

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
February 8, 2012
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Update on Timely Public Involvement Topics 1
Public Involvement for Technical Issues 2
State of the Site Meetings 5
Committee Business..... 8
Attachments 8
Attendees 8
Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 10

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. Steve reviewed the agenda.

The committee adopted the November meeting summary.

Update on Timely Public Involvement Topics

Issue manager framing

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, provided an update on the timeframes and public involvement expectations for projects the PIC has been following; the updates were also addressed during the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Quarterly Update prior to the PIC meeting. Specifically, Liz noted:

- The 100 K Area Proposed Plan will be available for public comment in mid-July; this is after the public comment period for the 300 Area Proposed Plan. Issue managers have

been working on review of the 100 K Area Proposed Plan and are appreciative of the early review period. The TPA response to the 100 K Area Proposed Plan will be in the form of a record of decision (ROD).

- Budget meetings will take place during the third week of March, and the Budgets and Contracts Committee will soon have a call to discuss the President's budget for 2013 after it is released on February 13.
- The HAB sounding board on the safety culture at the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) will take place during the February 9 Board meeting. The Board will continue to track safety culture issues at WTP and the rest of the Hanford site. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)-Office of River Protection (ORP) hosted an open house for information about the WTP over a month ago, and it was very well attended.

Liz noted that the WTP open house was mostly informational and did not provide a venue for open dialogue with the public. Open dialogue between the TPA agencies and the public has been a goal of the PIC for a long time. She said she would like to see the TPA agencies host more meetings that are focused on topics other than document publication.

Sharon Braswell, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), noted that the WTP open house met the goals set forth by DOE-ORP and said that many public participants engaged in one-on-one dialogue with agency representatives at the individual displays. She said she believes the PIC is looking for a public meeting forum to discuss general safety concerns. Liz said she would like the conversations that are taking place one-on-one to be open to a broader audience. Ken Niles, Oregon DOE, said the Oregon Department of Energy and Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board have also asked for a forum in which to engage in back-and-forth dialogue about technical and safety issues involving the WTP. Ken said the forum needs to allow for more than just DOE presentations.

Public Involvement for Technical Issues

Steve said he has been thinking about ways to increase public understanding of what is going on at Hanford, in order create more meaningful participation and input on decisions. He suggested that HAB members be encouraged to read the HAB Convening Report in order to learn more about what is expected of them. Steve spoke to his personal experience with a lecture series he attends in Oregon. He said he looks forward to the lectures and is provided enough information to do background research beforehand if necessary. Likewise, Steve wondered if there could be a Hanford series of lectures about topics of importance at Hanford. The lectures would be predictably scheduled so the public could plan for and anticipate them.

Steve spoke to the importance of public meetings that provide enough time for a question and answer period, as those meetings create fruitful conversations. He said the public has made it clear that they want better information. Steve said HAB members should be willing to go out to the public to discuss issues at Hanford, as Ken Niles does at universities in Oregon and Cameron Salony does for DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). He suggested the Board and

committees flag their agendas for topics that might be important or engaging for the public to attend, as there is a lot of rich dialogue taking place in the technical committees and at Board meetings. Steve noted that representatives of Ecology, working with the HAB issue managers, are doing an excellent job in translating technical information for public engagement related to the Hanford Site-wide Permit. Steve said the PIC needs to be more active about sharing information with the public, as they, and all HAB members, have an obligation to participate with the public outside of Board meetings, though it seems at times that a foundational relationship is lacking between individual members and their constituencies. Steve said Board and committee meeting times may need to change to accommodate attendance by members of the working public, especially if the meetings are supposed to help reach out to the public concerning technical issues.

Committee Discussion

The committee discussed ideas for relaying technical information to the public and noted the following key points and suggestions:

- HAB members that represent interest groups have an intrinsic responsibility to share Hanford information with their constituencies. HAB members representing the public-at-large or the workforce are not so required. The purpose of the Board is to advise the TPA agencies and complete the work in their charter while allowing the public opportunities to comment. Only the HAB Chair can speak on behalf of the Board, while Board members speak to their own positions on the topics.
- Interest groups represented on the Board should provide the TPA agencies information on when and where their constituencies would like to have meetings, and on what topic. Unfortunately, some interest groups are more outspoken than others and the needs of the other groups are not always addressed.
- Potential dates for public meetings should be vetted before the full Board.
- The TPA agencies should consider broadening their public outreach topics. General outreach to schools, trade shows, etc. could include one specific topic of interest to the group being addressed, as well as other broader topics of public interest.
- In the past, there have been Saturday forums in Portland to address tank waste treatment. Reviving the program would be an opportunity for an open forum, and it provides a good template.
- Neither TPA agency public involvement staff, nor members of the PIC, have the time to put forth an effort to create a new program like a lecture series. HAB members do public outreach on their own, and the Board should consider providing guidance to HAB members to help support their efforts.
- The general population of the Tri-Cities is not aware of what is going on at Hanford, whether because they don't read the paper, or because they are new to town, or because

