

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
June 1, 2011
Kennewick, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Comprehensive Debrief – State of the Site Meetings 4
Public Meetings – PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Proposed Plan..... 10
Update on DOE Speakers’ Bureau..... 13
Tri-Party Agreement – Revision 8 17
Committee Business..... 19
Attendees 21
Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 22
Attachment 2 – PIC 6-Month Work Plan..... 27

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. The committee adopted the March meeting summary.

Steve said that any committee member interested in seeing the PIC meeting discussion on the Greater Than Class-C Environmental Impact Statement (GTCC EIS) should read the summary from the March PIC meeting, especially if they were unable to attend the meeting.

Steve said Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation, has been working on creating a chart that shows how decisions are made about cleanup at Hanford. He said the document tracks what is important to consider in each decision making process, and the document is a great tool in terms of public involvement. The updated version of the chart was distributed to PIC members the day before the meeting.

Steve said there is a lot on the PIC calendar for this meeting, and he invited everyone to stay for the Tri-Party Quarterly Update later in the afternoon.

Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said Board members have been selected for the Non-Union/Non-Management seat. She said the paperwork has yet to clear Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ), but the two seats will be made official and will be introduced during the Board meeting the following day.

Review of Tri-Party Agreement agencies responses to Advice 239 and 240

Steve reviewed the tri-party responses to Board Advice 239 and 240. He said the intent of Advice 239 was to improve public involvement at Hanford and to open communication between the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies, Board, and the public. Steve addressed the TPA agencies' response to Advice 239 that indicated they did not believe a strategic plan should be included as an appendix in the Community Relations Plan (CRP). Steve said he believes there was an issue with the Board's definition of the strategic plan and what should be done with it. He said the Board meant for the plan to be more overarching. Paula said she thought the advice was clear in intent, but that some members of the PIC might not agree with the answer they received. Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters and Board chair, said that some PIC members see the strategic plan as a prescriptive attachment to the agreement that would be updated annually. Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, suggested adding a clarifying paragraph that says a plan should be developed but not necessarily included in the CRP.

Emy said a strategic plan is being developed internally but will take a while to complete in order to determine what the agencies' needs are. Emy said they do not intend to include a strategic plan as an addendum to the CRP. She said she knows some PIC members will not be happy with that arrangement, but noted that the agencies struggled to try to reference the strategic plan in the CRP and ultimately decided not to include it. Emy said the CRP will go out for public comment this year, and that will be the opportunity for individual HAB members to comment that they would like to see the strategic plan included in the CRP.

Sam Dechter, Public-at-Large, said he can see the advantages to having a CRP in addition to a strategic plan that looks ahead. He said the CRP should deal with micro items, while the strategic plan could be the macro plan that deals with a bigger scope and years to come.

Jean asked if it is possible to have a larger plan that could be incorporated into the CRP by reference, then have smaller plans that would be more flexible. Jean says a plan cannot be institutionalized without reference. Emy asked how the strategic plan will improve the TPA process as they already know what is in store for the next few years. She said they would like to develop a tool that covers what the TPA calendar does not, but they are experiencing difficulty in developing the strategic plan. Liz said the plan should be a strategic approach for connecting all of the items on the calendar; to demonstrate the common threads throughout the year and tie them to seemingly disconnected meetings. Consistent messages and institutionalized language needs to be included in the CRP. Liz said the plan does not need to be extremely detailed, but needs to tie meetings and themes together in order for the public to make connections. Jean said the TPA calendar is great but that it doesn't explain meaning to the public. She said the strategic plan will be the higher level text to explain projects that run throughout the year; it can be created in an outline form with the details in a smaller document. Emy suggested that the best way to restate the PIC's ideas about the strategic plan is during the public comment period in the fall.

