

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
January 14, 2009
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions 1
Strategic Planning Process – Part 1 2
Public Involvement -- Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (TC&WM EIS) 9
Committee Business..... 15
Action Items / Commitments 16
Handouts 16
Attendees..... 16

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, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee, introductions were made and the committee adopted the November meeting summary.

Steve mentioned ongoing PIC committee issues:

- The committee needs better membership and participation.
- The committee should review Board priorities and PIC goals by February 2010.
- After attending a public meeting, Board members should provide Steve with comments about what worked well and what did not.
- The committee will revisit the issue of hosting evening seminars on specific cleanup topics.

Steve said he wanted committee members to inform him of public involvement activities and share their experiences in a brief report of what was good and bad and how it can help PIC improve. Steve said PIC should work across all of the committees. He said it would be nice to have someone from each committee to head up public involvement efforts but that is a little unlikely.

Ken Niles, PIC vice-chair asked about reporting back on public meetings. He said he typically did not report to the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) on public involvement activities that are conducted on behalf of the State of Oregon. Steve said it is valuable to report on those activities, because it results in information about what was discussed at

the public meetings. Susan Leckband said the representation doesn't matter. She said each person on the Board is expected to reach out to others. Steve said it is good to draw from others who have expertise.

Steve said it is important that the PIC identify the new chair and vice chair by the end of February in order for them to attend the annual spring leadership retreat. Susan Leckband asked if the current leadership would like to continue in their positions. Ken said he would like to step down. Steve said he is interested in continuing as PIC chair. Liz Mattson said that she would consider the vice-chair position.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), wanted to get the committee's thoughts on EPA involvement at Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) public meetings. He said EPA has not been involved to date with the public meetings about the TC&WM EIS and has not made a decision yet about the upcoming public hearings partially because of this lack of involvement. Ken said if EPA sees issues with the EIS there should be a representative there to express this. Paula Call, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said if EPA has issues it is important for them to come to public meetings. Gerry Pollet said it is important that EPA hears what the public has to say, especially since EPA will gain more responsibility for tank closure decisions currently under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Dennis thanked the committee for its input.

Strategic Planning Process – Part 1

PIC's strategic planning process was designed to develop a group definition for successful public involvement by reviewing and discussing case studies and examples of successful public involvement efforts outside of Hanford and to identify benefits, challenges and principles for public participation.

Framing

Liz introduced the discussion on PIC's efforts toward a strategic planning process. Liz said the idea is to use PIC as a sounding board for the Strategic Planning Process. She said there has been energy surrounding public involvement and the goal is to have public meetings be more participative and engaging. She said strategic planning process issue managers are working toward developing a flow chart and a draft document for the agencies. Liz reviewed a draft timeline for this effort:

- February: Look at the big picture of public involvement and apply those concepts to develop strategic public involvement goals at Hanford.
- March: PIC will look at different tools and techniques for public involvement and how they can be used to address the goals. PIC will work on a draft flow chart and document so that there is something to show the agencies what was generated.

Susan Leckband recommended that these documents be brought to the Board. She hopes there would be a sounding board to take to the full Board to engage people and get a

larger view. Liz thought bringing the document to the Board was good idea; the initial goal is to generate ideas within the committee.

Betty Tabbutt (on phone) said it might be worthwhile to look at public involvement ideas and issues specific to Hanford first, and then move on to discuss broader, strategic public involvement.

Liz said the issue managers (IMs) deliberately wanted to focus outside of Hanford for this first session, which is why the discussion will take a broader view at first. Betty she just did not want PIC to miss this opportunity to look at Hanford specifically. Liz said that the question of what is unique about Hanford can be addressed at the February meeting when Hanford public involvement goals will be discussed.

Case studies and discussion

Steve said his review of case studies identified five similar that he feels are crucial to successful public involvement:

- Clear agreed upon goals and outcomes at the beginning of the process or activity.
- Consistent, regular and predictable public notification about a public meeting and what was discussed, so people know that there was involvement surrounding the activity.
- A consistent format with neutral materials.
- An evaluation form that provided a contact person for comments.
- All informational items are clear and provide people with steps and sources to get this information.

Liz provided an example of a process that used art to generate discussion in communities. Relevant questions were posted on sheets all over a college campus, with paper and pins for writing responses and attaching them to the sheets. The sheets were displayed in areas that were physically difficult to avoid, and therefore engaged people and encouraged responses (e.g. displayed in the middle of walkways around campus). She said many people provided written responses. Liz said she then hosted a community meeting to leverage the ideas that were captured. The successes that she identified in this process were:

- The unexpected ways of engaging people
- Highly noticeable and readable from a distance
- An element of mystery
- Very interactive and fun
- Having an invitational element for involvement
- There was a community building aspect

Sonya Johnson, CH2MHill Plateau Remediation Company, said she has had many experiences at other sites. She has found success through innovation and “meeting people where they are.” Sonya provided some examples:

- At the Savannah River site, they provided recorded events to community television stations. The recording provided a number for people to call with

questions, which was very popular with stakeholders and made the comment period go smoothly.

- At the Oak Ridge site a letter in the paper describing the public involvement opportunities and providing a commitment to what would be done.
- At the Yucca Mountain site during the site recommendation, web casts were used, which enabled the event coordinators to reach a broad stakeholder group.

Sonya said it is valuable to have subject matter experts at each location to come in and give comments. She said social networking tools such as Facebook and Twitter are useful in reaching large audiences and people who may not usually be involved or have resources to do so. Social networking tools are effective ways to reach the next generation of stakeholders.

