

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
February 3, 2010
Kennewick, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening, welcome and introductions 1
Public hearings debrief – Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement 2
Overview of near-term public involvement opportunities..... 3
Strategic Planning Process – Part 2 8
Committee Business 16
Handouts..... 17
Attendees 17

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.

Opening, welcome and introductions

Steve Hudson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made.

Ken Niles submitted changes to the January meeting summary that were incorporated. The committee adopted the January meeting summary. Steve encouraged the committee to read the summary and noted that all flipchart notes were included.

Steve reminded the committee to send him comments on Hanford activities in which they participated. This will help the committee evaluate public involvement at Hanford and ways they can become more active. Steve was particularly interested in identifying liaisons on other committees to bring issues forward with public involvement components. He said the other committees are aware of the need but no volunteers have stepped forward. He did not think the obligation was great; the liaison simply needs to provide a “heads-up” to Steve about an issue or idea.

Shelley commented that it seems it would be the responsibility of committee leadership to perform that liaison role. She thought PIC should provide guidelines. Steve thought he could suggest to the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) that the vice-chair serve as the liaison.

Steve reviewed the meeting agenda and noted that the Board meeting tomorrow includes a public involvement agenda item (sounding board) led by Liz Mattson. He noted the committee is still interested in organizing evening seminars on important and interesting cleanup issues.

Public hearings debrief – Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement

The committee shared and discussed impressions of the two public hearings on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) recently held in Boise and Richland. The committee also discussed what worked well at the hearings and what did not work as well. A handful of committee members attend the Richland meeting, but it was unknown if any attended the Boise meeting.

Madeleine Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said at the meeting in Richland, half the comments focused on “get on with cleanup” and the other half centered on restarting the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF). She thought that was because the meeting was held in Richland where many people are passionate about the fate of FFTF. Liz Mattson estimated there were over a hundred people in attendance.

Laura Hanses did not think the hearing was well publicized. Madeleine thought there was always room for improving advertising; she did not notice many general public-type people at the meeting. Laura thought there were many agency representatives and Hanford workforce; Sharon Braswell, MSA, noticed many stakeholders from the Tri-Cities.

Ken thought the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and Ecology’s presentations ran longer than intended. Laura thought the DOE-Office of River Protection’s (DOE-ORP) presentation was nice and succinct. Madeleine thought the entire meeting took longer than they thought it would.

Liz said the meeting was done by 9:00 p.m. and only 13 oral comments were provided. She said three were from Hanford Challenge, one was from Gerry Pollet, and one was from Columbia Riverkeeper. She said the other comments focused on FFTF. Liz thought the projected agenda was too hard to see. She was impressed with the turnout, which included injured workers. She thought Ecology’s presentation was a good summary of what Ecology feels is important in the TC&WM EIS; she thought Ecology used Board and PIC feedback to make their presentation clean and concise.

Liz said she was surprised by how many people attended the meeting, but how few provided comments. She did not think any HAB members beyond Tom and Gerry and herself provided public comment and felt the agencies cut off the question and answer agenda item too early; there were not many people signed up for public comment so more time could have been allotted to questions and answers. She did not feel the bulk of the discussion focused enough on the TC&WM EIS.

Gerry Pollet noted that the facilitator, Jim Parhan, asked twice if anyone else had questions and no one responded. He thought they had the opportunity to ask more questions. Gerry liked the facilitator; he thought Jim was respectful and made an effort to talk to people before the meeting to better understand the various perspectives.

Shelley thought meetings in the Tri-Cities typically focus on worker health and safety.

Laura thought the visuals were good, but it became difficult to understand the difference between alternatives. Shelley said if people found that difficult, it was not surprising there was little public comment.

Sharon said she was pleasantly surprised by the turnout, but not surprised by the issues discussed. She said FFTF closure is evaluated in the TC&WM EIS, so she was not surprised to hear comments about that. Sharon said Eric Olds, DOE-ORP, attended the hearing in Boise, and said that five people attended. The discussion focused on waste importation.

Gerry thought half the presentations were unnecessary. He said parts of the presentations were very good, but lost the “big picture” perspective. Gerry said Ecology should have gotten to the substance of their concerns more quickly, rather than providing so much information about cooperation history and consultation process. He said the impacts from each of the TC&WM EIS alternatives were not adequately addressed.

