

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
April 4, 2007  
Clackamas, OR**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions ..... 1  
Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Update – Look Ahead, Look Back ..... 1  
Budget Meetings ..... 2  
Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) ..... 4  
Leadership Retreat ..... 6  
Committee Business..... 6  
Handouts ..... 7  
Attendees..... 7

*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**

Helen Wheatley, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The January committee meeting summary was adopted.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), introduced Floyd Hodges, a new Board member in a Regional Environmental/ Citizen seat (Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington).

Karen Lutz, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), noted that Carrie Meyer is a new addition to DOE-RL communications team.

**Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Update – Look Ahead, Look Back**

*Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)*

Karen showed the committee the newly remodeled Hanford Events Calendar website, <http://www5.hanford.gov/hanford/eventcalendar/>. It went live on April 3 and is linked through the [www.hanford.gov](http://www.hanford.gov) website. Public meetings, tours, conferences, tribal interactions, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) meetings, and many other public events are posted on the Events Calendar. The Calendar can be viewed by day, month, or as a list, and has search capabilities. All events open to the public will be posted on the Events Calendar.

Erik Olds, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said that DOE is still inputting data into the Events Calendar and welcomes the committee’s suggestions.

Karen reviewed the Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities handout and highlighted a few meetings including the Hanford Communities budget briefing held on March 23 and the FY 2009

Budget Workshop scheduled for May 9 in Richland. Regional budget priority meetings will be held in Seattle, Spokane, Portland, and Hood River at to-be-determined dates.

DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) activities were also added to the handout. Karen noted that the public comment period on scoping of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was extended to June 4<sup>th</sup>.

Erik updated the committee on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) public involvement opportunities. The Model Technical Review Group (MTRG) is providing guidance to the Science Application International Corporation on the development of the groundwater model. A vadose zone and groundwater workshop will be held on April 16, followed by a MTRG meeting on Field Data Comparison on April 23. On April 26 the MTRG will have a closeout meeting on Field Data Comparison. Stakeholders are invited to the kickoff and closeout meetings.

#### *Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said Ecology is working on a responsiveness summary for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) 2+2 Melter Configuration Permit Modification. Ecology is also working on proposed changes to the IDF permit. He said IDF is being put into a “caretaker” mode, and directed the committee to Madeleine Brown for details.

#### ***Committee Discussion***

- Helen asked what progress DOE has made with the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA). Karen said DOE decided to involve the Natural Resources Trustee Council (NRTC or the Trustees) early in the ecological risk assessment process. Susan Hughs was “cautiously optimistic” and glad that DOE is working with the Trustees early in the process and trying to combine the cleanup and damage assessment aspects of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).
- Helen asked if NRDA calls for public involvement. Susan Hughs thought the public does not become involved until there is an assessment plan. She thought it was unlikely the entire site will be tackled in one process and thought the site will be broken up into manageable pieces, each with a public process which will likely be years out.
- Helen asked if there will be more public involvement opportunities for the TC&WM EIS. Erik said a series of workshops and activities are identified on the website.
- Gerry Pollet again requested an outline of the TC&WM EIS and the alternatives under consideration that were presented at the alternatives workshop in February. He thought it should be available on the website.

#### **Budget Meetings**

The FY 2009 Budget Workshop will be held on May 9 at the Clarion Hotel and Conference Center in Richland at 12:00 pm. DOE-ORP and DOE-RL presentations will run from 12:00 pm to 12:30 pm, followed by regulator perspectives and an information session for each DOE Hanford field office. DOE-RL will have three information sessions: 1) River Corridor, 2) Central Plateau, and 3) groundwater. DOE-ORP will have two information sessions: 1) Waste treatment and 2) tank farms (retrieval and supplemental technology). The workshop will convert into a public meeting at 5:00 pm.

In March, the agencies presented the FY 2007 and FY 2008 budgets to the Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC). Gerry thought that DOE-RL came well-prepared for the discussion, with

specific dollar figures, priorities, shortfalls, areas of question, and resource staff to answer questions. Gerry said DOE-ORP was not as well-prepared and did not meet the committee's expectations. He said DOE-ORP's information lacked a sense of priority and detail. He and Harold Heacock are developing a list of detailed questions for the agencies to answer at the FY 2009 Budget Meeting in Richland. They will circulate the list to BCC members and provide it to the agencies with adequate time to prepare responses.

### *Committee Discussion*

The committee was glad that public budget meetings will be held around the region.

