability for waste above Class C, but the Low Level Act of 1985 and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 have provided DOE the opportunity to dispose of waste greater than Class C. DOE developed a report on plans, costs, and EIS schedule in 2006. Arnie noted that the draft EIS (DEIS) was published on February 25, 2011 with a 120-day comment period. Arnie said the 120-day comment period was chosen instead of a 90-day period in order to give the Board more time to provide input.

Arnie said the EIS does not currently have a preferred alternative, and DOE is using this time in the process to solicit help in developing a preferred alternative. Arnie said DOE has already received input, but they need to pull all the information together before presenting to stakeholders and the public; the stakeholders and the public will then have the opportunity to inform DOE what considerations they should take into account while choosing the preferred alternative. Arnie said the considerations could include generation of waste, cost, and health impacts to the community.

Arnie referenced the current waste moratorium from December 2009 that prevents any waste from being imported to the site until the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) is fully operational. He said Hanford, if chosen at all, may not even be chosen for waste import until 2022. Arnie noted that there are concerns over cumulative impacts for the contamination already on site at Hanford, and one of the appropriate mitigation activities to prevent more contamination would be to not import more waste. Arnie said the waste moratorium and cumulative impacts will be studied closely when selecting alternatives.

Arnie spoke to the inventory of Greater than Class C waste at Hanford, noting that there are 12,000 cubic meters of waste that were evaluated over a 60-year time frame, which is 200 cubic meters per year, on average. Arnie compared that number to the 400,000 cubic meters of nuclear fuel waste generated each year. Arnie said the 12,000 cubic meters is broken down into planned and projected categories, noting that 55% of the waste may not ever be generated, making the waste amount much less; 5,200 cubic meters will most likely be generated. The projected number is based on whether 200 nuclear reactors come online by 2050. Arnie said that out of the

inventory, 3,000 cubic meters comes from sealed sources, which is a national security issue should that waste be used to make dirty bombs. For that reason, DOE would rather sealed source material not be stored in hospitals or other accessible locations.

Arnie said DOE will hold a public meeting on the DEIS at the Savannah River Site on April 19, in Pasco on May 17, and in Portland on May 19. The meetings will be in the same format as the 2007 scoping meetings. The format is as follows:

- 5:30pm - Open House
- 6pm - Poster session with DOE staff available
- 6:30pm - DOE presentation (detailed overview, results, path forward)
- 7pm - Community/stakeholder input

Hearings for the GTCC EIS will be complete by May 25. Arnie said the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will provide input on licensing and will speak to whether the preferred alternative will require additional regulations or if it fits with what the NRC is already doing. Arnie said the final EIS is projected to be published in early 2012 with a preferred alternative or alternative.

Arnie said DOE, in compliance with the Energy Policy Act, is preparing a report that highlights the alternatives and their impacts; the report will be sent to Congress, and DOE will await Congressional action. Congress will provide feedback to DOE on whether the EIS is good or bad and will speak to changes in legislation in order to accommodate.

Arnie said that at a site level, DOE needs to conduct additional National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) work, as well as characterization for the Hanford Site. Arnie noted that if everything goes according to plan, there should be a facility for GTCC by 2020.

Regulator Perspectives

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) didn't have comments to add, but Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, said they would be tracking the document and the process.

Committee Discussion

Ken Niles, State of Oregon, thanked Arnie for his help and accessibility for questions on the document. Ken said that Oregon is concerned that the DEIS does not rule out any alternatives, but rather makes an effort to make all of the alternatives available for review. Ken noted that it's disconcerting to see Hanford in the DEIS as a viable option, as Hanford is spending billions of dollars to clean up waste. He said the only reference to an alternative not being viable was due to the depth of groundwater at the Savannah River Site, but that still didn't rule it out. Arnie said DOE completed honest evaluations without trying to rule out or rule in. He said DOE is now at the part of the process where they can start defining criteria and rule out sites that don't meet those criteria. Arnie said if they find a site that performs well in regards to a minimal human health impact, they will rule out other sites. James Joyce, DOE-EM, said DOE tried to put

together a straight-forward document with results of analysis that was supplemented with other factors in the hopes of receiving input on those factors.

Ken said he appreciated that the waste import moratorium for Hanford was included in the DEIS, but said most of the waste would not be generated until after the moratorium has expired, making it relatively meaningless in this case. Arnie said the moratorium could potentially extend beyond 2022.