Madeleine said it was important to explain the process and how Ecology was involved. She said they did not want to hit too hard on their agency review of the document, partly because it was incomplete. Madeleine said Ecology’s views are clearly identified in the foreword to the TC&WM EIS and on the presentation slides. Gerry said that Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, verbally said the State of Washington believes that all waste should be vitrified and listed other things the state would like to see, but it wasn’t identified as clearly or emphatically in the print materials or presentation as Gerry thought it should be. Gerry said Ecology is good about stating their positions and opinions, but they should be clearer in print.

Gerry said the agencies have produced excellent graphics, and they should use them. He said he and Ken Niles presented to a group in Portland and people could see right away how waste is projected to spread to the river.

Ken said there are six more public meetings. He anticipated a good turnout in Portland, and said efforts have been made to involve people from Eugene and LaGrande. He thought they would see new faces at the Portland meeting.

Gerry passed around two maps showing the spread of contamination that he used in presentations; they are currently found in the Heart of America citizen’s guide and fact sheet, and on their website.

Overview of near-term public involvement opportunities

Steve briefly reviewed a list of upcoming public involvement opportunities:

- 2012 budget process
- Outer Area and Central Plateau (M-15, M-16) and TRU and mixed low-level waste (M-91) draft TPA change packages
- Community relations plan (CRP) public meetings
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site-wide permit public workshops
- PW-1,3 and 6 public workshops
- Draft hearings on the mercury storage EIS
- Remainder TC&WM EIS public hearings

Steve said PIC needs to increase its membership to address these big issues. Ken said the committee should discuss the capacity of the public and their ability to be engaged in so many issues. Betty Tabbutt thought they should consider a “cafeteria-style” public hearing where people could break into small groups to discuss particular issues that interest them most. Betty thought this way the agencies could get feedback on a number of issues without asking the public

to attend countless meetings. Steve suggested having public meetings in conjunction with Board meetings.

Norma Jean Germond thought these issues should be discussed at TPA Quarterly meetings. Paula said there will be one in April.

Madeleine did not have any new information about the RCRA site-wide permit schedule.

Outer Area conference call and notice of upcoming public comment period handout

Paula Call discussed the recent conference call with DOE and EIC. She did not participate in the call, but said it was scheduled for the EIC to receive an update from DOE on the Central Plateau negotiations. She apologized for the unclear messages on the call. She said the purpose was to convey the good news that the agencies had come to agreement on the concept of the Outer Area, and were going to sign changes to the TPA to implement the Outer Area and move forward with cleanup activities. The nature of this change does not call for public involvement. Paula said because the message was muddled, and the agencies did not want to give the impression that decisions are being made without involving the public, the agencies decided not to sign the TPA change to implement the Outer Area and instead to include that as a voluntary public involvement piece along with the larger change packages under negotiation.

Paula showed the committee a handout intended to be the 30-day notice (on proposed TPA changes to central plateau waste sites and transuranic waste) prior to start of a public comment period. Paula asked for feedback from PIC on the notice, which the agencies wanted to send the next day, and on level of interest in the agencies holding public meetings. The notice provided information about proposed changes to a number of Central Plateau TPA milestones, including:

- Implementing a geographic cleanup approach that addresses the cleanup of Central Plateau waste sites, facilities, pipelines and groundwater
- Adding a new focus on addressing deep vadose zone contamination
- Adding new milestones to clean up and demolish the canyon facilities
- Aligning schedules to ensure regulatory decision documents are in place to position the Central Plateau for post-2015 funding
- Adding enforceable milestones for retrieval, certification and shipment of transuranic waste off-site during 2010 and 2011, supported by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding
- Setting target milestones for retrieval and certification of transuranic waste for 2012-2014
- Streamlining the M-91 milestones series by creating stand-alone milestones previously embedded in milestone text, removing redundancies and improving readability

Ken asked if “implementing a geographic cleanup” applied to the Inner or Outer Area, or both. Sonya Johnson, CHPRC, said both, and also applies to processing facilities.

Gerry asked why EIC was only consulted on this and not the greater public or other organizations. Paula said DOE has been talking with the HAB and other stakeholders for months on this topic and the call was a follow-up to those prior discussions.

Gerry said there was a big disconnect; he said it was unacceptable for agency decision-makers to ask the EIC to “bless” the change package without public dialogue.

Paula apologized for the confusion about the conference call and its purpose. She said they did not think it would be so controversial. Once they understand that is was, they decided not to sign

the Outer Area change package at this time. She noted that TPA changes are regular and often minor enough to not warrant public involvement. Gerry said DOE is supposed to consult the Board if it thinks public involvement is needed. Paula commented that the TPA agencies are responsible for identifying public involvement needs, and often asks for the Board's input.