Sam said that no two processes are the same, and that is why a strategic plan is important from a project management standpoint. Sam suggested the TPA calendar be changed to incorporate strategic planning for events and include Jean's suggestion about adding in text. He said the plan and CRP can be updated on a yearly basis so the public can understand why a meeting in September may be different from a meeting in March. Emy said the calendar is currently one page and voiced concerns over making it longer, especially for people who may be disinterested in the first place. Liz suggested creating an online tool for the calendar that would involve scrolling over a specific meeting that will then produce a blurb on what the meeting is about and how it connects to others. Liz noted that this idea will not create extra pages and will be easy to produce. Paula Call, DOE Richland Field Office (DOE-RL), made note of Liz's suggestion and said the conversation has been helpful.

Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), asked who the audience is for the strategic plan, based on attendance to State of the Site meetings and understanding the difference between the public and stakeholders. Jean said the public is the audience, and they will be more informed and make better decisions because of a strategic plan.

Liz said the public needs quick information rather than just seeing acronyms used for meeting titles. Susan Leckband said she liked the idea of information boxes across the TPA calendar and suggested that the information be high-level enough to help the general public, but still detailed due to the understanding that anyone viewing the Hanford website and TPA calendar probably already has a Hanford knowledge base.

Susan asked how the PIC will report out on the responses they've received from the agencies. She said it would be a good idea to acknowledge they have received the responses, discussed them, and will be providing comments in return. Steve said they haven't been thoroughly examining the responses to date, and he hopes they will do so from now on.

Steve spoke to the separate agency responses to Advice 240. Steve said the Board had asked for the TPA agencies to provide monthly updates of the TPA calendar, and their response indicates that they are doing so already. Steve said it is important to note that the Board has asked for something, has received it, and should respond appropriately. Steve said the responses did not include information about whether or not the agencies will continue to provide presentations about the Hanford Site. He said he doesn't know if that project is still ongoing. Paula said it is ongoing but will be examined more closely once the ramifications of the 2012 budget are absorbed. Steve said he would appreciate an update as soon as possible.

Steve said that the responses to Advice 240 are nicely done, and he sees a number of points in the EPA response that the PIC can talk about and add to their calendar. He would like to see the committee follow up with EPA's mention of measurable commitments. Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, said the Board needs to appreciate the complete and specific responses they are receiving from the agencies, as they are doing more than just thanking the Board for sending advice.

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology's response to Advice 240 only came out last week and many PIC members may not have seen it yet. He said the response highlighted the collaboration between the PIC and TPA agencies on developing the

State of the Site meetings. Dieter said they worked together to develop an agenda early on, and spread the word about the meeting which helped to provide good attendance.

Comprehensive Debrief – State of the Site Meetings

Steve said the debriefs for public meetings provide an opportunity to identify what works well, what doesn't, and what should be applied in the future. Steve spoke to the January PIC meeting that featured a presentation on the content outline for the public State of the Site meetings, and at the end of that document there were a number of recommendations for how to strengthen that type of meeting. Steve said he is impressed with the amount of work done at the public meetings, and he is particularly impressed with the efforts of Dieter and Sharon Braswell, MSA, who walked around the room all night making sure the microphones made it to the people with questions. Steve said he appreciated that participants were allowed to ask follow up questions and provide comments, rather than ask just one question.

Steve said that the PIC made many recommendations for the State of the Site meetings that were accepted and were demonstrated at the meetings. Steve said he was impressed that agency representatives were very careful in their acronym use and were aware of their terminology use. He said Todd Martin, Citizens for a Cleaner Eastern Washington, has a very good sense of the audience as a facilitator.

Steve noted a particular instance during the Portland State of the Site meeting when a participant asked about earthquakes and the nuclear problems in Japan. He said Earl Fordham, Washington State Department of Health, said "This is what we know about Washington," and continued to explain the situation in extremely clear language. Steve said Earl addresses what the issues were and what Hanford is doing about them. Steve said the audience was able to pay close attention to what Earl was saying. Steve noted that Ken Niles also does a wonderful job on behalf of the Oregon Department of Energy, and that public participants easily accept what Ken and Earl explain.

Steve said he thought the publicity for the State of the Site meetings was strong; there was good turnout, and an excellent facilitator. Steve said he was disappointed by the number of Board members who provided comments on their impressions following the State of the Site meetings; he said he only heard from three to four Board members, a small portion of those who attended the Portland meeting. Steve noted that the Board members he did hear from had strong feelings about the meeting.

Norma Jean said she went to the Portland State of the Site meeting and was impressed with how tough questions were handled. She said one participant brought up the Energy Northwest nuclear power plant that is currently in operation at Hanford and will soon have to go through a new permitting process. The participant said he hopes HAB and DOE will pay attention to it and investigate whether or not the facility should continue to operate for another 20 years under the new permit. Steve noted that the participant knew the Energy Northwest plant is not under direct control of DOE-EM.

Sam said he thought it worked well to hold the State of the Site meeting in conjunction with the HAB meeting, as it gave Board members a chance to see an outside of Richland meeting without having to travel for it specifically. Liz noted the downside to the pairing, referencing the lack of time for members to help with HAB advice changes before leaving for the State of the Site meeting. Liz suggested holding the State of the Site meeting on Wednesday of Board Week in order to allow people time to work on advice. Emy said it was difficult for agency representatives to be on point all day long with the HAB meeting and subsequent State of the Site meeting. She said they would have more energy if they weren't on the same day.

Steve said some members of the public started conversations during the open house portion of the meeting and weren't ready for them to conclude when the presentations started, so they continued and people listening to the presentation could hear them in the back of the room. Steve said people want more time to chat, and that the meeting space in Portland was too compact. Paula suggested a five minute warning before the presentations start to help people wrap up their conversations.

Sharon said they received compliments on the round tables with white tablecloths so they will continue with the setup for the next State of the Site meetings. Susan Leckband said the round tables feel more comfortable for participants and foster more dialogue. Paula said they wanted the agency managers to sit among the public rather than at a high table in an authoritative role.

Barb said that some participants in Seattle and Portland were overwhelmed by the amount of material they were asked to track during the meeting; it was information overload. She said the older participants at her table did not know what to do with the material and found it difficult when they were asked to fill things out. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, said he received compliments on the information, but noted that many people in Seattle and Portland thought the budget exercise was too unrealistic without the real numbers. He said many people refused to complete it. Gerry said more emphasis was placed on explaining the exercise at the Tri-Cities State of the Site meeting. Paula said DOE has learned many lessons from that exercise. Sharon said she thought the exercise flowed easier in the Tri-Cities because DOE had just hosted the budget workshop.

Gerry said that in terms of turnout in Seattle and Portland, the citizen groups helped attract a lot of people who hadn't been to that type of meeting before so there was a great opportunity to expand the base of people coming to future meetings. Gerry said the number one topic of concern at the Seattle and Portland meetings was offsite waste. Gerry noted his concern that an op-ed placed in the *Tri City Herald* about the State of the Site meetings didn't even mention that concern. Gerry said he would be interested to know what the managers present at the State of the Site meetings told DOE-HQ, and what other managers from other agencies reported from the meeting. Paula said the purpose of the op-ed was to address concerns about what happened in Japan. The State of the Site meeting had just happened and they thought it was a good tie in. Paula said the op-ed was not meant to summarize everything that had been heard at the meeting. She said the agencies will look at the State of the Site meeting notes and report forward on what they heard. Paula said the op-ed was meant to ease public concern, but she understands Gerry's point.

Gerry said Todd did a great job in allowing people to comment and not just ask questions, which helped the meeting in Portland to flow more easily than the Tri-Cities and Seattle meetings did. He said the allotment of follow up and continuity made for a much better meeting. Gerry said the agencies need to emphasize that the meetings are about feedback and interaction, like Todd did in Portland.