Gerry said there are different ways to find common ground through public involvement. He said sometimes if people set aside positions, they realize they had similar values (e.g. stopping proposals through MTCA). Gerry described an example about large signs advertising a cleanup site. He said that even though some businesses may not have liked a sign that advertises a contaminated site in their area, they shared similar values and reached consensus to use signage for contaminated sites in Washington State.

Gerry said there was another successful exercise regarding cleanup priorities and budget where agencies and stakeholders shared presentations at a series of public meetings, instead of at one TPA review. This was followed by a dot matrix exercise where participants identified where they thought cleanup dollars should be allocated. The results were summarized and sent back out to participants and the community so they could comment before decisions were made. Gerry thought these public meetings helped make cleanup along the River Corridor a priority. He said the key messages from this public meeting were:

- Gathering different perspectives
- Having information in advance, such as a citizens guide to promote input
- Time to interact and opportunities to provide input
- A follow up element to get the results out to the public

Susan Leckband tries to educate people about the HAB and Hanford, by:

- Presenting her view using interactive techniques
- Challenging the public to pay attention to the issues
- Using the annual report as a tool
- Providing meaningful reasons for people to get involved in Hanford issues.

She said the biggest part is educational, and being encouraging; Susan said going “where the people are” builds interest in Hanford.

Dennis said some of his most enjoyable public involvement was at his church. The church service was held outside along with a yard sale where items were given away, rather than sold. He said they made contact with hundreds of people that wouldn't have occurred otherwise. Dennis said it was “outrageous and innovative” – and it worked.

Dennis said informal “coffee session” discussions where people just sit and talk on a personal level are useful. He said the discussion on the community relations plan was a simple dialogue that resulted in big personal impacts.

Gerry said all these examples required substantial behind-the-scenes work to make them effective public involvement tools and events.

Steve added that it is important to review examples of unsuccessful public involvement as well, and learn from those cases.

Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), said she used to live by Green Lake in Seattle, which has a path around it for walking, jogging and biking. She said then it was in such demand that it was extremely congested, so a committee was formed to set rules to make it possible for everyone to coexist. She said the committee helped build consensus rules for using the path by using people-friendly tools such as surveys available at lemonade stands around the path. She said including and giving everyone an equal voice is important.

Betty said the plutonium round table was successful because there was good turnout (Susan Hayman noted that Paige Knight, via email, had also identified the plutonium round-table as a good example of public involvement). She thought DOE did not initially respond to public input about having a national forum to promote equality. She said DOE committed to having a national dialogue, but after two meetings this slowed and then stopped. Ken said buy-in from the decision makers is essential to making things happen.

Betty said DOE funded this public involvement, but it seemed like they were just “checking the box.” Gerry noted that the meeting was successful because DOE allowed the League of Women Voters to facilitate. He thought it would be worth discussing that process. Betty said if DOE is going to have a public involvement process, they need to work to understand public values and needs, and follow through on commitments.

Barb said there were other meetings facilitated by the League of Women Voters. She remembered that there was a change of decision makers that took away from the momentum of the public involvement efforts. Betty said administration changes are common and should not significantly affect public involvement efforts. Barb said the workshops helped develop a useful informational tool that identified the locations of waste sites and equity. She said this was impressive because it gave context to the issues.

Gerry cautioned against confusing “moderation” and “facilitation.” He said facilitation requires meeting with stakeholders to design the presentations and exercises and “who sits with who,” for example. He said there is a lot of upfront work, not just pointing your finger at who gets to speak. Gerry said the success of public involvement exercises is based on independent facilitation.

Betty said the public needs “plain language” information. She suggested that the agencies provide funding to provide technical resources (“interpreters”) to the public to help them understand difficult issues. Liz agreed that collaborative design and the use of plain language is important.

Dennis agreed that someone has to ensure information is turned into useful pieces of work that the public understand. He said emergency preparedness and awareness was such an example. Barb agreed that good public involvement means providing understandable and clear information early to help the public better understand the issues.

A complete listing of the critical elements of successful public involvement from the case studies discussed are included in Attachment 1 – January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes.

Group discussion to define successful public involvement

Before beginning the discussion Susan Hayman asked the meeting participants to respond to the individual “prompts” posted in three different areas of the room:

- Public involvement is important because...
- Public involvement is challenging because...
- Some principles of public involvement are...

Participants were asked to write their responses to these three prompts on individual pieces of paper and post them under the prompts. Participants were then asked to self-select one of the three prompts to work on. Each group of approximately 4-5 participants then took the individual responses and synthesized them into a bulleted list under each prompt. A spokesperson for each group reported out the results.

A complete list of the responses to these three prompts is included in Attachment 1 – January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Group 1: Public involvement is challenging because...

Ken reported out for this group, which came up with the following bullets that encompassed the comments:

- Most public is reluctant to engage because it takes a commitment (apathy...busy?).
- The Public doesn’t understand the impact of decisions or feels unable to affect change.
- Takes a considerable amount of time to do well (including building public understanding).
- Sometimes decisions have to be made quickly.
- We’re not all on the same page (which is not always a bad thing). D.A.D. (decide, announce, defend).
- Issues are complex, multi-layered and resistant to easy solutions.

- Not all issues are equal.

Discussion

Gerry said that public involvement is challenging because of close relationships that some people have with the agencies. He said this is the case at Hanford and that, at times, the person who is regulated has a lot of access to the regulator.

Betty said public involvement is challenging at Hanford because the project has an extremely long lifespan; people do not see results quickly.