Paula said there was never an intent to ask EIC to "bless" the signing of the Outer Area change package; she said they wanted to share good news that cleanup was moving forward and she apologized for the miscommunication. She said she heard that it raised a concern about trust and questions about what other TPA changes the agencies have signed without public involvement. Paula noted that the change the agencies wanted to make did not require public involvement and the call was a gesture to people (EIC) they knew were interested.

Gerry said it was a Type 1 TPA modification and required public involvement. Paula was unsure that it was a Type 1 modification, but said it did not require public involvement. Paula said regardless of what type of modification it was, she wants to hear from PIC and the Board what kind of level of outreach it should conduct for these change packages.

Gerry said he cared more about the agencies changing the TPA and not involving the Board more so than the notice handout. He felt the notice was minor compared to the big picture. He said he felt that if he were not on the call, DOE would report that they were signing the Outer Area change package. Gerry noted that Paula was just the messenger, and said he wanted a scheduled discussion with key decision-makers about when public involvement is required by the TPA and how and when comments are incorporated. He said the agencies "missed the boat" if they thought signing the change package could occur without public comment.

The committee agreed it would like to have a discussion about how modifications are determined to be Level 1 and when changes require public involvement. It would like this discussion to take place at the PIC level.

Paula said DOE wants to send out the 30-day notice tomorrow. A fact sheet with more information is being developed.

Betty thought it would be clearer to say "the proposed change would create the Outer Area." The committee agreed the public should clearly see that statement. Gerry thought the notice was hard to understand.

Gerry said people will base the need to request a public meeting on this notice, and the notice does not provide enough or the right information. He encouraged DOE to use a map to show the Central Plateau and Outer Area. He said the agencies should describe how they did or did not incorporate comments received during past public comment periods.

Ken thought DOE should better describe the history of how they got here with the proposed change packages. Ken participated in a separate conference call on Monday with DOE, the State of Oregon and tribes, and did not know DOE proposed to sign the change package. He said the notice would have been good to have before the call, or something similar so they could understand the ramifications of the change packages. Ken said it was necessary for the public to see the draft change packages. Gerry agreed, and said in order to provide guidance on what kind of public involvement is necessary, they need to know what is in the draft change packages. He said he could not tell from the notice if milestones were being slowed or sped up.

Susan Leckband said if the change packages are under negotiation, then the change request has already been written. Paula said that change packages have been drafted and are under negotiations-until the negotiations conclude, the exact language in the proposed changes is not available. Once the agencies have reach agreement on proposed changes, they will be made available.

Ken thought the agencies hope to reach tentative agreement by February 28, 2010.

Barb said their assumption was that PIC and the Board like it when the agencies send out “heads-up” notices about upcoming comment periods. Is this correct? Ken said yes, they appreciate heads-up notices. Gerry agreed and added that they cannot decide what kind of public involvement is necessary based solely on a heads-up notice. Paula said the notice is not intended to be a full description of the proposed actions; she considered it the very beginning of the conversation.

Steve and Ken said the notice is fine to serve as a heads-up. Gerry thought it needed to include more definitions, such as for the Central Plateau.

Betty thought it would be helpful to highlight changes that will require a public hearing.

Barb asked if Gerry was comfortable with the language in the notice about requesting a public hearing. He said it should say because of the major changes, the agencies anticipate holding one or more public meetings. Gerry said the agencies should not have a deadline for when people can request a meeting. Paula said the deadline of February 18 was a workback date for finalizing and printing the fact sheet.

Paula noted the tension between how PIC wants to involve the public and what is required by law. There is a balance to be found between taking time to go above and beyond requirements for public involvement and in making decisions and getting on with the work. Gerry said that is why they want to meet with decision-makers and why they need a buffer or “float” period between when the draft agreed-upon package is presented and when the public comment period starts. He commented that they might not be in this position if the agency managers shared drafts of the change package with the Board.

The committee agreed that it would like a “buffer” period between when the agencies present the agreed-upon change package and when the public comment period starts. This buffer period would give time for PIC and the Board to work with the agencies to determine what level of public involvement is appropriate.

Susan Leckband suggested creating an identifier or some way to create continuity for each issue. There are many pre-notices, 45-day notices, meeting notices and more, and the public has a hard time tracking the progress of a particular issue.

The committee felt the need to see upcoming public involvement activities that are “on the horizon.” Madeleine will check on the status of planning tools, like the “what’s out there plan” and the Hanford Events Calendar.

FY 2012 budget outreach

Paula reviewed some other public involvement opportunities on the horizon. Guidance comes out in mid-February or early March on the FY 2012 Hanford budget request. There will be a public meeting, which may overlap on the comment period for the M-91 and M-16 change packages.