they are young and were not around when a larger percentage of people in the area worked on the site. The same people are attending the Hanford public meetings, so the same issues are brought up over and over again. New people do not attend the meetings because they do not want to admit their lack of knowledge base or be overwhelmed with technical details. Comments from new or inexperienced members of the public might be the most vital of input. The Board and TPA agencies need to reach out to those who are not already involved and help prepare them for commenting on important documents. They need to understand the foundation and fundamentals of the issues before they can read and comment on documents effectively.

- Technical information needs to be made relevant to the public. 20-year-olds who have no experience with Hanford need to understand how decisions on site will affect their water, air, leisure sports, and more. They cannot be expected to read the documents required to comment on technical issues.
- The PIC should consider advising the TPA agencies on public involvement outreach activities, topics of potential interest, and methods for engagement and communication. The advice should not dictate when or how they should conduct outreach, but help them understand how to better reach the public. The advice could include a format suggestion such as presenting on a technical issue, speaking to its relevance to the audience, and then providing ample time for discussion.
- If the public is to be motivated to provide comment on technical issues or documents, it needs to be clear how their comments will be used. They need to receive feedback on what they submit, as well as their general participation, and the process needs to be clear.
- HAB meetings are not normally of interest to the general public, so there is never very much turnout. To improve turnout, the HAB could make room on the agenda for a presentation and discussion on a topic that would be interesting and relevant to the public. The TPA staff and contractors are already at the meeting, so it would only take someone to speak to the topic in easy to understand language. The committee discussed that HAB meetings are not primarily intended to be the place for public dialogue, but are for Board business and interface with the TPA agencies. Another option is to request an after-hours educational opportunity for the public that HAB members could attend and provide their viewpoints. The public has more motivation to show up to meetings where they can ask questions and receive answers, not just listen to a presentation. The PIC will revisit their previous idea of public evening seminars that has been placed in their 6-Month Work Plan holding bin.
- One PIC member suggested that the public meeting on the Hanford Site-wide Permit could be a good alternative to the State of the Site meetings because the Site-wide Permit is so broad. It would be a good vehicle for addressing other broad topics, and the issue managers have already put a lot of time into translating the technical information for the public. Other members thought the focus of the Site-wide Permit meetings will be too focused to include broad information, and the topic may not be as interesting as to attract as large a crowd as the State of the Site meetings do.

The TPA agencies asked for specific recommendations for public meetings to be held on the 300 Area and 100 K Area Proposed Plans that are scheduled to be issued for public comment in May and July, respectively, as well as other documents coming out in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. The committee identified issues and documents they would like to address in FY2012 and identified which topics would be a priority for PIC/HAB involvement. The topics are:

- 300 Area and 100 K Area Proposed Plans (priority)
- UP-1
- Hanford Site-wide Permit (priority)
- FY2013 and FY2014 budgets
- WTP
- Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS; priority).

Priorities were identified because the 300 Area and 100 K Area Proposed Plans will inform the rest of the decision documents for the River Corridor, the Hanford Site-wide Permit is a major document, and the PIC and Board would like to finally close the loop on the TC&WM EIS and provide the public with feedback. Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, noted that the UP-1 document (related to groundwater treatment) will be straightforward and not controversial, and any meeting on the FY2013 and FY2014 budgets will be information sharing rather than a back and forth dialogue. The PIC will develop advice or a letter of recommendation for how the TPA agencies should handle public involvement on the priority topics. Steve will report back to the full Board to ensure the priorities have been properly identified.

The committee determined to ask the full Board about suggestions for educational public meetings/workshops on information and the upcoming documents and decisions relating to the River Corridor. Flip charts will be posted at the upcoming Board meeting to solicit input on public meeting times, day of the week, and location (e.g. evenings, Saturdays, Hood River). Interest groups in the locations where the meetings will be held will be asked to make sure the meetings are well supported locally and have good turnout. Emy said general education meetings on the River Corridor documents will need to be planned for the April timeframe in order to prep the public for the release of the first two proposed plans in May and July. PIC asked that the meetings be scheduled and advertised as soon as possible so the public may work it into their schedules.

State of the Site Meetings

Steve said the purpose of this agenda item is to discuss and capture the reasons why the State of the Site meetings are important to PIC and the Board, in recent light of the TPA agencies saying they would not host State of the Site meetings in FY2012. Liz said the State of the Site meetings provide a space for the public to talk about anything that is on their minds, and it is essential to recruiting new people for other meetings. She said she would like to see the meetings put on the Hanford public involvement calendar in a predictive way to be repeating year and year.