Dennis said that sometimes senior managers don't recognize the level of effort needed to carry out effective public involvement.

Lori Gamache, Department of Energy Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said she grew up around the Columbia Basin, but was not familiar with Hanford until she started working here. She said that she rarely hears people talk about Hanford in her community, so it is important to think about how to reach people.

Paula said that it is incorrect to measure the success of public involvement by numbers. She said it is about quality, education and informing people when they do have the chance to be involved. Gerry said numbers are valuable but quality is important to see what people's concerns are. He said there needs to be respect for how people give input, and showing up at meetings is not the only way.

Group 2: Some principles for public involvement are...

Barb reported out for this group, which came up with the following bullets that encompassed the comments:

- Early commitment to provide clear, honest communication.
- Opportunities for involvement as early as possible (e.g. before alternatives are identified).
- Opportunity to influence the decision.
- Decision-makers need to be involved in good, long term strategic planning with early involvement of stakeholder (public outreach and education).
- Those affected need the opportunity to provide input into planning how public involvement will take place.
- PI plan needs to reflect input of affected stakeholders.
- Feedback throughout the process.
- Open communication (equal voices, range of views, perspectives)

Discussion

Betty said decision makers need to take ownership of the public involvement process, not just check the box. She said she is not sure how this would be enforced. Ken thought the situation at Hanford was complicated by public involvement activities that are sometimes

run out of DOE Headquarters, and they were less likely to follow guidance offered by stakeholders. Paula agreed with Ken.

Dennis said his group talked about the challenge with the occasional decision maker who is not as committed to public involvement.

Sharon said it is hard to determine when an informational meeting is appropriate and when greater public involvement is needed.

Barb said there was an initiative to train managers on public involvement and its importance. She said public involvement is not a reflex – it takes experience.

Liz said agencies cannot enter the public involvement process knowing what the outcome will be. She thought public involvement is successful when people are heard.

Barb said the issue is that public involvement takes a lot of time and money. She said people often do not put the time in up front to make it successful.

Betty said the group emphasized that it is important to show the public how they affected decision making and how they were heard. Steve asked if it is incumbent on the public to show why their involvement is important. He noted that not all issues are of the same importance to everyone.

Group 3: Public involvement is important because....

Liz reported out for this group, which came up with the following bullets that encompassed the comments:

- It leads to improved, sustainable decisions.
- It results in decisions supported by the public (financially; reflect public values).
- The public should have a say on decisions that have a long-term direct effect on people – economically and environmentally.
- It supports citizen involvement in democracy.
- It provides a forum to exchange a balance of perspectives and learn from one another.

Discussion

Ken said he would like to better understand the goal of the TC&WM EIS public meetings, and see a clear goal and purpose set forth before the public.

Dennis said the sustainability of decisions is number one priority. He commented that when public involvement is done well, it is democracy at its best. He said that both public involvement and democracy can be very messy.

Liz said more follow-up work should be done to ensure success. She said there is constant public involvement at Hanford, but it is not necessarily quality public involvement.

Steve commented that early presenters set the tone for a meeting.

Betty said the HAB is a good example of public involvement and maybe PIC needs to give more credit to this DOE-established process.

What does successful public involvement look like?

Using their previous discussion as a basis, the participants brainstormed what they thought public involvement “looks like.” These bullets will then be taken and synthesized by the issue managers. A working definition will be brought back to the committee for further discussion.

The following are the brainstormed responses:

- Well-informed stakeholders
- Commitment to stakeholders from decision makers
- Early engagement
- Clearly defined process
- Clearly defined expectations
- Response / feedback loop to stakeholders
- Collaborative design / stakeholder involvement in the public involvement process
- Results in decisions that are sustainable, supportable and reflect public values
- Fun! Enjoyable!
- Decision-makers opened to letting public input influence decision
- Respectful
- More than a public meeting, fact sheet, etc.
- Interactive
- Inclusive – no barriers to people with different economic, social, physical needs.

Betty said PIC should revisit this discussion and tailor public involvement strategy and tools to Hanford.

Public Involvement -- Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (TC&WM EIS)

The PIC committee reviewed the public involvement piece of the TC&WM EIS to discuss public involvement activities and collaboration opportunities before and at the public hearings. The PIC committee also discussed recommendations for the information that may be contained in the mailer for the public hearings and how PIC and Agencies will stay coordinated throughout and following the EIS public comment period.

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, said comments on the draft TC&WM EIS will be different than comments received during the scoping period. She said scoping is about

educating people, while the public hearings on the draft document is a way to see what people are thinking about it. She said DOE will not change the set of preferred alternatives identified in the TC&WM EIS, but DOE wants to hear from the public on issues that DOE has not yet made a decision on.

Discussion

Ken said it is useful to hear that DOE is willing to look at revisiting some aspects of the TC&WM EIS. Mary Beth said she does not see why DOE would not change things based on comments; however she is not the one making these decisions. Paula said that this is what the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is all about, for the public to be able to understand and comment on what is being proposed.

Ken said it is apparent that change is not always effected by public comment. Betty asked if Ken thinks DOE should state if things are subject to change. Mary Beth said she will identify where DOE is in the process so the public understands what they can influence. Ken wanted to make sure this is clearly stated.

Gerry commented that some decision makers do not read public comments. Mary Beth said there is a process to ensure all comments are reviewed. Gerry asked Mary Beth to identify decision-makers for the TC&WM EIS key decisions. Mary Beth said DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM-1) leadership and DOE's General Counsel (GC-1).