Betty asked if the change packages have budget implications. Paula said no, not on this FY 2012 request.

Susan Hayman asked for clarification on the change package names, the “M15 and/or M-91?” Paula said the change packages involve M-91 and M-15 milestone series and additional related scope.

Ken said while the required single budget meeting should be held, he did not think additional meetings were required for the FY 2012 budget since the president’s budget request was not very different from DOE’s. He was curious about FY 2013, since that is when ARRA funds run out. Gerry added that there is a tentatively planned DOE public workshop on FY 2012 for March 23. He agreed with Ken; if there are no surprises, additional budget meetings for the FY 2012 budget are not necessary.

Shelley noted that on an Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM-SSAB) call, she heard that Hanford is positioning itself to receive other sites’ ARRA money if those sites do not use it. Hanford is advertising itself as shovel-ready. Gerry added that other agencies and sites are doing the same thing, so it will be competitive.

Susan Leckband said the EM-SSAB also heard that the end of FY 2011 for ARRA funding is not hard and fast; if Hanford can demonstrate it can complete major works successfully, and show the dollars committed to real work, they will be able to continue with increased funding in FY 2012 and possibly into the future.

The committee agreed that with the information at hand now, and unless there are surprises with the FY 2012 budget, it does not advocate a series of regional public meetings. The focus and energy can remain on other big issues.

Paula noted other activities at Hanford:

- DOE issued a 30-day notice to do an environmental assessment (EA) for demolishing non-contaminated buildings in the 100, 200 and 300 areas. DOE and the regulatory agencies made the decision it would be more appropriate to do under CERCLA, so the document is now an engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA) with a comment period to begin in mid to late February. There will be a 30-day notice.
- DOE is preparing a RCRA closure plan to close the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill (NRDWL). The project also requires NEPA documentation that will be done under an interim EA. Paula said DOE will present information at the next River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting. There will be a 30-day notice to announce the upcoming public comment period on the EA. Following the NEPA process, the RCRA closure plan will include a separate public involvement process.
 - Ken said they provided comments on the draft closure plan. The document did not include an inventory of what was in the landfill, but the draft TC&WM EIS has an inventory. Ken said it would be good to include an inventory in the closure plan. Paula said she would pass that along.

- The Central Plateau Cleanup Completion Strategy will be revised to reflect input received over the past several months from Tribal Nations, Oregon and the HAB. There was no formal comment period, because it is only an approach for cleanup, not a TPA or regulatory decision document. There will likely be one or more revisions to the document, possibly one in the March timeframe, and then a second revision later in the summer as change packages are finalized.
- The Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework will also be revised to reflect input from the comments received during the public comment period and to incorporate updates on the Central Plateau cleanup approach.
 - Barb added that DOE received comments from 33 individuals on the framework. They are preparing a response document now. Barb noted they received a number of comments on the need for public education and involvement with the younger generation.

Liz said the committee and agencies frequently throw around the term “public.” She commented it would be useful to be more specific and define the kind of public they are discussing, especially for the more technical topics. Most people new to Hanford will not be interested in the technical meetings.

Norma Jean added that they should better define the purpose of public outreach – is it to inform or involve? The agencies should remember to focus on the big picture when reaching out to new audiences.

Strategic Planning Process – Part 2

Liz described the current strategic planning for public involvement effort the committee is undertaking. These generative sessions are meant to build the foundation of a strategic plan that can be fleshed out the by agencies into a full strategic plan. Each session builds on the next.

The committee tackled Part 1 in January, where it developed a draft working definition of successful public involvement, and identified challenges and principles of public involvement. The committee also generated reasons public involvement is important and critical elements of successful public involvement.

Today, the committee entered into Part 2 in the strategic planning process. It focused on what is unique about public involvement at Hanford and Hanford public involvement goals.

Liz said PIC’s end product will be a public involvement flowchart and guiding document for the agencies to use.

Draft definition of public involvement

The draft definition included recent edits from Steve. Sam Dechter thought it was important to say that public involvement should make Hanford accessible for people with all levels of knowledge.

Susan Leckband commented that there is a spectrum for public involvement; some efforts are to simply inform while others are to heavily involve the public.

Betty commented that sometimes the educational aspect dominates when it does not need to. She advised not sacrificing involvement for information, and said the agencies should solicit values and input from all levels of knowledge.

Norma Jean said education is essential; there has to be a basic level of knowledge to solicit any type of comment.