Susan Leckband said she agreed that the Portland meeting went well, but that explaining the game with buttons and other items to track was very difficult. She said people didn't understand. Susan said she sat near the back of the room where the interest groups were still leading conversations during the presentations. She suggested moving the interest groups into a different room for the next meeting, as the noise from the open house area was difficult. Susan said she heard some really good comments, but doesn't find bringing up nuclear energy helpful, as it does not relate to Hanford cleanup. Susan said she does understand that the public needs a venue to voice their concerns.

Steve asked if the agencies tracked how many people responded to DOE with question cards that were provided. Steve said it was a great idea to provide the question cards, and asked how many have been returned for follow up. Sharon said they have only received two of the question cards; those two question cards were handed back to agency representatives before the meeting was over. Sharon said the agencies have followed up with the people who provided question cards.

Barb said she thought Ecology did a great job with the radio public service announcements for the State of the Site meetings. She said she received a lot of feedback from the public that that's how they heard about the meeting. Dieter said the announcements reached the Tri-Cities thoroughly, but that reaching the Seattle and Portland markets was a little harder. Dieter said there were 156 radio spots between Centralia and Seattle, and that the announcements in Oregon reached the whole state. Dieter said they reached out to the major universities in Seattle and Portland. He said they received comments on evaluations that the radio spots or newspaper articles were how the public and students heard about the meetings. Dieter noted that the stakeholder groups were well represented at the meetings. Norma Jean said she heard the announcements at least six times.

Gerry said that the fact that the State of the Site meetings are so successful and important leads back to the issue that there are many members of the public and stakeholder groups that would like a meeting to be hosted in Spokane and Hood River, as well. Gerry said a few people from the Columbia River Gorge attended the Portland meeting. Gerry said that Spokane is the second largest city in Washington, and as a downwind community from Hanford, they have an interest that is not currently being represented. Gerry said that while the Portland public is concerned with the river, the Spokane public is concerned about air quality and Eastern Washington crops. Gerry said the Board and agencies' commitment to those cities needs to be part of the discussion about the CRP.

Gerry said that the agencies need to be willing to address issues that concern leased pieces of Hanford property, like the property leased by Energy Northwest that contains a plant that is utilizing plutonium fuel. Gerry said that to the public, it's all Hanford. He said it undermines the agencies for the managers to tell the public it's not their job. Jean said the agencies need to do a better job at explaining how that property is not under their jurisdiction. Norma Jean said the

agencies need to say they care about the whole site, and the issues need to be addressed carefully. Gerry said that if plutonium fuel is going to be used and it creates waste on site, the public doesn't care which office or company oversees it. Paula said the agencies need to explain to the public how Hanford is set up, and if they don't like how it's set up, they need to find other avenues to address their concerns. They need to talk to their elected officials about Hanford leased property. Paula said they can't bring everyone potentially involved in questions that get asked to the meetings.

Susan Leckband said she understands how the public doesn't understand the distinction between Hanford and Hanford leased property because it is unclear. She said she thought Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, handled the related questions very well. She said the public clearly needs a venue for those types of questions, and DOE should work on how to provide it, but it does not fall under the responsibility of the Board; the Board only addresses DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM) issues. Susan said the public needs to better understand the artificial boundaries. Norma Jean said DOE should be able to help people find answers whether or not it's under their jurisdiction.

Liz suggested the creation of a systems map to help illustrate where all of the agencies fit in, how the site is regulated, and where the leased land is and which agency manages it. Liz suggested the map be provided at all public meetings. Liz also suggested that the decision making process map that Jean made be extended to show the whole system. She said it would be a good opportunity to show how everything fits in and how many different processes there are.

Liz said a few of the Board members and Dieter got together after the Portland State of the Site meeting to talk about what happened at the meeting. Liz said it was an informal debrief and a good community building experience. She said she would like to see more Board members and agency representatives interact socially before or after meetings as it is a good opportunity to hear other perspectives in an informal setting.