Ken said it is important to identify what is being planned for the public hearings so that collaboration on a smaller scale can be coordinated.

Public Involvement Prior to the Public Hearings

Liz reviewed what Hanford Challenge has planned for the TC&WM EIS public hearings. Hanford Challenge hired two people to review the EIS technical comments and will prepare educational materials. Hanford Challenge will email and mail notifications and provide information on their website. Liz said there is the potential to create a public workshop on general education about Hanford and then focus on the TC&WM EIS. She said Hanford Challenge is thinking about bringing in a technical expert for a "living room meeting" where a small group of invited people can meet to talk about the TC&WM EIS. Hanford Challenge will attend the DOE public hearings and provide oral comments in Richland, Hood River, Portland, and Seattle. Liz said they will provide educational materials at the public hearings as well. Hanford Challenge is looking at the potential to collaborate with Heart of America NW (HoANW) and Oregon DOE.

Ken said Oregon DOE is conducting a technical review of the TC&WM EIS; this will help them prepare comments for DOE. Oregon DOE is expanding their mailing list to notify people of the hearings and potentially provide information. He said Oregon DOE has drafted a summary of the TC&WM EIS. Ken is hosting a "living room meeting" in Portland and an informal talk about the TC&WM EIS. Oregon DOE is looking to do

more of these. He said Oregon DOE will attend the four Oregon hearings; Eugene, Hood River, Portland and Eastern Oregon. Oregon DOE will attend the open house an hour before and will provide oral comments at these meetings with written material at a table. He said there is already more effort being invested in this process than there has been in the past. Susan Leckband asked if Oregon DOE will share the same information at each hearing. Ken said it depends on the audience and Oregon's role in the hearings.

Gerry said Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) will share presentations and informational materials at all hearings except Boise. HoANW has a large mailing list and Gerry expects to mail information about the TC&WM EIS to at least 5,000 people. HoANW sent Ecology a draft fact sheet and hope to have funding to mail that to 500 people in the Tri-City and Walla Walla areas. HoANW hired independent experts, who are reviewing the EIS, and HoANW is collaborating and getting comments on their citizen's guide. Gerry said the technical reviews will feed into the workshops and presentations. HoANW is planning to do fact sheets on 6-8 major areas of the EIS.

Gerry said he hopes that the agencies will hold educational workshops in advance of the public meetings. Ken said he is concerned about having workshops in addition to meetings; he did not want to over-saturate people with meetings. Gerry said the workshops are to prepare people for the public meetings. He said Hanford Challenge and HoANW have proposed a workshop. HoANW is actively working to get environmental groups to provide notification and forward emails to use as list serves for the hearings; they are also using Facebook and Twitter. HoANW hopes to collaborate on a pre-meeting presentation and posters from the EIS itself with data and visuals.

Madeleine said Ecology has developed two focus sheets on the EIS, and these include a preliminary review. There will be 6-8 fact sheets developed for the web site and handouts to show what Ecology thinks is important.

Public Involvement at the Public Hearings

Mary Beth reviewed the format of the public hearings. She said there will be an open house prior to the official hearing portion of the meeting. During the open house, organizations will have the opportunity to set up at tables and provide information in a separate room. DOE and Ecology will provide presentations prior to the comment portion of the hearing. When the hearing starts, everyone will gather in the main room. She said DOE would like to get public comment so they can hear what people are thinking regarding the TC&WM EIS.

Gerry asked for clarification on the room layout; will presentations be given in the separate room, or will they be in the main room? Mary Beth said the DOE and Ecology presentations will be provided in the main room. Other organizations are welcome to share presentations in the separate room. She asked organizations who would like to provide information at the hearings get in contact with DOE soon.

Betty said she would appreciate it if DOE would keep the presentation concise. She thought it might be helpful to summarize how far the process has come and the big changes that have been made as a result of the process and public comment. Mary Beth said DOE will provide background information, but in the interest of time, will not focus too much on history. Madeleine said Ecology's presentation will help explain the purpose of cooperating agencies.

Mary Beth said notification post cards have been mailed. DOE received suggestions to provide more information, so it developed a full 8 1/2x11 page of information, folded into large postcard-sized mailer. Fact sheets will be available at the meeting, and notification will be made through area newspapers.

Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, said DOE uses a list serve to send informational materials out to the public. He said press releases can be put on Facebook and Twitter. Ken asked if DOE can track how many people view Hanford information on those social networking tools. Erik thought this is possible and would provide good data.

Madeleine asked if the posters from the December 15th public workshop will be there. Mary Beth said yes, and the ones that are most related to the topic will be more prominent.

Mary Beth asked for suggestions on ways to display information from the EIS; she said DOE is aiming for a mix of narrative and visual.

Gerry said he would like to see a place for people to comment online, and a web site where people can post and view their comments. He said this would not be the same as the fact sheets, but short summaries of the issues that people can comment on. Paula asked if this would serve as a formal comment. Gerry said yes, it would be on the DOE web site but the benefit would be seeing other comments made on the topic. Mary Beth said DOE cannot comment on whether that would be feasible but is willing to see if this is possible. Steve thought it would be good to look at how the statements are framed. Gerry said it would fit in the Open Government Directive where it has been discussed to use this type of tool.

Liz asked about the possibility of organizing comments around specific topics at the meeting, rather than taking comments on all aspects of the document at the same time. Mary Beth said DOE should try to focus the comments on what people can potentially have an effect on. She said if there are comments on something that is not under the scope, or under the actions and decisions the agency is making, then the comments are not as useful.