Betty commented that by including in the definition that public involvement should be “fun” seemed to trivialize it. Ginger Wireman, Ecology, thought the definition should include “engaging” the public.

Susan Hayman said the definition can be refined over time. It will be “finalized” when the committee develops its product. The full Board may weigh in on it as well if it takes the form of advice.

Susan Leckband reminded the Board of the PIC white paper on public involvement. She thought a white paper may be the end product of this exercise, or the exercise may result in an update of the existing public involvement white paper. Steve noted that the existing white paper does not have an operational statement, which is what the committee is currently trying to achieve.

Issue managers will further revise the definition. It is a working definition.

What is unique about Hanford public involvement?

Brainstorming exercise

Large posters were posted on the walls of the committee room with the following prompts:

- Information generated about Hanford impacts public involvement because...
 - Ways to frame or present information so it is more accessible to the public could be...
- The timeframe for cleanup and long-term stewardship at Hanford impacts public involvement because...
 - Ways to keep the public involved in long-term and renewable ways could be...
- Hanford’s geographic reach impacts public involvement because...
 - Ways to frame the geographic impact for the public could be...

The committee read the prompts and wrote ideas/responses on the posters. Below are the responses that were provided on the posters. Statements in italics were prompts and not generated by committee members themselves during the brainstorm time.

Information generated about Hanford impacts public involvement because...

- *It is highly technical in nature*
- *It is abundant*
- *It takes a long time to get a grasp of basic information*
- *Full of acronyms*
- *One generally needs to be prepared (have background knowledge) before attending a presentation, public meeting or hearing, if they want to understand what is going on*
- It is unrelenting and there is so much of it
- It is public money being spent in great abundance
- Public needs access to same quality of information as the decision-makers
- Is often from one perspective (one-sided)

- For the most part, the risk is not “now”
- You have a diffuse audience

Ways to frame or present information so it is more accessible to the public could be...

- *Using simple language – avoiding technical phrasing and acronyms*
- *Checking for understanding during presentations*
- *Using graphics and images to explain difficult concepts*
- *Using metaphors to demonstrate volumes and dangerous doses*
- Keep trying new things/tools/methods
- Provide independent consultants (with funding) to analyze and translate information
- Storytelling
- Maybe not as complicated as we always make it

The timeframe for cleanup and long-term stewardship at Hanford impacts public involvement because...

- *The timeframe to complete cleanup is beyond any one generation’s lifespan*
- *The timeframe to remember Hanford is dangerous is beyond any one generation’s lifespan*
- *It is difficult for human beings to grasp timeframes beyond their experience or memory*
- *Human beings do not think in terms of thousands of years of impact*
- It wears out the public (from past 20 years and looking forward)
- It wears out those who wish to effectively engage the public
- Delayed gratification – long time between proposals to construction
- Progress is often difficult to measure because of the lengthy timeframe
- “Successful” public involvement is not always easy to define
- Changing cast of characters and “commitment-makers”
- People with firsthand knowledge are leaving/passing away
- Long-term financial viability/economy of communities

Ways to keep the public involved in long-term and renewable ways could be...

- *Setting up a HAB renewal committee (succession planning)*
- *Invite families, young adults and children to participate in fun and meaningful ways*
- Go to the publics
- Involve HAB seat constituencies more
- HAB family event
- Seek out site workers with memory of operations – gain their information
- Tie decisions to public concerns
- Use storytelling, make it personal
- Use TV/video to tape all public meetings and post on web/air on local cable
- NPR Story Corps
- Invite tribes to teach oral tradition then add on with reference/incorporation to stories/styles of the time; drama classes at high school, A.C.T., etc

Hanford’s geographic reach impacts public involvement because...

- *A large and spread out geographic area involves a lot of people, some of whom live very far away from the Hanford side, who have different interests, levels of knowledge*
- *When people can’t see a problem, it is hard for them to get involved*
- Post Hoc Propten Hoc issues
- Geographic impact is not explicitly visible

- The consequences of a Hanford concern may not appear/impact people a long way away
- Impacts are defined differently by different publics – how to balance the different impacts
- Hanford is part of a network of sites (competes for money)
- Economic impacts has large geographic reach/impact, including multinational corporations
- Presence of river extends reach
- Some don't care about this "desert"

Ways to frame the geographic impact for the public could be...

- *Using maps to show the far-reaching impact of Hanford (on site, Tri-Cities, downstream populations, Tribes, transportation corridors for waste moving to and from Hanford)*
- Focus on the river and the water

Discussion

The committee discussed each statement from the posters.

Information generated about Hanford impacts public involvement because...