- Betty Tabbutt hoped that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are strongly coordinated and will show a united front to the public. She thought budgeting and funding is confusing, and the public may wonder if DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are competing for the same dollar.
- Susan Hughs said DOE-ORP had much more budget detail when they presented to the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board. She thought their presentation was greatly improved. Gerry thought it was improved, too.
- Erik compiled BCC feedback and DOE-ORP's responses and is still looking for additional feedback. He said budget presentations will be posted on the website, and that he and Karen typically try to make their materials similar so there is continuity between DOE-RL and DOE-ORP.
- Karen noted that the DOE-RL presentation was updated to include milestone information. DOE-RL will also continue to enhance their information and will focus more on budget priorities at regional budget meetings rather than dollar amounts.
- Erik thought giving projects visibility helps obtain funding. He understood the concern that the offices should not compete, but having some projects stand out, like tanks or groundwater, helps Congress see what needs funding.
- Susan Leckband thought the committee and Board have a good opportunity to provide advice before the budget request is submitted to DOE-HQ since the submittal is not until June 15. Erik agreed, and thought there was more time for public involvement than in the past.
- Erik noted that the five year targets have not been released by DOE-HQ, but he expects to have them by the FY 2009 Budget Workshop on May 9.
- Dennis noted that Hanford is in a budget-constrained cleanup, and said FY 2008 is the first year DOE has said it cannot meet its cleanup commitments.

Regional budget priority meeting dates were suggested:

- Seattle – Monday, June 4 or Tuesday, June 5
  - Spokane – Wednesday, June 6 or Thursday, June 7
  - Portland – Tuesday, June 12
  - Hood River – Wednesday, June 13
- 
- Laura Mueller asked why the committee wanted to wait until June for budget meetings. Norma Jean Germond said they have to wait for detailed budget information plus allow enough time for publicity.
  - Nolan noted that facility availability will influence meeting dates. He also wondered if it would be difficult to have back-to-back meetings in different cities; Gerry agreed and thought it would be good to have at least a day between the Seattle and Spokane meetings.
  - Karen thought having a meeting on June 13 would leave little time to compile public comments for the budget submittal on June 15. Greg thought that allowed enough time for DOE to accurately capture comments because he anticipated that comments would follow general themes and take little time to summarize.

- Karen asked if the committee would consider having the meetings earlier if detailed budget information is available.
- Susan Hughes noted that two days to compile comments would not give PIC as much review time or input as it may like. Erik agreed, and said it will take time to analyze comments collaboratively.
- Dennis thought getting information to the public should be the main goal so they can take action and lobby Congress. Erik thought the process begins with DOE and obtaining public priorities, and then asking Congress for funding. He said Congress cannot allocate funding if DOE does not request it in the first place. Dennis said DOE is already legally obligated to ask for adequate funding for the TPA.
- Betty said the public should know if the goal is to lobby Congress so they are not misled into thinking the budget submittal will be changed according to their comments. Karen said all comments from the Board and public will be submitted with the budget submittal.
- Susan Leckband affirmed that public input does make a difference, even if it is late in the process. She cited the instance when Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, collected feedback from end-state workshops and comments provided to DOE-HQ resulted in some changes.
- Greg thought public comments should be collaboratively compiled to make sure they are accurately captured.
- Nolan asked if the PIC wanted to take ownership of public comments made at the regional meetings to make sure they are accurately captured. Helen said the committee would need to think about it.
- Dennis said that public comment has an impact even if changes are not made in the original submittal.
- Susan Hughes said the success of public meetings on the FY 2009 budget is dependent on how much detailed information is available.
- Susan Leckband volunteered to act as a liaison between DOE and the cities that will have budget meetings.

The committee discussed the “dot” public feedback technique. Gerry described how priorities can be visually presented to the public using a large chart with dots representing dollars – people can move the “dollars” to the issues they think should be top priorities.

- Dennis thought it would be good to show which projects are currently funded.
- Nolan asked where the list of issues would come from; Erik thought they could use the topics being used for the May 9 Budget Workshop.
- Nolan suggested that the Board use the dot exercise at the June Board meeting.

Karen noted that DOE is finalizing the special edition of the budget update, and that Susan is submitting budget priorities on behalf of the Board. Karen also showed the committee a draft advertisement the agencies will use to try to get new people involved in Hanford issues. DOE is accepting feedback on the draft ad.

### **Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP)**

US-DOE, Office of Nuclear Energy, is preparing a Programmatic EIS for GNEP. Public scoping meetings were held in Pasco on March 13 and in Hood River on March 26. The public comment period was recently extended from April 4 to June 4, 2007. The committee was concerned about GNEP’s public involvement effort and the impact GNEP will have on the Hanford site if Hanford is selected.

### ***Committee Discussion***

- Gerry thought GNEP's public involvement effort was inadequate and did not provide meaningful notice for the Hood River meeting. Gerry thought all DOE activities about Hanford need to meet regulator and TPA standards for public involvement.
- Karen said DOE-RL and DOE-ORP sent emails about the meetings to the Hanford listserv, even though GNEP is not part of Environmental Management (EM).
- Gerry said pertinent information on the scope of environmental impacts was unavailable at the Pasco meeting, like how much spent fuel waste the selected site will have to accept or how much cesium will be extracted from the waste stream and remain on site. He thought that information was important for meaningful public involvement and for the Board's ability to properly advise on cleanup.
- Susan Hughs noted that the Hood River meeting was added late because originally there was no meeting planned for Oregon. Susan counted approximately 170 people at the Hood River meeting. She said the State of Oregon is sending a letter to GNEP requesting individuals receive longer than two minutes of speaking time. Bob Parks thought speaking time should be limited to ensure everyone has a chance to speak; Pasco received three to five minutes of speaking time.