Liz asked about HAB presence at the hearings. Susan said she will attend the hearing in the Tri-Cities. Gerry said having the consultant report available and a presentation at the open houses is important. Susan agreed that if there are materials available by then, it would be beneficial to have them available.

Gerry said the HAB advice would be ready for the Seattle hearing.

Steve asked about how the web sites will be used to get information on the EIS. Ken said the Oregon Department of Energy website does not yet have information about the topic, but he expected it would within the next week. He said it would include links to other web sites that have information on the draft EIS. Madeleine said that Ecology has something similar to this. Steve said if there are links he would put a document together and have it available for the public hearings. Ken said this document could be emailed as well.

Content and Distribution of the Public Hearing "Mailer"

Mary Beth said DOE developed a mailer which is 8.5"x11" and includes information about the proposed action and the dates of the hearings. She said the second mailing will include the additional four meeting dates. DOE talked about adding a description of the results, but that is essentially what the summary does. Steve asked if there is contact information. Mary Beth said there is standard contact information included. Mary Beth said the second mailer will probably be sent out around the 25th of January.

Steve asked about an evaluation form for the meetings. Mary Beth said there will be a comment form and an evaluation form at the table at the hearings.

Gerry said he thinks PIC should talk about getting something more substantial for the mailer. Ken said he drafted a summary of the EIS to use as a public tool and thought some of the wording could be used in DOE's mailer. Ken thought that in the past the announcements have not shown enough of the importance of the topics.

Ken suggested that DOE send out the draft second mailer for suggestions from the committee. Gerry said he has concerns about a notice that says "Tank Closure EIS," instead of "come to the public meetings to discuss whether the tanks will be removed." Mary thought the conversation on the mailer should be deferred until it is available for review. Gerry suggested that a conference call be scheduled so PIC can provide comments to DOE on the mailer. Mary Beth said she will send the mailer to Susan Hayman to distribute to the PIC.

DOE and HAB Coordination throughout/following public comment period

Liz said future coordination is on the agenda because the PIC has felt there has been lack of coordination to date and would like to discuss how DOE and PIC can stay engaged throughout the remainder of the EIS process.

Ken said there are PIC meetings coming up; however by the time of the February meeting, there will have been two public meetings on the EIS. Gerry thought that after the first meeting it would be good to discuss how the presentations at the hearings were going. Mary Beth said DOE is not planning to change the presentations from one meeting

to the next, because DOE needs to provide consistent information. Liz said there may be different ways to present the information based on PIC input and suggestions. Gerry did not think there was a legal reason why the presentations could not be changed. He said he understands the desire to have uniformity, however if the presentations are too long, things could be shortened for example. Betty thought if there is strong concern on something there should be flexibility.

Mary Beth said the purpose is for DOE to hear perspectives on the EIS, and people at each meeting should be able to hear the same thing as everyone else. Betty said that certain topics may be of more interest than others in certain areas. Gerry said people in Boise need to know information on certain topics for their area, such as the sodium shipments going through their town, and topics such as this might not be relevant in Eugene. Mary Beth reiterated that she felt it is good to keep the presentations consistent.

Liz thought it was important to talk about the presentations and felt she was hearing resistance from DOE on input. She said this is a learning process on how to improve the public input process for the EIS. Erik Olds said small changes to the way things are presented will be made automatically after the first presentation.

Mary Beth confirmed that information about sodium will be shared with Idaho, and expects there will be differences in the open house and the question and answer period for each area to allow people to ask more detailed questions about their topics of interest. Gerry felt that this approach puts the burden on people to go to the meeting and the open house, and look at documents including the EIS summary. He thought a description is needed of how issues impact a citizen in Boise which takes special effort and is worth including in the presentation. Betty said if DOE sees value in being more responsive to public concerns there are easy ways to include information ahead of time, such as the comments from the internet as Gerry mentioned. She said then the agency would be prepared and could be more responsive. Mary Beth said she will make adjustments from one meeting to the next; if she gets a question that is difficult to answer or demonstrates confusion about the information, she will work to clarify this up front at the next meeting presentation.

Susan Leckband said there are meetings coming up where the HAB can use information gathered and lessons learned. She said there is value in assessing how the public is reacting to these meetings. Steve said he does not know why there is not a debriefing after each hearing.

Liz said her hope is that the agencies see the PIC committee as a resource for public engagement, and that she hopes the agencies are as interested in getting input from the PIC as they are to give input. She said the PIC's interest is in the service of helping people become better informed.

Follow up Items

Mary Beth said DOE has added three new locations for meetings and she expects that some people will have never heard of Hanford at these locations. Gerry said this is why workshops are needed prior to the meetings. He said in terms of strategic public involvement planning, the EIS is a great opportunity to inform people about the high level waste in the tanks for example. He said the public should be given as much background possible before the public hearing. Gerry also suggested holding a briefing after the hearings to see what can be learned from the EIS process. Steve said it is powerful to look at how this document can shape other things that go on in the future.

Mary Beth said DOE has heard mixed things on getting an alternative perspective at the hearings. She said DOE is not sure if people want representatives of local groups there to comment, but DOE would like to keep this portion to five minutes. She said it needs to be decided who the representatives will be and whether they should be different in each location. Betty said getting a representative for the alternative perspective would be difficult, and having a local representative should not be a limiting factor. However she did think it is important to have a neutral party for presenting balance. Mary Beth said that many people can sign up for public comment and DOE would like to leave time and respect that.