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and HAB chair, asked if there was any GTCC legacy waste. Arnie said legacy waste represents 25% of the total inventory. He said DOE is currently cleaning up waste at the West Valley Demonstration Project, and there is waste in storage that is being included in disposal decisions. Susan said the HAB is concerned about Hanford being stuck with high level waste should Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository not open. Arnie said DOE is not examining Yucca Mountain for the GTCC EIS, but is taking into consideration what is being stored and put into the ground at Hanford. Susan suggested that the high level waste glass logs that will most likely be stored at Hanford be taken into account in the GTCC EIS, rather than just the Tank Farm Closure and Waste Management EIS (TC&WM EIS).

Arnie said the DOE-hosted public meetings in May will be at the Red Lion in Pasco on May 17 and at the Doubletree Hotel in Portland on May 19. He is working with DOE field offices to schedule meetings with local tribes while in the area, and they will be happy to offer additional time for HAB, noting that everyone is welcome at the public meeting. Paula Call, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), offered to set up a meeting with the Hanford Communities, as well as a meeting with HAB with conference call abilities to include HAB members not located in the Tri-Cities. Ken said the State of Oregon will also be interested in a meeting during the Portland visit.

Pamela McCann, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), suggested that the PIC would benefit from the perspective of how the GTCC EIS aligns with what the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) is doing. Arnie said the BRC is mostly focused on the back end of nuclear fuel sites, with 99% of that on nuclear power reactors and their waste. He said the intersection of GTCC and BRC occurs where there is waste coming out of the reactors once they are decommissioned. Arnie said that the BRC will look at the future of high level waste, and that they were originally planning to release a draft report in June 2011, but are rethinking their approach after the earthquake and subsequent nuclear activity in Japan. He said that a draft in June would mean a final report in January, at which point he will review what they are proposing; they may propose long term storage for spent fuel and high level waste that would need to be a component in the GTCC EIS. Arnie will work with the BRC should that occur. Arnie said he is tracking the BRC report, and the BRC agreed to not include GTCC as a part of their report.

Debrief the March 16, 2011 Budget Workshop

Steve provided an introduction to the budget workshop debrief, noting that the PIC has been completing debriefs more frequently and with good results. The reason for the debrief is to

discuss successes, what can be done better, and the application for future meetings. Steve said there will also be a debrief on the State of the Site meetings at the half-day PIC meeting on April 14.

Steve commended the agency representatives on their good work on presentations and materials for the workshop. He asked the group to discuss what went well, what didn't go well, and future applications for public meetings. Susan Hayman, facilitator, recorded agency and committee comments. The transcribed notes are attached (Attachment 2).

Agency Perspectives

Emy Laija, EPA, said she thought the workshop went well. She said the GoToMeeting and conference call abilities helped DOE to reach a larger audience and those capabilities should be available in the future. Emy said she appreciated that the presentations were made available online before the meeting.

Dieter said that he took a rough head count and removing agency and HAB representatives, there weren't many other participants. Dieter said he would like to see more of the general public participate in workshops. He said he thought the presentations were nice and succinct, which works well for workshops as well as State of the Site meetings.

Paula Call said DOE got a lot out of the workshop. She said the question and answer period provided insights into concerns and issues and gave them an opportunity to clarify some things. Paula said DOE learned that they should provide more information on previous budgets and their plans in order to differentiate between budgets so meeting attendees don't lump the budgets together. This provided them some clues on how to better communicate and they will work to flesh out the information for previous years' budgets.

Committee Discussion

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, asked if the workshop was advertised at earlier State of the Site meetings. Paula confirmed that it was.

Steve said the presentations and general agency dialogue should be scrubbed for acronym usage that the public will not understand. He said that even some HAB members only pretend to understand the acronyms and terminology. Liz pointed out that acronyms are not always used in the same definition. Steve suggested introducing some of the terminology for the audience's benefit. Laura Hanses, Hanford Work Force, added that Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL, did an excellent job explaining the budget numbers for the audience.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick, noted that most members of the public work during the day, and that is primarily the timing for all Hanford meetings. Bob referenced a US Fish and Wildlife Service evening workshop he attended that was packed with people. He also noted that the DOE budget is probably not the top of anyone's priority list. Bob said the City of Kennewick holds meetings on the weekend to allow the working public to attend.