Steve asked if the focus of the State of the Site questions are tracked, noting that questions raised in the Tri-Cities are different from those raised in Portland. Steve said it might be a good idea to have a different, focused topic for different locations. Steve said managers do an uneven job of being patient with participants and questions, noting that the managers in Richland spent a longer amount of time listening to the question, considering their answer, and making sure the participant felt their question was answered. Steve said Dennis Faulk, EPA, does a great job in making sure the participant gets their question answered adequately and engages them in a conversation about the topic, which Steve thinks is an excellent technique. Paula said she will make sure DOE hears that feedback. Liz and Gerry echoed that the managers in Richland did an excellent job with follow ups. Barb said she appreciated the collaboration between the agencies in their responses to questions.

Barb asked if a webpage was set up to ask the public for suggestions on State of the Site focuses and themes. Sharon said there is a webpage but only one person has responded. Liz said requests like that need to be made personal, referencing a recent survey that required personal contact to receive feedback.

Gerry said the exercise and written comments are provided for the PIC to see, but there isn't a listing of comments and questions that were actually presented during the meeting. Emy said the meeting summary will address the verbal questions and concerns. Barb said all of their information has been posted to the website.

Summarized Results of the 2013 Budget Exercise

Paula reviewed the summary of the budget exercise that was provided at each State of the Site meeting, noting that 300 people attended the meetings, and that 74 (25 percent) chose to fill out the exercise. Paula said the amount of material on the tables and complication of the exercise may have led to the low completion rate. Paula said people didn't think it provided enough information to be worthwhile. She said Todd thought from the beginning that it was a bad idea to combine the State of the Site meeting with a public budget meeting as there isn't enough time to complete both. Paula said people did not follow the exercise instructions.

Barb said that when there is very rich dialogue during a meeting, it is hard to know how to cut it off and ask participants to complete the exercise. She said people will not stay late to complete the exercise, and the dialogue was too beneficial to want to subtract from it. Barb suggested that more meeting time was needed to explain how to do the exercise.

Paula said that even though the percentages are low, it is clear that the priorities for the Richland public are groundwater, the River Corridor, Transuranic (TRU) waste, and the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). She said the concept of getting PFP running earlier than planned to save money resonates with the public. Paula noted the importance of groundwater to the Richland public.

Gerry asked if it was possible to ask meeting participants to complete the exercise online, and encourage them to not halt their conversations. Barb said the best results are received from in person communication, followed by telephone communication, and lastly by online. She said there will be a decrease in response rate the further away from an event.

Barb said the K Basin and K Reactor language was confusing to people. She said the agencies need to be careful when considering the audience of the exercises and what level of information they will need to provide meaningful feedback. Barb reiterated what Paula said about groundwater, that the topic is important to everyone because it's what they know.

Jean asked how the results of the exercise correspond with the budget request and budget priorities for the next year. Paula said most everything was in sync other than the PFP and TRU waste. She said they are trying to find funding for the PFP, and the TRU waste program is being analyzed by DOE-EM on a national level. Paula said that since all of the waste gets fed into the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), all of the waste sites are merely waiting their turn in an effort to be efficient.

Jean asked what happens next with the public's priorities; if there is anything DOE can do to more align DOE and the public's priorities. Paula said they send the information to DOE-HQ, noting the public meetings that were held, what was heard at those meetings, and where the priorities differ and where they're compatible. She said it is an information data point for them to know what the public wants, but she doesn't know if it can change DOE-EM's priorities. Paula

said it has the potential to affect the budget priorities but there is a lot more to consider than just the results of a budget exercise.

Paula said that for DOE Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), the public focus is more on the completion of the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and tank waste retrieval. She said there isn't a great public understanding of waste feed preparation, the stage between getting it out of the ground and treating it. This reflects that DOE needs to spend more time giving basic instruction on what things mean. Barb said that leaking tanks is a powerful message for the public; groundwater and leakage is what they can relate to.

Paula said there is generally a lot of alignment between the agency and public priorities. She said Central Plateau remediation is low on the priority list for the public, but DOE is going ahead with Process Waste 1, 3, and 6 (PW-1/3/6). Paula reiterated that there is good alignment on groundwater, river cleanup, and the PFP.