Ken offered to provide the alternative perspective at each of the Oregon meetings, but didn't want to "hog" four of the meetings. Gerry thought Oregon DOE would be welcome to present this at the Oregon locations, and said stakeholders have a process for agreeing among themselves on who provides the alternative viewpoint at the different locations.

Betty asked about an alternative perspective at the Boise hearing. Gerry said he is working with the Snake River Alliance to see if they would like to be at the Boise hearing. Mary Beth said DOE in Idaho will talk to their public involvement people who might have contact with stakeholders who could provide an alternative perspective.

Committee Business

The following reminders were shared by committee members:

- Step 2 of this public involvement planning exercise will be held at the February meeting.
- State of the Site meetings: There are currently no plans for State of the Site meetings in the spring of 2010. Liz commented that Hanford Challenge will track State of the Site meeting development. Review details of the TPA public involvement survey results and findings.
- Review PIC and Board priorities. PIC can be the "sounding board" for the HAB on public involvement topics.

Due to a shortage of time, the committee decided to use the scheduled committee call to update the 6-month work plan and to detail the February meeting topics.

Action Items / Commitments

1. Let Mary Beth Burandt know by Tuesday if org wants a table at the public hearings
2. Give DOE feedback on their use of graphics in EIS --- other presentation in that doc at meetings
3. DOE to take website proposal (interactive dialogue) under consideration. Will get back to PIC.
4. Share links to info – fact sheets and Steve will put document together. Make available at hearings / share
5. Mary Beth to send to Susan H – mailer – distribute to PIC and invite comment to MB

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tgilley@enviroissues.com

- Hanford Challenge: Tentative plans regarding the TV&WM EIS, Liz Mattson, January 14, 2010.
- Oregon DOE: Tentative plans regarding the TV&WM EIS, Ken Niles, January 14, 2010.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Laura Hanses	Gerry Pollet	
Steve Hudson	Betty Tabbutt (phone)	
Susan Leckband		
Liz Mattson		
Ken Niles		

Others

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Annette Carlson, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Lori Huffman, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Barb Wise, MSA
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL		Blair Scott, EnviroIssues

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Case Studies

- Context (what, where, when)
- Critical elements for success
- Why did these elements contribute to the success?

Page 1

Case Studies – Critical Elements

1. Clear goals and outcomes at outset → agreed by members of committee
2. Consistent, regular, predictable public notification
3. Meetings held used consistent materials (tone, content), and evaluations of meeting

Page 2

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

4. Coherent, responsible, trustworthy information (equal to agencies and others – equality in information)
5. Dependable sources of information
6. Surprising and unexpected, use of engaging people
7. Highly noticeable (large and readable)
8. Element of mystery → generated discussion
9. Interactive and fun

Page 3

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

10. Invitational element – invitation for involvement
11. Community-building → gathered people
12. Innovation → techniques that meet people where they are: accessible
13. Made a commitment to the public and stuck to it.
14. Technology that enabled reaching a lot / broad number of people (including people not usually involved)
15. Innovation in tech to reach a new generation of stakeholders

Page 4

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

16. Go to core principles – find ways to focus on other than positions
17. Allow organizations the opportunity to select their own representations in “Advisory Board” processes
18. No pre-determined solution
19. Different perspectives expressed
20. Relevant information on issues sent out in advance
21. Adequate time to interact
22. Process that allows interactive part

Page 5

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

23. Challenge the public – their participation, look for information, e informed, accept responsibility
24. Be personable, talk direction for relation-building
25. “Outrageous” and innovative (work up front)
26. Personal, one-on-one dialogue (with work up front)
27. Involving people in identifying what information they need, what they want to get out of a process (include your audience as part of the planning for process)

Page 6

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

28. Reached out to users of a given resource – didn’t exclude any given stakeholder group – equal work
29. Decision maker buy-in about the process and how the public input will influence decision (commitment to allow public to influence)
30. Authentic process (not a check the box)
31. Independent facilitation (difference between moderation and facilitation). “Up front work”
32. Follow-through on outcomes
33. Maintain commitment to processes underway in spite of ‘regime’ / manager changes
34. Making technical information accessible to understand

Page 7

Case Studies – Critical Elements (Cont'd)

35. Collaborative design
36. Use of plain language
37. Take information that intellectually influence how people can use the information

Page 8

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Public Involvement is **important** because...

- It leads to improved, sustainable decisions.
- It results in decisions supported by the public (financially; reflect public values).
- The public should have a say on decisions that have a long-term direct effect on people – economically and environmentally.
- It supports citizen involvement in democracy.
- It provides a forum to exchange a balance or perspectives and learn from one another.

*Individual Sticky Notes (Public involvement is **important** because):*

- ✓ *We learn when we listen.*
- ✓ *Citizens need to have active input and control into their government, into all that affects their lives.*
- ✓ *As Americans, we all have a right and responsibility to voice our opinions.*
- ✓ *We need to know what's going on – whether we choose to act or not.*
- ✓ *Provides communities with reliable, consistent information.*
- ✓ *Gives an individual the opportunity to effectively participate in this culture.*
- ✓ *Closed decision-making undermines democracy.*
- ✓ *To recognize and understand all perspectives.*
- ✓ *Public owns decision (public policy decision).*
- ✓ *Decisions have a direct effect on people – economically and environmentally.*
- ✓ *Decisions can have long-term consequences.*
- ✓ *Decisions (at Hanford) will have lasting impacts that affect the environment, future use of the land, and possibly people's health.*
- ✓ *Decisions that include the public's input will likely be better and most lasting decisions.*
- ✓ *Decisions need to be implemented.*
- ✓ *Having a stake in the decision-making process increases success and support of the decision.*
- ✓ *We make decisions when we get input.*
- ✓ *To achieve the best decision and results.*
- ✓ *Good, sustainable decisions are made when quality public involvement is done.*
- ✓ *Helps decision-makers to arrive at solutions to problems.*
- ✓ *Government decisions are supposed to serve public values.*

Page 9

Public Involvement is **challenging** because...

