

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
June 7, 2007
Pasco, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions..... 1
Public Involvement Examples for the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs Meeting 1
Leadership Retreat Debrief..... 2
Review of Public Involvement Priorities 4
Work Plan Topic Discussion 4
Committee Business 5
Handouts..... 5
Attendees 5

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 April committee meeting summary was adopted.

Public Involvement Examples for the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs Meeting

Shelley Cimon asked the PIC to review *The Politics of Cleanup*, a report prepared by the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA). ECA is an organization of local governments that are adjacent to or impacted by Department of Energy (DOE) sites. Copies were available at the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) meeting. Shelley said the document contains cleanup site case studies, including Rocky Flats, Mound, and Oak Ridge, and analyzes the technical challenges of cleaning up sites and how politics affect cleanup decisions. She thought the PIC should respond to the report because it is important to Jim Rispoli, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management. Shelley interpreted the report as having a bias toward decision-making by local governments without public involvement or input from advisory boards.

Shelley said that in some cases in the transition to legacy management, advisory boards cease to exist and local governments have become the sole or primary local decision-makers. She thought *The Politics of Cleanup* did not accurately portray this enmity of the transition at some sites, specifically at Rocky Flats.

Shelley also thought that reading *The Politics of Cleanup* would help generate ideas of what public involvement means, how the Board involves the public, and how individuals in Board seats involve their constituents. She said other SSABs are eager for examples of successful public involvement. She and Susan Leckband, Board Chair, thought it was important to highlight the Board’s public involvement work and the importance of continuing it during cleanup and beyond.

She asked PIC to compile examples of how the Board involves the public, both currently and in the past. Shelley and Susan plan on presenting Hanford public involvement examples at the fall SSAB Chairs meeting.

Committee Discussion

What groups are involved with ECA?

Shelley said the City of Richland is involved with ECA. Barb Wise said that the Hanford Communities also works with ECA.

Should the HAB be interested in a relationship with ECA?

Shelley said no because it is not part of the Board's mission.

Who paid for The Politics of Cleanup?

DOE paid for it.

Should PIC develop a document to counter The Politics of Cleanup?

No, but Shelley reiterated her interpretation of the report's bias toward allowing local governments to speak for the public. Susan and Shelley's intent should be to fairly represent the Board's consensus process and describe successful public outreach attempts in the Northwest.

Is the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) composed of DOE employees?

Shelley said they are not, but they are paid to participate. Barb said EMAB was restructured and is smaller and more streamlined now.

Barb commented that other boards are impressed with the Board's level of knowledge of the budget. She thought Shelley should bring examples of budget presentations to the Chairs meeting.

Barb mentioned the Future Sites Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force were good examples of public involvement, in addition to other activities that were done prior to the establishment of the Board. She also thought PIC should describe the level of work committees and issue managers do prior to Board meetings.

Shelley thought there was openness at DOE-Headquarters (HQ), and the Board may have opportunities to leverage new ideas for public involvement.

The committee will read *The Politics of Cleanup* and develop good examples of Hanford public involvement for Shelley and Susan to present at the fall SSAB Chairs meeting. PIC members will brainstorm individually and send ideas and examples to Helen or the to-be-named issue manager, who will compile the examples. This will be discussed further on the June conference call.

Leadership Retreat Debrief

Helen described the Leadership Retreat discussions regarding the PIC.

1. *The Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS)*: Helen said PIC needs to think about how to educate the public before and after the launch of the TC&WM EIS. Is it timely to think about issuing advice on how to do this?
2. *Public involvement versus outreach*: Helen said the committee needs to clarify outreach versus public involvement. She thought that outreach is done during preparation for

public involvement, and that public involvement is done to obtain input. Helen also described outreach as helping the public become educated about particular issues.

3. *Effectiveness*: Helen said the committee needs to evaluate the effectiveness of public involvement and outreach.
 - a. *State of the Site*: Will State of the Site meetings be held this year?
 - b. *Outreach versus traditional public involvement*
 - c. *Integration*: How does PIC integrate with other committees and how does PIC assist the agencies? Does PIC need to meet during committee week? Helen said the agencies requested help with technical outreach as well.
 - d. *Resources*: What can PIC afford to do, and how can the gap be closed?