Susan Leckband said it has always been a struggle to provide information the public can understand, but it is frequently to no avail since the public doesn't attend anyway. Susan said she

thinks the information scrubbing effort is lost unless an evening meeting is provided to support attendance. Susan said the HAB has a different level of involvement and comprehension level, so the information can be different for HAB members. Susan suggested one workshop during the day that would be more in depth for HAB members, and a workshop in the evening for the general public. Ken said that DOE should try to communicate clearly no matter who the audience is.

Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), referenced an evening meeting a few years ago that only three people attended. She said DOE hasn't been able to attract a high level of interest in workshops, no matter what time of day it is. Barb said she thinks that State of the Site meetings attract good attendance.

Liz said she took it upon herself to be more involved with the budget this year, and prepared an explanatory handout for how the budget works. Liz said that even the scrubbed handouts provided at the budget workshop were difficult to understand. She asked questions at the workshop assuming that she was the only one not understanding, but discovered that she was not. Liz said her handout will help anyone to understand the process and can be used year after year; she will provide copies for the HAB during the Board meeting and at the State of the Site meeting. Liz would like to see the budget information made relevant. She said there is a way to integrate field office priorities into budget workshops so the public can understand the context and how projects relate. Liz said that no one is to blame for the budget complexity, but that it would be easier to integrate budget during conversations about different projects. Liz provided an example of integration: discuss how the Solid Waste Burial Grounds (SWBG) integrate with funding during a Solid Waste workshop.

Susan Leckband suggested including which year projects are funded in documents about the project, such as SWBG. She said it will provide an idea about what will get done and what won't get done; the budget information should be included in the work plans. Paula said DOE could include if it is planned for implementation in a given year, but pending budget approval.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, commented on Liz's budget handout, noting that a calendar could be included to help display timelines of when budgets must be submitted to Congress, and when is the time for input. Liz said that she left off a calendar in order to keep the handout to two pages. Susan suggested adding a calendar to the side of the document.

Liz said the deadline for commenting on the DOE budget is April 7; she will check to confirm the date.

Susan Leckband said she learned more about the continuing resolution at the budget workshop. She said she learned that DOE is not working at fiscal year 2010 funding levels, but at the lesser of the two budgets proposed for fiscal year 2011. Barb said DOE is operating more along the lines of the 2010 budget, but Congress has proposed DOE go back to the 2008 funding levels, which is hard because it is six months into the year and 2008 levels were significantly less than 2010 funding levels. Barb suggested that Liz's work on the budget handout be shared with the Board to help everyone get their heads around the budget. Barb said she thinks it is a good idea to share Liz's handout with the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB); it will provide them the opportunity to comment on whether it is a good communication tool. Barb noted that other sites

have only been involved with the DOE budget for five years, while HAB has been involved for much longer and can provide guidance to the other sites. Susan said she is happy to share Liz's handout with other boards as they can put in their own three year budget numbers.

Susan Leckband said the deadline for all site budgets is the same, noting that the difficulty with site budgets has been that DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) does not provide budget guidance to the field offices until very late in the process. Susan suggested the field offices share what they have as early as they can, and share the rest once DOE-HQ weighs in, rather than holding everything until the last minute. Paula noted that DOE-HQ has responded to that information by allowing field offices to go ahead with budgets without having to wait for guidance.

Ken suggested DOE provide the handout on the DOE website in a type of format that provides consistent high-level budget information for the previous few years. He said it is difficult to locate these figures year after year.

Susan Leckband said she would like to see other committees look at their issues and work plans to see how they can fold their budget information into discussions. She said the Board should also incorporate budget information into advice.

Steve asked Sharon Braswell, MSA, if presenters at the previous State of the Site meetings wore name tags. Sharon said they had table tents, but didn't wear name tags because she thought that would mean everyone in the room, including the audience members, would need to wear a name tag. Steve suggested that just the presenters wear name tags in order to be identifiable.

Steve asked Sharon if there was any element of the State of the Site meetings on which she needs future assistance. Sharon said the biggest problem was the lack of a mute button on the home phones of those who called into the meeting or participated via GoToMeeting. Susan Hayman said she would work with Sharon to mute the callers.

The group discussed different types of meetings and whether the public attends any of them. Ken said the Tank Closure workshop saw a lot of general public participants. Bob Suyama said attendance at workshops or Committees of the Whole (COTW) depends on the topic. Liz suggested converting workshops into COTW meetings. Paula said that would put a strain on the HAB budget, as the Board is not required to pay for meetings that have to be provided by DOE, and that's why there has been a separation of workshops and COTW meetings. Paula said that if HAB wishes to spend some of their budget to turn a workshop into a COTW, that option can be revisited for next year. Susan Leckband said the COTW option would encourage HAB participation as it would provide travel options.

Liz suggested small group breakout sessions for workshops since some people would prefer to ask their questions in small groups rather than in front of the whole room. Sharon said the call in and webinar options would be lost for small group sessions and those participating by phone would not be able to break into groups. Liz said time at the end of the workshops for those who wished to stay to ask questions or break into groups would be helpful without having to break the format of the workshop.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington, suggested a provision of materials online leading up to the meeting for those who would like to prepare and discuss online before the workshop. He said

there could also be some debrief from the workshop online or over the phone. Doug said he is working on this kind of format independently of the HAB.

Issue Manager Updates

Steve said that it is important to note that all of the issues being addressed are joint-committee issues, and that those not interested in public involvement might be interested in working on other issues that are connected to the PIC.

Issue Manager Liz said that most PIC members also attend the technical meetings where the issues are discussed, so most of the information she provides will not be new to many of the committee members.

Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds

Liz said that the advice being brought forward at the next day's Board meeting was worked on for many hours in order to make the challenging issue easier to handle in a smaller advice piece. She said the PIC was involved in the decision to have a SWBG workshop last fall, and to postpone the State of the Site meetings in order to accommodate this workshop. Liz said it was a great interactive workshop with presentations and participation from local university students. Liz said the issue managers for the Solid Waste advice had lots of information to pull from after HAB conducted a sounding board at the November meeting. She said the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) helped to synthesize the advice.

Agency Perspective

Agency representatives did not provide comments.

Committee Discussion

Susan Leckband suggested the PIC members come to the Board meeting ready for a lively discussion on the SWBG advice.

Hanford Site-Wide Permit

Liz said the Hanford Site-Wide Permit is a document that is longer than the TC&WM EIS. She said the plan is for it to be published in the summer, with public meetings in September. Liz said Ecology has provided some parts of the document for the issue managers to review. She noted that part one of the document is general Washington state information, while the second part is specific to Hanford. Liz said the issue managers are looking into different parts of the document, noting that Pam Larsen, City of Richland, is specifically interested in the emergency planning aspect. Pam is interested in how those plans are made and communicated to the public. Liz said that the long term process for document review will be helpful when it is time for public meetings, as the issue managers will have had time to troubleshoot language, how it can be clarified, and how best to present the information to the public. Liz mentioned that a baseball card type tool is being used as a way to display photos and share key information.

Liz said the next step for the permit is a series of two hour meetings to discuss the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and how it relates to the permit. Liz said it is important to remember that the document is constantly changing as it is a container for many different processes, for example, the emergency planning aspect will always change as DOE learns more about the Hanford Site.

Liz said that anyone can sit in on the issue manager meetings to hear more about the permit. She said the issue managers are looking to schedule a meeting during committee week, and she will discuss this during the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) dinner meeting.

Agency Perspective

Dieter said the release date for the permit is tentatively July 1, 2011; there will be a 120-day comment period. He said parts of the document are available online for the public to see what they're working on, and Ecology has been working very hard to produce it. Dieter said Ecology will discuss the interface of SEPA and the permit at the next RAP meeting.

Committee Discussion

Susan Leckband said she understood that the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) is being permitted in sequences as the Site-Wide permit moves along. Dieter confirmed.

Susan Hayman pointed out that the term 'Site-Wide permit' is being used instead of "RCRA permit," because of the potential confusion with the RCBRA (River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment) .

Liz said it has been difficult for the issue managers to facilitate and note take for their meetings without the support of EnviroIssues due to budget cuts. Liz said the EIC will be discussing the facilitation cuts and what can be done about them. Susan Hayman will provide tips on how the issue managers can better facilitate and track documents on their own. Susan Leckband said that historically, the budget has not allowed for facilitation for the issue manager meetings, which is fine for the smaller projects and pieces of advice, but for the bigger projects like those of late, facilitation support is greatly needed. She said the budget needs to be balanced in order to support the larger workload, but the budget always needs to allow for Board members to travel to and from meetings.

Liz said there is a plan to conduct a COTW earlier in the permitting process, in order to inform the advice, how PIC takes on the process, and how other committees are involved in shepherding the advice.