Betty said public involvement is not valuable unless the public has access to the same quality of information as the decision-makers. She thought overly technical information is also problematic because it "freezes out" the public. Barb agreed, and said providing the right level and kind of information is very tricky.

Madeleine said they try to provide technical information to those who want to see it through the administrative record and information repositories.

Betty thought it would be useful to hire an independent consultant to "translate" Hanford information for the public. Barb said at one time, there was a high school student on the HAB who helped provide information to the younger generation by writing articles for the high school newspaper. Barb commented that they have all become "Hanford insiders." Norma Jean thought it was not as difficult as they sometimes make it.

Gerry said he shares information with University of Washington students and teaches some classes, but it is difficult to motivate people to come to the Tri-Cities to participate.

Gerry heard from a member of the public that they felt they needed to be specific in order for their comments to count, and felt speaking from the heart did not qualify. He thought it was a problem; people should be able to say "I care about the river, are you doing everything possible to protect it?"

Ken thought because the risk is not imminent, it is difficult to get people think about it, engage and see the importance now. The risk is in the future.

Steve said the audience is large and varied, educated and not educated. Ginger added people uneducated about Hanford can understand simple concepts, but most likely cannot understand complicated issues.

The timeframe for cleanup and long-term stewardship at Hanford impacts public involvement because...

Ken said there are different timeframes – public outreach has been strong for 20 years and people are tired; cleanup has been ongoing for 50 years. There is then the timeframe for impacts, which

is thousands of years. Betty added there is a timeframe for having firsthand knowledge and history – original Hanford workers are aging and the site is losing institutional knowledge.

Betty said Hanford cleanup has a huge impact on the local community; the timeframe, the life, of the Tri-Cities community is a consideration. Madeleine said the economy of the local community is a huge concern for many people.

Gerry said at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), for example, decades will go by between planning, contracting, construction and operations. There is no guarantee that an involved person will see the results of their involvement. Barb thought in general, people do not handle delayed gratification well.

Liz said they need to consider the plan for renewal – how do you plan to keep people at the table 20 years from now?

Gerry added that not only is there turnover in the public, but in agency management as well. Liz said commitments made by past managers may not be remembered by new ones. There should be continuity between “commitment-makers.”

Ginger suggested a Hanford family event, or HAB “family reunion,” to help with succession-planning. She also noted that oral tradition is an important way to transmit knowledge through generations. She thought Hanford could learn from tribal oral traditions. Ginger suggested that Hanford investigate how to participate in National Public Radio’s Story Core program.

Barb said advisory boards are one of many public involvement techniques – the HAB is not the sole mechanism by which to involve the public. Liz agreed and said HAB is the first layer of public involvement. The Board has a deep level of knowledge that needs to be passed on.

Gerry did not think the Board is doing as well as it should to involve the constituencies of the seats each member represents. He said the Board is a great way to involve people, and members should commit to the task. He also said two-way communication is essential to show people that public involvement counts for something, and that comments do not “go into the void.” Betty added that the agencies should show how public involvement affects decisions.

Hanford’s geographic reach impacts public involvement because...

Steve said an uncomfortable tension is created because of Hanford geography. People can be confused about cause and effect relationships; someone with cancer who lives downwind of Hanford did not necessarily get cancer because they lived downwind from Hanford.

Betty said there are equity issues with other DOE sites. Ken said whether they strive for equity or not, there is a network of DOE sites. Sam added that there is competition between sites as well.

Ginger said the Columbia River helps to create a broad reach for Hanford; Sam said wind and weather patterns contribute as well.

Ginger commented about the geographic division in Washington and how people in western Washington do not value eastern Washington and its natural habitat; she thought they often see eastern Washington as an “ugly desert.”

Norma Jean thought people in Portland tend to care about Hanford because the Columbia River is adjacent to the city.

Liz commented that geographic impact is not explicitly visible; economic impacts have geographic components.

Ken thought multinational corporations can influence work at Hanford.

What are the opportunities and regulatory requirements for DOE, EPA and Ecology?

The committee discussed what public involvement activities are required by law, and what compels or inspires the agencies to go beyond minimal requirements.

Ecology

Madeleine said regulatory requirements are found in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for dangerous waste. She said she uses the Community Relations Plan (CRP) to help remind decision-makers about the need for advance notice and how to incorporate public involvement into planning. She commented there is a creative tension, balancing all needs of the site and projects. Madeleine said HAB advice and white papers, samples from Ecology projects, and her experience as a stakeholder are some of the things that inspire her to go beyond the requirements.

Madeleine said for decisions under dangerous waste regulations, such as new facilities or significant changes to a permit, there is a minimum 45-day public comment period and a 30-day notice for a public hearing. She said a Class 1 TPA change is the most significant, under the WAC it is called Class 3. Madeleine noted that given the notification requirements, it is important to figure out a hearing schedule at the outset. Ginger added that they often schedule a hearing without waiting for a formal request from the public.

Madeleine said the regulations are strict about what has to be in the notice, and she thought some of that required language is not very valuable to the public. She said she was particularly frustrated that regulations do nothing to address Internet and email, much less online social networking tools. She said regulations are based on older methods of notification and outreach, such as postal service mail, meetings and signage. She said she uses technology as much as she can.

Madeleine noted that Ecology has to maintain a facility mailing and email list; the TPA list is Ecology's facility list for Hanford.

She said Ecology has to include a "statement of basis," or fact sheet, when it issues a permit. There is a firm regulatory definition for such a fact sheet to ensure it is an artifact of the decision-making process for setting permit conditions. She thought it was a somewhat different definition for a fact sheet than most other organizations would consider a fact sheet.

Ecology has a standard agency template for fact sheets and other materials. Ginger commented that she has a background in advertising and graphic design, and so it is sometimes frustrating to use a template that does not necessarily serve the public or the issue well. She said they sometimes try to avoid using the template when possible.

Betty asked about Washington State's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) public involvement regulations. Madeleine said Ecology is not directed to follow MTCA except for the US Ecology Site. The committee captured the question as an action item – who is monitoring MTCA

compliance? Gerry noted that MTCA was used as a model for effective communications regulations.

Liz asked Ginger what inspires her to go above and beyond requirements for public involvement. Ginger said she puts extra effort in to get people to pay attention to Hanford. She said the recent TC&WM EIS hearings were not well advertised. The print ad designs could not compete with the multitude of other ads in a newspaper that vie for people's attention. Ginger said the agencies need to become more graphically innovative without being inflammatory.

DOE

Erik Olds said NEPA is not nearly as prescriptive as other regulations, like the WAC. NEPA requires public comment periods and notice, and allows for some discretion for the agency to make determinations of the length of review periods.

Barb said, for example, the TC&WM EIS has a 45-day public comment period. She said they do not necessarily have to have a 30- or 45-day notice. Barb noted that public involvement regulations for Environmental Assessments (EAs) are more restrictive, and discuss host state and host tribes reviewing the EA, and a 15-day public comment period. Barb said they often extend the comment period to 30 days. Barb said 15 days is the minimum, and there is some flexibility.

Barb said the Nonradioactive Disposal Waste Landfill (NRDWL) will have a 30-day comment period. She said the agencies have criteria to identify what decisions might require public involvement, for example, is the issue controversial, does it affect the budget, and how will stakeholders be involved and react? She said they work with the project managers to identify areas that would benefit from involving the public. How that involvement looks can vary – DOE can opt to conduct a focus group, for example, or telephone surveys or a full blown process with public meetings.

Barb said an EE/CA is an interim CERCLA document that results in an Action Memorandum (interim decision), The regulatory document from a CERCLA proposed plan is an interim or final Record of Decision. Both EE/CAs and Proposed Plans require a 30-day comment period. CERCLA does not require a 30- to 45-day notice prior to start of public comment, but the Community Relations Plan does. She said the agencies try to do their homework to determine the level of interest.

Gerry added that there is another suite of regulations that include requirements like access to public records. Barb said they have to maintain the Administrative Record and documents out for public comment were sent to the regional Public Information Repositories prior to the start of a public comment period. She said the Internet has led to more challenges, and DOE is trying to keep on top of emerging online technologies. Gerry said DOE has come a long way, and can continue to grow. Barb said feedback from PIC identified some of the problems the public had accessing information online.

Betty asked if scoping is automatically triggered if DOE does not get a finding of non significance. Madeleine said scoping accompanies an EIS, not an EA. Betty asked who must comply with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA); Madeleine said Ecology is required to comply with the public involvement provisions of this law.

Barb said any notice, fact sheet or document from the TPA agencies must be concurred upon by all three agencies, including public involvement and project staff. She said this can go fast or very

slow; it sometimes has to go through legal review. Barb said that recently the agencies have been extremely busy given the large increase in number of documents requiring public review and comment. Barb commented that there is a balance between doing meaningful public involvement and actually doing work in the field.

Liz asked what inspires DOE to above and beyond the requirements. She thought it sounded like time was the biggest constraint. Barb said anyone who does public involvement truly cares about the process and involving the public in that process.

Ken commented that the public involvement process needs a fair amount of time. The TPA negotiations, for example, dragged on for months and the agencies asked the public involvement process and comment period to be done relatively fast. He said DOE came around quickly on extending the comment period.

Erik noted that planning for public involvement is important. If you begin without an end goal in mind, and there is not consistency, the agency can get to the end and feel like it was an ad hoc process. Barb said managers are well-intended, but it is difficult and overwhelming when they are trying to finalize a document. Public involvement should be planned up front so it takes less time at the end. She said it is sometimes not the highest priority.

Ginger noted that managerial support of public involvement changes as managers come and go. Gerry commented that thinking strategically about public involvement helps ensure buy-in from decision-makers.

Erik added that public involvement improves the quality of decision-making and helps create sustainable decisions. Gerry said it should also be done simply for the value of openness and transparency.

EPA

EPA did not have a representative at the meeting, but provided a handout outlining their requirements and ways they try to do more than is required.

Liz thanked the agencies for their candor.

What are the goals for public involvement at Hanford?

The committee brainstormed goals for public involvement:

- Engage the public in a meaningful way, predictably and regularly
- Provide opportunities for people to share their values
- To solicit assistance from the public
- Effective public contact
- To educate [the public]
- Prepare future generations
- Bring in new people
- Broad distribution of ages involved
- Ensure open and transparent decision-making
- Enabling the public to have the information and opportunity to effectively comment and influence decisions before they are made
- Provide feedback to commenters
- Provide route to provide resolution to conflicts when public is split (conflict resolution)

- To understand and respond to the concerns of the public
- Anticipate conflict and encourage early discussion of differences among affected parties
- Prepare people to make future decisions (long-term)
- To ensure public support for your decision
- Do [public involvement] early, do [public involvement] right
- Get on with cleanup
- Improve cleanup

The committee discussed grouping public involvement goals that are similar and related, and refining those that are not necessarily structured as goals yet. Liz commented that they need to separate values from goals. Gerry agreed and said a goal is supposed to be measurable; “do it right, do it early” is not a real goal. Susan Hayman said the issue managers will clean them up and send out for ranking in order of importance.

Liz said the committee needs to differentiate agency goals versus Board goals, if there is a difference. Ultimately, the committee will create a toolkit of public involvement techniques for the agencies to consider.

Ken noted he was unsure if the Board can tell the agencies what their goals should be. He said different activities may have different goals as well; some goals are universal. Ken thought sometimes the Board may say the public needs to be “involved” when the agencies think “informing” is sufficient. Steve thought the Sounding Board at the HAB will be a great opportunity to identify such agreements and differences.

Susan Hayman said the committee could refine the list and select what are most important for different activities.

Ginger asked PIC if it sees the goals as goals for the committee and Board. The committee said yes.

Committee Business

Action items

- Madeleine Brown to check on currency of “what’s out there” plan. Once current, provide to Susan Hayman to distribute (by February 19)
 - Hanford Events Calendar identifies what is “nailed down”
- Refine group goals, send out by February 26 for committee to rank in order of importance
 - Refine list as needed – all brainstormed items not at same level
 - Write in “goal language”
- Compile information on committee work versus priorities
 - Susan H. to send to Steve and Ken by February 18
- Susan H. to send out email to solicit committee leadership nominations

Follow-up

- Should chairs/vice chairs have responsibility to notify PIC of issues with public involvement consequences?
 - Steve and Ken to discuss with EIC
- Larger discussion about public involvement disconnect with “Outer Area call”
 - Lessons learned
 - How are TPA modifications determined to be Level 1 (or not)?

- Barb Wise to send out criteria
 - Potential March meeting topic
- Would like TPA agency flowchart with public meetings and workshops (calendar)
- Define what we mean by “public.” Some of the actions contemplated for public involvement are really technical/in the weeds. Determine which sector wants technical, and which want more general.
- Who monitors MTCA compliance...particularly regulatory

Handouts

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

- DOE draft notice: *Draft under review; Notice of Upcoming Public Comment Period, Proposed TPA Changes to Central Plateau Cleanup Work*
- *Public Involvement Strategic Planning Part 1: What does successful public involvement look like?*
- *Draft Strategic Planning Process Part 2: Unique Hanford – Hanford public involvement goals*
- *EPA: Major public involvement requirements as presented in the TPA; the value of public involvement*

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson
Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles
Norma Jean Germond	Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet
		Betty Tabbutt

Others

Eric Olds, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Sharon Braswell, MSA		Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
Barb Wise, MSA		