- Most public is reluctant to engage because it takes a commitment (apathy...busy?). The Public doesn't understand the impact of decisions or feels unable to affect change.
- Takes a considerable amount of time to do well (including building public understanding).
- Sometimes decisions have to be made quickly.

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

- We're not all on the same page (which is not always a bad thing). D.A.D. (decide, announce, defend).
- Issues are complex, multi-layered and resistant to easy solutions.
- Not all issues are equal.

Individual Sticky Notes (Public involvement is *challenging* because):

- ✓ *Timelines – enough time to do a good job.*
- ✓ *Takes a considerable amount of time to do well.*
- ✓ *It takes a lot of prework.*
- ✓ *Sometimes you need to act quickly and there is a lack of time to prepare.*
- ✓ *Lack of unanimity of goals.*
- ✓ *Most public reluctant to engage.*
- ✓ *Life gets in the way!*
- ✓ *The public is already busy -- hard to have them engage in difficult topics.*
- ✓ *Public is very busy.*
- ✓ *Public sometimes feels intimidated by technical info.*
- ✓ *Public doesn't understand impacts of decisions.*
- ✓ *Requires building public understanding long in advance of a particular decision.*
- ✓ *Different knowledge levels of the public.*
- ✓ *Issues are incredibly complex (at Hanford).*
- ✓ *There are too many decisions/public involvement efforts done simultaneously.*
- ✓ *The issues are complex, multi-layered and resistant to easy solutions.*
- ✓ *The audiences are diverse.*
- ✓ *The costs are prohibitive.*
- ✓ *Agencies typically have chosen preferred outcomes before starting public involvement processes.*
- ✓ *Often because the government is not sold on it...wants to work in a vacuum...path of least resistance.*
- ✓ *People can get tired of showing up and engaging if their involvement does not lead to visible change.*
- ✓ *Audience priorities change – loss of interest in an issue.*
- ✓ *Public feels impotent to actually making a change.*
- ✓ *Different outrage levels of the public.*
- ✓ *To meet the needs of different audiences – providing equal opportunities.*
- ✓ *Special interests who work with/have access to agencies shape choices and agency preferences (or even write the decision).*
- ✓ *When public participation leaders co-op the process for ego and personal gains of one or two of many organizations.*

Page 10

Some principles for public involvement are.....

- Early commitment to provide clear, honest communication.
- Opportunities for involvement as early as possible (e.g. before alternatives are identified).

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

- Opportunity to influence the decision.
- Decision-makers need to be involved in good, long term strategic planning with early involvement of stakeholder (public outreach and education).
- Those affected need the opportunity to provide input into planning how public involvement will take place.
- PI plan needs to reflect input of affected stakeholders.
- Feedback throughout the process.
- Open communication (equal voices, range of views, perspectives)

Individual Sticky Notes (Some principles for public involvement are.....):

- ✓ *Clearly define upfront the process, goals and how input will be used.*
- ✓ *Public must have a real opportunity to influence the decision.*
- ✓ *Honesty.*
- ✓ *Provide facts.*
- ✓ *Truth and clarity in advertising.*
- ✓ *Public involvement has to be incorporated from the start of a project.*
- ✓ *Good, long-term strategic planning with early involvement of stakeholders.*
- ✓ *Decision-makers need to own public involvement (and not just leave it to PI staff).*
- ✓ *Be clear about the purpose of an activity/event. Is it to inform? Is there a change to shape a decision?*
- ✓ *All affected (or those who perceive themselves to be) need to have a role creating the public involvement process.*
- ✓ *Decision-makers and management must be evaluated on and participate in public involvement.*
- ✓ *Engaging the public early in developing the PI event/program/agenda.*
- ✓ *Truly involving those in the public that choose to be involved (same people or new people).*
- ✓ *Success depends on up front/advance sharing and distribution of views of the problem and potential solutions BEFORE people arrive at a meeting.*
- ✓ *Unbiased distribution of notice describing how a decision may affect the public's values and concerns.*
- ✓ *Public must feel "ownership" of the public involvement process throughout.*
- ✓ *Demonstrate to the public how their involvement has had an impact.*
- ✓ *Provide public feedback throughout the process.*
- ✓ *Feedback on how input was/was not used/considered in the decision.*
- ✓ *Real feedback by agencies.*
- ✓ *Do not start with a government "position" on what is the best proposal.*
- ✓ *Flexibility.*
- ✓ *Must sustain education to build an informed public to have informed input.*
- ✓ *Go to the public (don't expect them to come to you).*
- ✓ *Listening and taking time to check that you understand what someone is saying.*
- ✓ *Open communication in a non-threatening atmosphere.*
- ✓ *Differences of opinion are o.k.*
- ✓ *Public must see results reflecting input, values, and proposed solutions.*

- ✓ *Giving equal voice to all participants.*

Page 11

Successful Public Involvement Looks Like

- Well-informed stakeholders
- Commitment to stakeholders from decision makers
- Early engagement
- Clearly defined process
- Clearly defined expectations
- Response / feedback loop to stakeholders
- Collaborative design / stakeholder involvement in the public involvement process

Page 12

Successful Public Involvement Looks Like (Cont'd)

- Results in decisions that are sustainable, supportable and reflect public values
- Fun! Enjoyable!
- Decision-makers opened to letting public input influence decision
- Respectful
- More than a public meeting, fact sheet, etc.
- Interactive
- Inclusive – no barriers to people with different economic, social, physical needs.