*Would the Board be able to reach consensus on GNEP issues?*

- Susan Leckband said in the past, the Board agreed not to discuss the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) because it was such a divisive issue and the Board was unable to reach consensus. She suspected GNEP would have the same effect.
- Charlie Weems thought the TC&WM EIS would change completely if GNEP selects Hanford. He understood the divisiveness concerns but thought GNEP's impact on cleanup is too important.
- Betty thought that even though the committee or Board may never reach consensus, it is important to discuss GNEP because of its potentially large impact on cleanup at Hanford.
- Greg thought the Board should address GNEP because of its ability to produce large quantities of waste and because it has not identified cumulative impacts. He thought it was an opportunity for the Board to identify issues GNEP needs to address and take it to the public to show how the proposal will impact cleanup at Hanford. He thought FFTF did not need to be discussed and GNEP would not be divisive.
- Bob Parks thought GNEP should be discussed, but agreed with Susan that the Board will be divided. He said the Board needs the handouts from the GNEP meetings.
- Jim thought GNEP has the potential to rewrite the TPA. Nolan said Ecology submitted comments to Tim Fraser, and sent a copy to EnviroIssues. He said the state's position is that onsite cesium and strontium are covered under the TPA and nothing under GNEP changes the TPA agreement. He said Ecology has many questions and concerns and will seek more information but, as a potential regulator, cannot take a position for or against GNEP.
- Charlie thought GNEP would not be divisive if the Board focused on the Programmatic EIS scoping. Jim thought the Board should provide scoping comments.

*Can the Board provide advice on GNEP?*

- Susan Leckband acknowledged the impact GNEP would have on the site if Hanford were selected, but cautioned that the Board can only provide advice to EM because it is an EM Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB).
- Susan Hughs noted that while GNEP is not a HAB issue, the potential outcomes are HAB issues.

*Who would the Board send advice to?*

- Helen thought GNEP advice could be sent to the agencies.

- Susan Hughs thought the Board's chance of influencing DOE-HQ and GNEP on public involvement was slim.
- Dennis suggested sending advice to Jim Rispoli, who could then direct it to other offices as appropriate. He thought the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) would be more apt to listen if the committee kept the advice positive, saying that public involvement works well at Hanford and other offices could learn from it.
- Karen said the Board could send the advice to the local DOE offices and they could forward it on.

*Is the committee concerned about GNEP itself or GNEP public involvement?*

- Gerry thought there were two issues – public involvement and the effect GNEP will have on the TPA and cleanup at Hanford.
- Helen thought advice could be written on the public involvement effort and scoping.
- Betty thought the PIC could recommend other committees to analyze GNEP and identify questions and concerns of their own. She thought the Board needs to make sure issues affecting cleanup are included in the Programmatic EIS scope.
- Nolan noted that the GNEP program is only defined at a conceptual level; Gerry said detailed information is needed now to give scoping advice.
- Gerry suggested the advice say that consistent with prior advice, the NEPA process from other DOE offices needs to meet NEPA and TPA public involvement regulations if other offices are going to rely upon the GNEP Programmatic EIS for other TPA or EIS changes. He suggested mentioning specific examples, like how GNEP should utilize the TPA mailing list.
- Susan Leckband said she would carry forward whatever the Board wants, but the advice must be EM-related. She thought it was difficult to provide advice on scoping when the Board has not received any information. She cautioned that this kind of advice had the potential to have a negative effect on the Board and it must be carefully crafted. She was hesitant for the committee to try to put together advice in one day.
- Charlie asked what Karen and Erik thought about GNEP – would the DOE Hanford field offices be affected? Karen said their stance all along has been that it is a separate program and that it is too early in the process to tell what the impacts will be.
- Jim suggested writing a letter of concern instead of advice.
- Betty thought the letter should request that HAB advice regarding GNEP adopted at the June meeting be considered by DOE even though it is three days after the comment period ends.

The committee will ask other committees to compile scoping comments on the GNEP Programmatic EIS.

The committee decided to craft a letter of concern regarding GNEP's public involvement effort, and requested that DOE consider HAB advice that may be adopted at the June HAB meeting. The committee will reach consensus on the letter before presenting it at the Board meeting.

### **Leadership Retreat**

The Leadership Retreat discussion was postponed to the April committee call.

### **Committee Business**

The GNEP letter was drafted for the Board meeting on the following day, April 5.

## Handouts

- Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities – TPA Agencies
  - Draft Budget Public Meeting advertisement – DOE-RL, DOE-ORP
  - FY 2009 Budget Timeline – EM
- 

## Attendees

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg deBruler	Ken Niles	
Earl Fordham	Bob Parazin	
Norma Jean Germond	Bob Parks	
Floyd Hodges	Gerry Pollet	
Steve Hudson	Betty Tabbutt	
Susan Hughs	Jim Trombold	
Pam Larsen	Helen Wheatley	
Susan Leckband	Charlie Weems	
Laura Mueller		

### **Others**

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Mike Bermochou, CH2MHill
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Lori Gamache (phone)
		Natalie Troyer (phone)
		Barb Wise, FH (phone)