Emy said the TPA agencies decided not to host the State of the Site meetings this year given the other public meetings that will need to take place for the decision documents being released in FY2012. She said they want every public meeting to be valuable, and if there are too many meetings, the public, as well as the agencies, will reach a burnout stage. Sharon noted the expense of the State of the Site meetings and said that even conjoining the meetings with HAB meetings to reduce the cost does not make a significant cost reduction. Sharon also noted that the agencies have not said they will not host SOS meetings, but that they are concerned about the frequency of the State of the Site meetings. She said when the meetings started in 2000, they were popular at first, but then attendance dwindled year after year, which is why there was a three year break before the FY2011 meetings. Sharon asked the PIC to consider if the State of the Site meetings should be held this year based on cleanup progress since the last meetings, and what is important to communicate now. The agencies said they would like to hear the PIC's opinion on where, when, and how often to hold the State of the Site meetings, noting that every year may not be possible.

Committee discussion

The committee discussed the importance of State of the Site meetings and noted the following key points:

- The cohesive environment of the State of the Site meetings that provides the public the opportunity to speak with both the TPA agencies and the HAB should not be lost. The public trusts the HAB, and we help create the arena for discussion.
- MSA reported that 300 people attended the FY2011 State of the Site meetings, a number that may have been high due to there not having been State of the Site meetings for the three years prior.
- The State of the Site meetings provide the forum for the agencies to talk about cleanup progress and public policy, which does not occur at other public meetings focused on documents or singular topics. The meetings also provide direct contact between decision makers and the public, and the agencies have an obligation to eliminate the multiple barriers between the public and the decision makers, as most of the time, the information between the two is filtered or diluted.
- The State of the Site meetings are different depending on the communities in which they are held. It is important to gain the perspective and distinct opinions of the different communities. There needs to be space for the public to make general comments on Hanford.
- The committee discussed the multiple meetings being held by the TPA agencies in FY2012 and made suggestions for how to avoid planning burnout on behalf of the public outreach staff. One suggestion is to partner with HAB interest groups in the cities where the meetings are to be held to create a shared responsibility for public turnout and meeting value. The agencies could also partner with universities or colleges who could

contribute free venues. Local interest groups could do the work to find free venues to help cut the budget.

- There is a need for the TPA decision makers to go out to the public to explain the PW 1/3/6 decision and why it turned out the way it did given the public input. The public may want to address the topic no matter what the next public meeting is.
- State of the Site meetings should be held in a predictable pattern so the public can anticipate them. If another important topic comes up and a State of the Site meeting gets bumped from the schedule, it ruins predictability. As long as there is predictability, the meetings could be held further apart, but the committee suggested still keeping the meetings on an annual or one and a half year cycle. The State of the Site meetings do not need to be held concurrently with each other, but could be spread apart by a few months. Three to four locations could host the meetings throughout the year.
- Even though the meetings are always well attended, the success should not be measured exclusively on the number of attendees.
- DOE and the HAB have a responsibility to consider the Hanford budget. When there is a budget crunch, the agencies and the Board need to go out to the public to get them to advocate for what Hanford needs. If support for the budget is a consideration for the State of the Site meetings, it may be important to hold the meetings in February before the budget cycle begins.
- The State of the Site meetings allows a space for creative interaction, and it is the perfect venue for attracting people who are new to Hanford issues. People who are new would be lost at a technical document meeting, but they can start to get involved and increase their knowledge base at a State of the Site meeting. The audience for the State of the Site meetings is always more general than the audience that will attend a technical meeting and the committee doesn't feel that the State of the Site meeting will detract from the technical meeting audience.

Emy said that hosting a State of the Site meeting in the fall would not allow the flexibility that may be needed for issuing decision documents for the River Corridor and other important documents that need to be completed by the end of the fiscal year. She said she thinks it makes sense to hold State of the Site meetings when there is a lull in the schedule. She doesn't want to see anything put at risk because the agencies have committed to too many meetings. Emy said there will be more time for State of the Site meetings once the River Corridor decision documents are complete; the River Corridor documents are a priority for the agencies. They need to hear from the public about that specific topic, and it is not served by a State of the Site meeting. The committee agreed that the River Corridor meetings take precedence.

The PIC agreed that a group of issue managers (Steve, Liz, and Norma Jean Germond) will examine prior HAB advice on the State of the Site meetings to determine if advice for meetings in 2012 is necessary. Sharon asked that any potential advice provide specifics on which months

would be best for holding the meetings. Cameron Salony, DOE-RL, asked that the advice also address how the HAB may help alleviate the burden of so many meetings.