River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA)

Liz said RCBRA draft advice is currently scheduled to be brought forward at the June Board meeting. Liz said they have a draft of the advice but are still working through some of the issues. She said that the second part of the assessment (Volume 1, Ecological Risk) is expected to be available in July.

Susan Leckband asked if the PIC is involved in the advice because the advice recommends a public meeting. Susan Hayman said there are components to the draft advice that relate to a public comment opportunity and public response document.

Liz said that this document, like many others, is a good opportunity to engage the public on the topic of risk, as risk is a big concern for the public. Liz noted that the document will be a good point of reference for public discussions, but the PIC will need to decide how to communicate the large data numbers to the public as they are hard to understand. Liz referenced a book lent to her by Ken that speaks to communicating risk; she said it will be helpful for when they plan the outreach component of the assessment. Liz said Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, has done some training on how to put risk into context and understandable terms; he would make a great contribution to planning for outreach. Barb suggested that Tony James, Benton-Franklin Public Health, would be a good addition to the planning as he provided an excellent Risk 101 presentation for the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP). Susan Hayman noted that RCBRA is a joint topic in April for RAP, PIC and HSEP; they will be discussing the advice, and Tony James will be able to present if requested during that meeting.

Tank Farm Closure Planning

Liz said the Tank Farm Closure Planning started as a pilot project to apply some of the lessons learned from the strategic planning advice. The issue managers would like to see collaboration on the planning between the agencies and Board members in order to support efficiency and shared understanding of the issue. Liz said the issue managers have identified one question to be discussed over time, and that question will be discussed during a one hour meeting during committee week. Liz said they believe this slower process will help those who cannot commit much time to feel involved in the process. She said there is a core group of members that are committed to the process. Liz said another question they are asking themselves is how to frame Tank Closure in the bigger world of Hanford and how it relates to the 2015 DOE-ORP Vision. Liz said they are hoping this framework will be able to be used on any Hanford issue to help the public understand the context. Liz said the next step for Tank Closure will be for the issue managers to develop a mission statement of what they are trying to achieve with the planning in order to create a shared understanding. Liz says part of the goal is to build a public understanding slowly over time.

Steve said this issue integrates concerns from a number of other issues, including not only how the Board will deal with it, but how to incorporate budget and public concerns. Steve said the planning template can be used for any cleanup issue. Steve noted that the same names of committed members keep showing up, and the Board needs to find other people with expertise and time to contribute to the issues.

Liz said that this issue does not have the same level of urgency as the SWBG and budget advice, but consistent involvement and attendance helps the issue progress. Liz said if there is an intention to provide advice on planning and timing, then the time given to that advice better be what it requires and nothing less. Liz said she supports the idea of having one question to address over a period of time rather than trying to cover a lot of information in an exhaustive three-hour session.

Agency Perspective

Paula said it is great to hear that the template being developed may be applicable for any issue. Paula said she appreciates that the issue managers are using DOE terminology for the Inner Area, Central Plateau, and River Corridor.

Dieter said he is still working with the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) and Pamela to develop a communication plan. He said there are still meetings to discuss how to frame communication. Dieter said that it is important to keep those conversations alive and to keep the issue moving. He said he has a much better understanding of where the process is going than he did two months ago.

Committee Discussion

PIC members did not provide comments on Tank Farm Closure Planning process.

Liz demonstrated the materials and displays she created for the State of the Site meetings. She displayed a poster created to help participation in a Hanford quiz; the display encourages participants to look up the answers to the quiz rather than guessing or giving up. Liz also displayed a poster called “What is Hanford Cleanup” that helps to show how cleanup is defined at Hanford. Liz pointed out that most of the public is not aware that waste will continue to be left on site. Liz said the 2015 Vision terminology helped to explain the different areas of the site on the display. Barb asked how the public responds to the displays and quiz. Liz said the quiz is meant to be interactive; the answers won’t be known without looking them up or asking other people, which is the point.

Bob Parks asked if the public knew that the waste is just being moved from all over the Hanford Site to one centralized location on site. He said people in the Tri-Cities know that, but the rest of the public may not. Bob asked how that message can be conveyed. The PIC agreed that that message is important. Susan Hayman suggested the message be incorporated into other public understanding of cleanup communications.

The PIC members thanked Liz for all of the hard work she contributes on behalf of the PIC.

Committee Business

Committee Leadership Selection

The PIC members unanimously agreed to re-elect Steve Hudson and Liz Mattson to their positions as chair and vice-chair, respectively. Ken noted that both Steve and Liz are great chairs as they are active, involved, and creative.

Comprehensively Update the 6-Month Work Plan

The PIC discussed topics they would like to see placed in their six month plan. Some items were added due to timing with other Board issues, and other items were left in the holding bin in order

to accommodate issues with shorter timeframes. Steve noted that PIC is in need of other members willing to take on issues as issue managers to help lighten the PIC workload. The agreed upon Work Plan is attached (Attachment 3).

Doug said all of the items in the work plan are interconnected, and he will work to find the common thread in order to determine the appropriate chronology.

Barb mentioned that DOE has reinstated the Speaker’s Bureau in order to reach out to schools, communities, and organizations.

Review Follow Up Items

Susan Hayman reviewed the noted follow up and action items.

1. Susan Hayman and Steve Hudson will suggest to the EIC that a hyperlink be provided in future advice to any relevant committee meeting summary and/or background material.
2. Paula Call will help to coordinate meetings in conjunction with the May 17 GTCC meeting in Pasco. The two meetings will be for:
 - a. HAB members (with a call-in option); and
 - b. Hanford Communities
3. Liz Mattson will provide her budget example handout to Susan Leckband and will provide copies for the back table at Board meetings.
4. Susan Leckband will provide and share Liz’s budget example handout at next SSAB meeting.
5. EnviroIssues will provide tools to help issue managers document and facilitate their meetings.
6. Doug Mercer will work to find a common thread for issues for the 6-Month Work Plan.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	Ken Niles
Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson	Bob Parks
Steve Hudson	Doug Mercer	Bob Suyama

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	James Joyce, DOE-EM	Barb Wise, MSA
Sharon Braswell, MSA	Emy Laija, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Arnie Edelman, DOE-EM	Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Follow up

1. Suggestion: hyperlink advice to relevant committee meeting summary (Susan Hayman and Steve Hudson)
2. Paula to help with coordination of Hanford Communities meeting (local government, etc.) in conjunction with May 17 Pasco meeting for GTCC, and set up phone call for outside of area Board members to participate (HAB specific meeting). (Paula Call and Susan Leckband)
3. Share Liz's budget example handout at next SSAB meeting, may be a tool that is useful to others. (Susan Leckband)
4. Liz to provide Word file to Susan Leckband and copies at back table to HAB meeting (committees to consider by issue).
5. Issue Manager tools to help them facilitate/document IM meetings (Susan Hayman with EIC)
6. Steve to talk to Dennis Faulk, Re: post decision public involvement.
7. Doug Mercer- look for threads in 6-Month Plan.

Attachment 2 – PIC 6-Month Work Plan

(italics indicate a topic brought forward since the committee last updated the work plan)

<p style="text-align: center;">April <i>(Committee Week)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint with RAP (at RAP meeting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RCBRA ○ Hanford site-wide permit • More extensive debrief on State of Site meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship to employee meetings • 2011-2012 PIC priorities to bring to Leadership Retreat • Issue manager updates 	<p style="text-align: center;">May <i>(Committee Week)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of 2013 Budget Priority exercise • Involving other communities (Spokane, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include result of SOS information / Speakers’ Bureau • Update on DOE Speakers’ Bureau and other communication efforts; discussion on development of products • <i>Review the revisions in the reprinted TPA document</i>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">June <i>(Pre-Board Meeting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What’s the right level of involvement for what kinds of topics • Ways to reach younger audiences (what’s working, other ideas) • How to distribute the Hanford PI workload (agencies/interest groups) 	<p style="text-align: center;">July <i>(Committee Week)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanford Site-wide Permit • “Systems” look at inter-relationship of NEPA/CERCLA/RCRA
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">August <i>(Committee Week)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRP review (during public comment period) 	<p style="text-align: center;">September <i>(Pre-Board Meeting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public understanding of cleanup levels- “When do we know we’re done?” Thematic. Tied to 2015, joint with RAP? • Risk communication, perception
--	--

<p>Holding Bin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Post-decision agency engagement techniques (Dennis Faulk, EPA, request for committee input)

- Working with agency responses and how they influence future work, strategy moving forward
- Discussion of agency responsiveness to TC&WM EIS comments
- Develop proposal for a HAB-sponsored public evening seminar (e.g. Thursday night of Board meeting) – to further education and public involvement goals