Page 13

Successful Public Involvement Looks Like (Cont'd)

- Department of Energy (DOE) – at hearings
- Written evaluation form

Page 14

Purpose for Public Hearings

1. What does the public think of the DEIS?
2. Is there something the DOE missed?
3. Give people an idea of where to focus on those things the DOE has yet to make a decision on
4. DOE may modify things based on public input

Page 15

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Tentative Format for Public Hearings

Open house (1 hour ahead)

Separate room – space to talk to people, provide information (include PowerPoint presentation)

*DOE presentation

**Ecology presentation

Take Public comments

(Idea: maybe focus comments by specific sections of document)

--

*Process...how long it's taken

*Highlight issues

*Highlight changes based on previous processes

--

**Context for why at table as cooperation agency

Page 16

Prior to Hearings

HOANW

1. *Mail 4 page tabloid citizen guides to 5,000 people (plus 15,000 additional)
2. Sent Ecology draft fact sheet. Hope to get approval to send this to 500 people in Tri-Cities (to accommodate time frames)
3. Tech Review of EIS
4. Public workshop / presentations (Eugene – public law conference. Spokane, Portland, Walla Walla, Eastern Oregon?, Seattle, Hood River?)
5. Fact sheets on 6-8 focus areas
6. Email whole list / focused emails
7. Collaborate with other organizations list serves
 - a. *Focus on impacts and “missing” alternatives, missing, mitigation
8. Facebook / Twitter

Page 17

Prior to Meeting / Hearing

Hanford Challenge:

1. Technical review for HC
2. Prepare educational materials / online printed
3. Movie night / info sharing
4. Online notification of dates / location
5. (?) Public workshop for general Hanford education, then tie in with the TCWM EIS
6. (?) Technical expert talk to “living room party”

--

ODOE

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

1. Tech Review for ODOE
2. Submit written comments and preliminary comments

Page 18

Prior to Hearing

Ecology

1. 2 focus sheets (hard copy and website)
 - a. Why it matters
 - b. What we think

--

Proposal:

DOE website → interactive dialogue log

6-8 topic areas (summary of issues from variety of sources)

-- See what others are saying

Page 19

Prior to Hearing (Cont'd)

ODOE

3. Expand mailing list / update
4. Distribute informational materials
5. January 25 – Portland “Living Room” (may do more than one)
6. Contact editorial boards (Eugene, Eastern Oregon)

--

DOE

1. Postcards for first set of four meetings (opens to full size) and second notification, including additional three meetings
2. Federal Reg. notice / first and second
 - a. Listserv
3. Materials on website
4. Press release to specific areas
5. Facebook / Twitter

Page 20

During Hearings

DOE

1. Fact sheets at hearings
2. Posters / display boards (may vary by site)
3. Presenting

--

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

HOANW

1. Presence at all hearings except Boise
2. PowerPoint prior to hearing (collaborating on input)
3. Posters of charts from EIS

--

Ecology

1. 6-8 factsheets
2. Open house
3. All hearings

Page 21

During Hearings

Hanford challenge:

1. Attend hearings and provide oral comments (Richland, Hood River, Portland, Seattle)
2. Table at hearing (open house) (information) and materials

ODOE

1. Attend hearings (Eugene, HR, Portland, Eastern Oregon)
2. Attend open house
3. Provide oral comments
4. Have written materials at table

Page 22

HAB Actions

1. When HAB tech review summary is available, post on web
2. Make HAB advice available for Seattle meeting

Page 23

Mailer – DOE

1. 8 ½ x 11
2. Proposed actions
3. Dates (will change for 2nd mailing) – January 23rd
4. General format (open house, present, comment)
5. On back, took decisions to be made / not made through the EIS
6. Contact information
7. Need for special accommodations

Page 24

Attachment 1: January 14, 2010 Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Tentative Additional EIS Public Hearings

Feb 22 – La Grande
Feb 23 -- Spokane
March 1 – Eugene
March 8 -- Seattle

Page 25

How May Agencies / HAB Stay Engaged Through Process

1. Input (email) on mailer
2. Update on meetings at February 3 PIC meeting
3. Use information from these meetings to inform future “big ticket” public meetings
4. Debrief at end of hearings (April?)
 - a. Opps to use info for other means
5. Share info / updates at meeting

Page 26

Follow-Up

1. What is unique about public involvement at Hanford (part 2)
2. Metrics (part 2)
3. TCWMEIS – what is ability to change analysis alts, etc. based on public input
4. Decision-makers – who are they for this document? (EM-1, GC-1)
5. What is the timeline for EIS decision? Stay tuned!
6. Separate meetings – decisions on dates
7. Alt viewpoint

Page 27

Action Items

6. Let MB know by Tuesday if org wants a table at the public hearings
7. Give DOE feedback on their use of graphics in EIS --- other presentation in that doc at meetings
8. DOE to take website proposal (interactive dialogue) under consideration. Will get back to PIC.
9. Share links to info – fact sheets and Steve will put document together. Make available at hearings / share
10. Mary Beth to send to Susan H – mailer – distribute to PIC and invite comment to MB

Page 28