Liz said State of the Site meetings in 2012 will only help generate enthusiasm for the River Corridor meetings, as the State of the Site meetings can help get people excited about the River Corridor in a different way. She said she would like to revisit the issue of the TPA agency public involvement staff being stretched thin on their responsibilities and potential contract modifications to help alleviate the burnout.

Committee Business

Review Follow Up Items

Susan Hayman reviewed follow up and action items.

1. Suggestion: include HAB Convening Report in HAB member packets.
2. Steve, Liz, and Norma Jean will examine past State of the Site advice and determine the need for new advice for FY2012.

Comprehensively Update the 6-Month Work Plan

The committee updated their 6 Month Work Plan based on interest level, timing, and work load. The updated work plan is provided as Attachment 2.

Committee Leadership

Susan Hayman noted that the committee will need to select committee leadership in March, and there is currently one nomination. She asked those who wish to nominate someone to send her their nomination after first consulting with the person to make sure they are willing to be nominated.

Attachments

PIC Meeting Transcribed Flip Chart Notes (Attachment 1).
PIC 6-Month Work Plan (Attachment 2).

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Betty Tabbutt (phone)
Norma Jean Germond	Liz Mattson	Jean Vanni
Laura Hanses		

Others

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Mark Loper, Heart of America NW
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Rachel Monto, Heart of America NW
Emy Laija, EPA	Barb Wise, MSA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Wednesday, February 8, 2012

Public Involvement for Technical Issues

Communication ideas

- Hanford “series” of topical discussions.
- Flag agenda items of interest.
- Use Ecology’s model with site-wide permit for future public involvement.
- PIC – identify public involvement priorities (can’t do it all).
- HAB meetings with structured public involvement time (e.g. meeting 12pm-7pm).

Page 1

Public Involvement for Technical Issues (continued)

Communication ideas

- PIC report to HAB with suggested date/times/other public involvement information and ask to network.
- Help inform people on foundational information about Hanford in order to help them feel comfortable/understand technical issues.
- Help people understand the relevance of technical issues to them.

Page 2

Public Involvement for Technical Issues (continued)

Communication ideas

- Advise TPA agencies on suggestions for effectively engaging the public in technical issues.
- Provide feedback to public on how their comments/involvement were used/useful (and let public know the process for how they will be responded to).
- Add a 1-2 hour presentation on some topics of public interest at a HAB meeting (after hours?).

Page 3

Technical Issue Opportunities (*= public involvement priority issue for PIC/HAB)

- * 300 Area (May) and 100 K Area (Mid-July) Proposed Plans.
 - a. Will impact rest of River Corridor decisions.
 - b. General public River Corridor kick-off meeting? April?
- UP-1 (April)

- a. Decision by E.O.F.Y.
- b. May not be controversial
- * Site-wide Permit
- Budget (2013/2014)
- WTP (TWC/HSEP)
- * TC&WM EIS (Closing the loop)

Page 4

Informational River Corridor Meeting

1. Time of day.
 2. Day of week.
 - a. Day, night, weekend.
 3. Where would we have it?
 - a. One location? More?
- Interest groups should support the success of these meetings.
 - Post flipcharts with questions.

Page 5

State of the Site Meetings

- Provide context for Hanford,
- HAB “partnership” with agencies at SOS meetings.
- Opportunity for “general” discussion.
- Keep constituency informed – support for budget.
- Important connection between agencies/public/HAB.
 - a. Broader look at Hanford.
- Opportunity to introduce new people to Hanford.

Page 6

State of the Site Meetings (continued)

- Decision makers are there.
- Opportunity to hear about cleanup progress.
- Allows decision makers direct access to the public – they hear unfiltered message.
 - a. Accountable to public.
- Space for public policy discussions
- Give communities opportunity to talk about what is important for them

Page 7

State of the Site Meetings (continued)

- Frequency/timing?
 - a. PW 1/3/6 and CW-5 decision (“hangover” at next public meetings).
- Annually, if possible, or 18 month interval.
- SOS meetings should be “predictable” and scheduled in its timing/frequency.
- Recognize adjustments may be necessary for critical timing.

Page 8

State of the Site Meetings (continued)

Options

- Space out meetings over the year (Seattle one month, somewhere else three months later).
- Other face to face technologies.
- Timing in spring (near budget cycle).
- Partner to reduce expenses (e.g. meeting venues)
 - a. Local interests help with outreach, etc.

Advice?

- Suggested months, given current schedule.
- Specific, how HAB can alleviate the burden.
- Issue managers – Steve, Liz, Norma Jean.

Page 9

Follow Up

3. Suggestion: include HAB Convening Report in HAB member packets.
4. State of the Site Meetings – Issue managers propose whether the PIC should recommend advice to the Board (April?)
5. Post flip charts at the Board meeting to solicit Board input on information river corridor meetings

Page 10