4. *Review*: The committee needs to allow time for review of its public involvement efforts.
 - a. *Review tool*: Helen said the agencies asked PIC to create a value- and principle-based tool to review efforts based on HAB advice.
 - b. *Clarify different forms of public involvement and communication*: Helen said the PIC needs to help clarify that the HAB itself is a form of public involvement.
 - c. *Clarify the HAB as a form of public involvement*: Helen said the HAB itself is a form of public involvement, but asked what the role of the PIC could be beyond the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). For example, can or should the PIC get involved with the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP)? Can the PIC get involved on a national level?

Committee Discussion

Helen thought the committee should develop a work plan to keep track of work assignments and to use it as a tool to keep the Board informed of PIC's work.

Helen will create a document outlining public involvement priorities from the Leadership Retreat for PIC to review. This will serve as a metric by looking at past projects and identifying past advice to accomplish priorities as well as assisting in the development of a values and principles tool.

Barb asked if information dispersal is part of public involvement or outreach. Helen said she thought it is part of outreach because it is the process of getting information out to people.

Norma Jean Germond asked if the PIC meeting time will change. Helen said it was discussed at the retreat, but more in the context of how the PIC integrates with other committees.

Gerry Pollet said that the PIC and Board need to be involved with anything that happens at Hanford, such as GNEP. He said GNEP has a clear relationship to cleanup issues and should be discussed, and the committee should involve the public especially during the Programmatic EIS comment period.

Helen thought the PIC's role is expanding and the committee may have to create subcommittees or assign issue managers.

Shelley thought PIC should think about how to ratchet up public involvement at the Hanford Site. She noted that the Board was unaware of an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) public involvement conference in Florida in September, and thought a PIC member should attend. Susan said the committee and Board need to ensure they are notified of events like the conference.

Gerry noted that EnviroIssues is involved in many public involvement projects around the region, and suggested that the committee and agencies have a workshop with them, depending on funding. Susan asked if a workshop would develop public involvement ideas that the committee could suggest to the agencies.

Norma Jean did not want a public involvement workshop because she did not think people would put what they learn into action.

Helen proposed having an outreach review committee evaluate Board and agency public events and again reiterated the need for committee issue managers.

Review of Public Involvement Priorities

Helen said the committee needs to approve the PIC priority language set forth in the 2007 Board priorities memo.

Susan thought that detailed information about PIC priorities could serve as the committee work plan.

Shelley noted that work plans revolve around what individuals choose to do; people have to commit to a task.

The committee approved the PIC priority language set forth in the draft 2007 Board Priorities.

Work Plan Topic Discussion

The committee discussed the following issues to possibly include in the PIC work plan.

TC&WM EIS

- Helen said an issue manager is needed for the TC&WM EIS public involvement.
- Barb thought the committee should think about what tools will be needed for EIS outreach, such as a primer. She noted that the PIC played a role in developing two fact sheets for the Solid Waste EIS. Barb also suggested creating a work-back plan to keep the committee on track.
- Susan thought it is important that the committee start thinking about the TC&WM EIS outreach now.

State of the Site Meetings

- Helen did not know if the agencies plan on having State of the Site meetings in 2007. She asked if the committee thought the meetings were helpful and how they can help the agencies this year.
- Madeleine Brown, Ecology, encouraged and welcomed advice or ideas on the State of the Site meetings.
- Helen thought the committee should review past State of the Site meeting advice and perhaps compile the advice into a memo.
- Gerry said the agencies should develop an annual Public Involvement Plan (PIP) as the committee has advised in the past.

Hanford Update

- Gerry thought the committee should help improve the content for the Hanford Update newsletter. He noted that the last issue came out too late to provide appropriate notice of the public budget meetings.
- Madeleine agreed that the Update could use some revision to make it a more usable and helpful tool. She asked the committee for specific improvement suggestions.
- Gerry said its role should be identified in a PIP. Gerry also said that the Committee Relations Plan needs to be updated.
- Helen said the committee will add the Hanford Update revision to its work plan.

Committee Business

Norma Jean requested that the Look Ahead, Look Back handout for TPA Quarterly meetings be sent out to the committee ahead of time. Barb will send it to Cathy for distribution a few days in advance of the TPA Quarterly meetings.

Norma Jean will give the committee update at the Board meeting.

The committee will have a conference call on June 21st. The call time may be changed to accommodate Steve Hudson.

Handouts

- Leadership Recap – Helen Wheatley

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Gerry Pollet	
Greg deBruler	Keith Smith	
Norma Jean Germond	Helen Wheatley	
Susan Leckband	Charlie Weems	

Others

Barb Wise, FH	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues