

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
April 7, 2010
Portland, OR**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions 1
Public Hearings Debrief – Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS 2
Strategic Planning Process – Public Involvement Goals 6
Action Items / Commitments 7
Handouts 7
Attendees..... 8

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, Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) opened the meeting. Steve noted that the PIC will have a meeting next Wednesday, April 14th in Richland, and will continue some of the discussions that will take place today.

Introductions were made. The first topic of discussion was the need to approve the February meeting summary. Steve noted that PIC members should have both the February and January meeting summaries and encouraged members read them because a lot of useful material is included. Chelsey Funis noted that there were no significant changes made to the draft February summary. The group adopted the summary.

Steve recommended that the PIC propose a buffer period to allow the PIC and the Board to work together more effectively. The buffer would provide a reasonable amount of time between when the PIC receives materials for review and comment to when the materials are finalized/used. Steve feels that this buffer is necessary for the PIC to provide meaningful feedback to the agencies, which will allow for materials and meetings to be more successful.

Steve provided PIC announcements. The next meeting is on April 14th. Part of the meeting will be used to recap all of the PIC accomplishments from the year. As last May’s Leadership Retreat, committee leaders agreed to review mid-year what they hoped to accomplish (Board and agency priorities) and what they did accomplish. Steve asked Susan Hayman to include this discussion on the April 14th agenda. Steve noted that the PIC needs to look at the agency responses to Board Advice #222 . He thanked committee members for providing useful feedback, especially concerning public meetings. He reminded the PIC of their need to build a collection of these observations and attempt to address them.

Madeleine Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) announced that Ecology hired two new public involvement people; Erika Holmes has replaced Annette Carlson, and Dieter Bohrmann has replaced Sharon Braswell.

Ken Niles mentioned a past conversation the PIC had about ways to spread awareness about Hanford beyond the Northwest and why people should care about it. He noted that the PIC has not fully addressed this topic since that discussion so he followed up on this with his own research. Ken visited the University of Oregon and solicited feedback from an environmental class. He asked them what types of messages would resonate with them. The students stressed topics concerning water and the nearby Columbia River would grab their attention. Ken noted that he has a meeting in Chicago in May with a couple of environmental studies classes. He is crafting a message to resonate with these groups and promised a follow up with the PIC on how these meetings go. The group was appreciative and thanked Ken for his efforts.

Gerry Pollet noted that the second Tri Party Agreement (TPA) M-19 draft fact sheet should be discussed by the PIC. Gerry did not know how much time that discussion would require but that it would fit into a discussion with the agencies about what they are proposing with the Solid Waste Landfill (SWL) and the Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill (NRDWL). The group agreed that the fact sheet should be discussed at the PIC meeting next week. Madeleine asked if someone would consolidate these comments. Steve agreed to make a pitch during tomorrow's Board meeting committee reports.

Steve noted that there are two major topics to discuss in today's meeting. The first is a discussion about the importance of following up each public meeting with a debrief to identify strengths and weaknesses that occurred. Steve noted that this is one of the ways to strengthen and correct difficulties.

The second topic is to continue with Step 3 of the PIC's public involvement goals and follow up on the work they have been doing. Steve noted that the group will be prioritizing these goals to ensure the PIC's limited time and resources and being used efficiently. Steve announced that Liz has been identifying the tools necessary for conducting successful public meetings and ways to improve public involvement, which she will be discussing later today.

Public Hearings Debrief – Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS

The committee shared and discussed impressions of the public hearings on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) recently held in the northwestern states. The Committee also discussed what worked well at the hearings, what did not work so well, and ways the meetings could be improved. A handful of committee members attended the meetings and provided their thoughts (see Attachment 1 for the flip chart notes of this discussion).

Ken noted that he would like to broaden the discussion beyond just meetings and include any of the public involvement activities that were undertaken because they are interrelated. Ken stated that there were eight public meetings held across the Northwest. He attended four of them. Ken noted that a much larger magnitude of effort went into these meetings than previous meetings, which is why they were more successful than the others. Ken stated the positives and negatives he observed during the public meetings and identified areas of improvement (see the table in Attachment 1 – Flip Chart Notes)

Ken praised the Department of Energy (DOE) for extending the comment period after they were asked to do so. He also noted that the December Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Public Workshop was well attended, informative, and a good discussion took place. DOE also solicited input on the public meetings as well as on the second mailer; however, they did not do a good job in implementing individual PIC member suggestions on how to improve this second mailer. Some areas where the DOE could have improved were: choosing the dates and locations of public meetings; the design and content of the first mailer; and the structure and content of the public hearing presentations, which contained too much emphasis on background information and too little on the current status of the project. Ken noted that the key finding section included in the DOE and Ecology presentations was informative.

Ken noted that there was a conflict in timing between the pre-meeting and the open house, and this distracted the focus away from the hearings. Ken also felt DOE overstaffed the meetings. Ken feels that the hearing format is too regimented, however; he did not know how it could be changed. He feels that the format is slightly uncomfortable in the sense that the public asks questions as part of their formal comments, but the agencies standing in the front of the room cannot answer them during this part of the meeting.

Ken stated that the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) worked hard to be creative in their public outreach effort, informing the public about upcoming meetings via email, listserv, etc. He thought the successful turnouts reflected their efforts and in areas where outreach lacked, such as Boise, low turnout resulted.

In round-robin fashion, Susan H. asked other PIC members who attended any of the eight meetings to share their thoughts.

Susan Leckband felt that Ken covered a lot of the same thoughts she had. She added that it is very difficult to attract people to the meetings if they do not have direct ties to Hanford. It is difficult to get other ethnic groups, particularly Hispanics and farming groups, to show an interest because their concerns are focused on water rights. Susan mentioned that although it is difficult to draw new people into the meetings, any sort of contribution is still very beneficial.

Laura Hanses added that she liked Ecology's handouts. She also suggested changing the order of the meeting locations. The Tri-Cities meeting always takes place first while the other meeting notices are still coming together. By finishing the meeting series in the Tri-Cities, it might provide the public with more time to pay attention. Laura also mentioned that she would like to see a meeting held in a neighboring town immediately outside of Richland. A recent meeting in Moses Lake drew in a lot of interest and provided a different perspective of the Site. Laura noted that the Tri-Cities hearing would have been more effective had the public been informed that the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) was not on the table. The FFTF added to people's confusion about what they were there to discuss and took the focus away from the EIS.

Tom Carpenter applauded Ken for his thorough list. He, too, was frustrated with the format of the meetings. He understands that the presenters are not supposed to respond during the comment period because it is important for the public not to receive push back from the agencies but it is an out-of-date style and the comments become repetitive.

Tom noted that the most important part of these public meetings is the outreach effort beforehand and getting people out the meetings. Tom argued that the agencies could do a much more creative job by using radio and other methods to alert people. Tom was surprised that the Seattle public meeting did not make any of the Seattle newspapers. Tom understands that there are limited funds

for outreach but added that it is important for people know what is going on. Tom noted that he is in the process of trying to get more reporting and articles on Hanford. He stated that it is left up to public interest groups to get this information out but their scope and abilities make this difficult.

Gerry distributed a handout that he and Lisa Van Dyk prepared that provides a quantifiable evaluation of the meetings and offers some perspective. Gerry noted that he sent an email to DOE in December to schedule the meetings and he did not see the DOE notice prior to its distribution. Gerry felt that the 600 people who attended the eight meetings (not including approximately 100 people who attended in Richland) was a great turnout. Gerry noted that places that received substantial notification, even if the DOE had not held a public hearing there in years, had successful turnouts. Eugene was a perfect example of this. Gerry informed the group that he attended a conference at the University of Oregon and gave a presentation. He had previously arranged a local National Public Radio (NPR) interview and people came to his presentation after having heard the interview. Gerry noted that he did a lot of pre-meeting workshops prior to the public hearings and also assisted other people in doing additional outreach in classrooms. Gerry stated that most public hearing attendees came because of other notifications, not the DOE mailer. Gerry thought the DOE notice came too early and was easily ignored.

Gerry gave kudos to Shirley Olinger for sitting in on the Seattle and Eugene workshops. People want to see the decision makers at the front of the room and she made herself available to answer the public's questions. Gerry added that he was concerned that the question and answer portion of the workshops was not on the record. People received different answers to the same questions in different cities, some pertaining to the different impacts of the alternatives listed in the EIS. Without these answers on the record, issues concerning accuracy and the public involvement process arise. Gerry felt Jim Parhan did a very good job facilitating these meetings. He worked with groups in advance, was respectful, and planned the meetings in a way to ensure they went smoothly.

Madeleine asked Gerry what questions were not on the record and what their reasoning was for not being on the record.

Gerry explained that the public was notified at the beginning that their questions during the informal question and answer period would not be on the record. Comments were not on the record until the formal comment portion of the meeting. Gerry also raised his concern about the presentation that Jeff Lyon from Ecology provided. Gerry noted that it was poorly designed and that there were a number of inaccuracies with Suzanne Dahl's (Ecology) presentation.

Norma Jean Germond received both DOE notices in the mail and commented that she was pleased with the first one because a lot of information was included in it. Although the content didn't contain some information the PIC might have included, it was still an informative notification. Norma Jean told the group that they focus a lot on getting more people involved and at times feel that there is limited interest in Hanford. However, what she has noticed is that people are simply too busy to show a greater interest in Hanford but they do appreciate that there are passionate people working on this issue who care about what happens to the Site.

Steve noted that he attended the Portland public meeting. He drew three conclusions from this meeting. The first is that there is not enough consistent and reliable background information to enable people to come to the meetings prepared. Secondly, many people were confused why they received notification about the meeting via NPR and not through their local news. Lastly, some of the answers the public received were inaccurate, and discrepancies between the agencies was evident during the presentations.

Liz stated that the PIC did not have the opportunity to provide advance feedback on draft presentations, and received resistance from DOE when asked to do so. She also felt that working with DOE was a challenging dynamic. Liz believes that the PIC's feedback would have improved the presentations. Liz noted that there was initial resistance to changing the dates of the public meetings; however, DOE did eventually agree to do so. Liz commented that the difference in quality of Ecology's presentations (Jeff's versus Susan's) had a large effect on the quality of the meeting in Portland and Seattle and she was disappointed to see such inconsistency. Liz was impressed with Suzanne's ability to portray the positive strides Ecology has been making on the cleanup process.

Agency Perspectives

DOE-ORP

Lori Gamache, Department of Energy- Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) thanked the committee members because she knows they did a lot of work and a lot of outreach effort, which was reflected in the turnout they received. Lori added that the comment period for the TC&WM EIS was extended until May 3rd.

Lori attended two of the three additional meetings and was very pleased with the turn out. She was happy the PIC suggested those. Lori felt that all thoughts shared today were great but asked what action the PIC feels needs to be taken to solve them. She added that there are overlapping comment periods coming up and although she did not know how to resolve all the issues discussed, it is still important to continue the discussion about these lessons learned.

Ecology

Madeleine agreed that the turnout was wonderful and the meetings were successful. She agreed that the stakeholders did the heavy lifting in bringing in people and she thanked them for doing so.

Madeleine stated that the process for receiving comments from the PIC made the development of the mailer more difficult. The DOE-ORP received four different sets of suggestions which made it tough to integrate them. Madeleine asked if the PIC could work together and nominate one person to serve as the lead in providing Ecology with one final version in the future. The group expressed their concern about how the PIC could overcome this same problem of consolidating all of their suggestions into one final deliverable for Ecology.

Gerry added that the PIC had very little time to provide feedback. Collaboration on these products requires adequate lead time. Gerry also felt that because his suggestions were not considered on the second mailer, he is less enthusiastic to spend the time to submit suggestions again. Liz stated that Ecology did add in some of the PIC's suggestions and the group needs to acknowledge that.

Lisa Van Dyk felt that she was not given enough time to create a mailer for their Heart of America Northwest contacts because the timeline to submit suggestions to Ecology was too tight. This hurt their public involvement. Lisa agreed that news and radio coverage is essential to getting people, especially new people, to the meetings.

Lisa stated that the agencies need to be more transparent on who is making final decisions. By doing so, it makes the process more human and accessible. People need to know where their

comments are going. Sending comments to a Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) email address generates a disconnect between the agencies and the public.

Norma Jean asked Steve to further discuss what he meant by the level of accessible information. Steve stated that if a meeting is coming up, it is typical for people to precede this meeting by conducting their own preliminary research to prepare themselves. He feels there is a lack of accurate information for the public to do this type of pre-meeting research.

Norma Jean discussed the positive impact a television story can have for public outreach. In her past experience, a television station provided her with 30 seconds of air time to share a quick announcement about the Hanford Site. At the subsequent public meeting that evening, people showed up to learn more about Hanford after having seen the 30 second television blurb. Norma Jean stated that the agencies are not using these types of media avenues enough.

Gerry suggested that anyone who signed into a public meeting or submitted a comment needs to be added to the TPA mailing list to ensure they receive meeting notifications. Gerry asked Lori if the people on the Solid Waste mailing list would receive meeting notifications. She replied the TC&WM EIS mailing list was developed from the Solid Waste mailing list, everyone on the Solid Waste EIS mailing list was put on the TC&WM EIS mailing list. Lori told Gerry to forward the names and contact information for those who did not receive meeting notifications and she will put them on the list.

Strategic Planning Process – Public Involvement Goals

Liz stated that the PIC had a preliminary discussion about goals at the Kennewick PIC meeting. She organized those goals into a workable grouping of “why” and a “how” goals. Liz noted that, for today’s discussion, she would like to finalize these goals – to identify if anything missing; if anything should be added; and the overarching the goals the PIC and agencies can agree upon for effective public involvement. Liz noted that she would like to include the PIC’s goals into Phase 3 of the Strategic Plan for public involvement.

The group discussed if anything was missing from the list of ‘why’ or ‘how’ goals.

The group raised concern about what audience the PIC has in mind with these goals. Different groups will support different goals. Liz noted that this is a high level discussion for now and realizes that some goals are not going to apply to all stakeholder groups. The group agreed to create a category of overarching goals that could be accepted by stakeholders, agencies, and the public. Gerry noted that it was important to continue to support people already involved in Hanford, in addition to reaching out to new people. He also felt that these goals did not include reaching out to underrepresented effected communities such as migrant workers who live on the Columbia, environmental justice groups, and tribes. Lori felt that the overarching goal “to engage public early and regularly” captures Gerry’s ideas.

Ken suggested that “to give feedback and responses to public comments” is an underrated goal and needs to serve as an overarching goal under “how.” The group agreed with this change.

Tom felt that prioritizing these goals is a good idea otherwise the PIC will overwhelm themselves by thinking about too much at once.

Steve suggested that identifying overarching goals will reinforce to the agencies where and why the HAB wants them to spend their scarce resources.

Gerry asked about the next steps.. He suggested creating a timeline for public involvement activities. Madeleine noted that she sees a timeline as a helpful tool but that this goals document is a separate and equally important tool. Liz agreed that this discussion and goals document will lead the PIC into the next step.

The group felt that “provide adequate resources to enable people to participate” should be added to the “how” goals. This goal is important for the HAB process to work.

The committee members and agency representatives finished refining the goals, and identified the overarching goals. Liz will take this information and reorganize it prior to presenting it for final review at the April 14 PIC committee meeting.

Steve stated that the goals discussed today are the key issues and the PIC is at a point to begin working towards these goals and begin writing advice for the Board.

Action Items / Commitments

- Evaluate PIC accomplishments with Board priorities (4/14)
- NRDWL/closure plans (“piecemeal” approach)
 - Relationship to RCRA permit
 - Match up Gerry with the RAP Issues Manager
- TPA Change Package fact sheet (M-15, 16)
 - Someone to consolidate comments by Tuesday
- TPA Change Package fact sheet (M-91)
 - To be addressed on the 14th - Paula to Susan Hayman, Susan to the Committee
- Continue to discuss how to apply lessons learned for the TC&WM EIS to other public outreach efforts
 - Future Topic
- Response to advice #222 (4/14)

April 14th Agenda Topics

1. Strategy planning
2. Evaluating priorities and accomplishments (15 min)
3. Response to Board Advice (15 min)
4. TPA change package fact sheet (M 91) and TPA change package public involvement (60 min)
5. Other opportunities for budget workshop- evening Webinar (20 min)
6. Committee Business (30 min)

Handouts

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

- Goals for Public Involvement at Hanford, Liz Mattson, April 2010.

- Public Involvement and Communication Committee – 6 Month Work Plan, March 18, 2010
- Report on TC&WM EIS Hearings, Gerry Pollet and Lisa Van Dyk, April 2010

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Tom Carpenter	Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet
Norma Jean Germond	Liz Mattson	Steve White
Laura Hanses	Ken Niles	
Steve Hudson	Bob Parks	

Others

Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Chelsey Funis EnviroIssues
	Emerald Laija , EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Lisa Van Dyk, Heart of America Northwest

Attachment 1 – Flip Chart Notes of Debriefing of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearings

Attachment 1 – Flip Chart Notes of Debriefing of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearings

What Worked

1. DOE extended the public comment period
2. December workshop was well attended and a good open discussion took place.
3. DOE delayed the Seattle meeting and added more meetings
4. DOE solicited input on mailer
5. “Key Findings” in DOE and Ecology presentations
6. ODOE and lots of citizen groups tried to be creative in spreading the word (listserv, email, etc.); high turnout numbers reflected this effort
7. Ecology fact sheets and handouts were good.
8. Very good facilitator (respectful, advance work)
9. Pleased with level of information included in the first mailer. More than usual.

What Didn't Work/Suggestions

1. DOE did not do much with recommendations on the 2nd mailer
2. DOE was late to consult on meeting dates and locations
3. No consultation on the first mailer; it was not effective
4. Received comments that agency presentations were not “tight”/understandable; too much Background information and not enough on current status
5. Open House/pre meeting scheduled on top of one another; possibly have a 45 minute delay
6. DOE “overstaffed” the road show
7. Hearing format overly regimented
8. Awkwardness when DOE and Ecology stand in front and cannot answer questions. Maybe system can be improved upon.
9. When outreach effort was lacking (i.e. in Boise) low turnout numbers reflected this
10. Difficult to get other folks to Hanford meeting in the Tri-Cities outside of “company” people (agency/contractors)
11. Difficult to get other groups involved; Hispanics, farmers. They are more interested in water rights, not Hanford.
12. Reorder meetings: do not always have the Tri-Cities first. News stories may increase draw. Maybe end meeting series in the Tri-Cities
13. Look to add meetings in Moses Lake, Yakima – might get different perspectives
14. Would have been helpful to say that FFTF was “off the table” for discussion – it took focus off target in Tri-Cities
15. Layout of meetings; very repetitive, all meetings were the same
16. Agencies need to a more creative job in outreach (could use radio, TV, etc.)
17. Didn't make the “Seattle Times!” Seemed like outreach was left to advocacy groups.
18. Q&A should have been on the record

Attachment 1 – Flip Chart Notes of Debriefing of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearings

19. A lot of concern about Ecology's presentation (inaccurate, poorly executed, etc.)
20. People were surprised that there was not more substantial background information (before they walked in the door)
21. People wondered why they did not see or hear about the meetings in advance
22. There were conflicts of information with presentations
23. PIC not consulted or given the opportunity to provide feedback on presentations (feedback would have improved them)
24. Initial resistance to feedback on a number of things (flyers, presentations, meetings dates, etc.)
25. Differences in Ecology presentations; Jeff and Suzanne's were drastically different/inconsistent
26. Need more lead time to have meaningful PIC feedback (advance collaboration on noticed)
27. Time crunch didn't allow advocacy/interest groups enough time to produce their own mailer
28. Impact of radio/TV very obvious in affecting level of turnout
29. Make sure people know who is making decisions
30. Sending comments to a company hired to write EIS (SAIC) and not to the DOE is confusing to the public
31. Everyone that attended the hearings or sent in a comment should be added to the TPA mailing list