Gerry said the results of the exercise are skewed for participants in the Richland meeting; he believes it's not an even breakdown. Paula said that all meetings were included in the summary. Barb noted that 27 exercises were filled out in Portland, 13 in Seattle, and 35 in Richland. She said they can only look at trends.

Norma Jean said she agrees that trends are important. She said the public doesn't need to know about waste preparation if their focus is on tank waste and tank closure. She said DOE doesn't need to worry about it unless they would like to address it specifically in Richland. Norma Jean said the public know about the basics like groundwater and the River Corridor because they are invested in safety. She said it is important for the agencies to place emphasis on the issues important to the public so they know their concerns are heard.

Liz suggested adjustments to the exercise in the future, specifically to contain identification of key contaminants in each area of concern to help build an understanding of the terminology. Paula said the handouts assume a basis of understanding, but that they will provide more descriptions of structures and what is out there. Jean suggested providing the terminology and allowing the interested the search for the terms on the internet on their own. Liz said it is important to build an understanding of the contaminants and terminology in every public meeting, so that when it comes time for a State of the Site meeting or public workshop, the public has a strong knowledge base and won't be confused by terminology.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters, said there is an important step before DOE and the PIC starts to plan for next year's meetings. She said the public needs to hear back from the agencies that their priorities are mostly aligned. She said that if that information coming from the agencies isn't appropriate, the Board can make a public statement about what was heard at the public meetings. Betty said the public shouldn't have to wait for feedback. Gerry said the Board's advice demonstrates some of the significant differences between agency and Board priorities as outlined in the proposed budget. Paula said the Board doesn't comment on what should be a priority on principle, but that DOE has heard what the Board thinks is important. She said it is still up to DOE to determine what order to put the important issues in. Paula said they can't say where the agency and Board priorities are different because the Board doesn't identify priorities.

Betty said someone needs to tell the public that someone is listening, they have been heard, and their comments are being taken seriously. She said that if there isn't alignment in priorities, there isn't much to be done. Liz suggested the PIC or Susan Leckband craft a letter that summarizes what was heard at the State of the Site meetings. She said it can be used to provide feedback and used for total communication. Liz said the letter doesn't have to mention priorities specifically. She said it needs to be something more understandable than the budget exercise summary. She said it wouldn't be a letter addressed to the public, but from the standpoint of people who represent the public.

Barb said HAB members have the responsibility to share information with the public they represent, and to take information from the public to the Board.

Susan Leckband suggested developing an op-ed piece (rather than a letter) about what the Board has identified as their concerns and values. She said she can point out where those concerns and values align with the agencies and can include what was heard at the State of the Site meetings.

Paula said the agencies will send a thank you note to each participant; the thank you note will direct them to the website if they wish to read the meeting and budget exercise summaries. Barb said that the each meeting's notes are provided online, where the public can find a whole suite of information about what is being heard from the public. Sam suggested that the thank you note be printed in the newspaper to show those who did not attend that they missed some active involvement. Liz suggested that in the future, a radio thank you be provided shortly after the meeting.

Laura Hanses, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees of the Hanford Work Force, asked if the next planned meeting is for Spokane. Paula said the agencies have agreed to rotate the meetings around the region but they are not sure where the next meetings will be. She said there will be plans provided later in the year and they will address whether the agencies do more State of the Site meetings, or smaller regional meetings, in the future. Paula said the agencies are considering their options.

Public Meetings – PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Proposed Plan

Liz provided an introduction of the draft advice, noting that it addresses the issue of plutonium and cesium removal. She said the Board is advising DOE to remove the contaminants and the advice provides specific information on how to do it. Liz said PIC was asked to comment on public meetings for this issue. The timeframe for the meetings is July or August. Liz said PIC needs to comment on where to how many meetings to hold, where to host them, and what themes should be followed. Liz said the meetings should be based around what the contaminants are, where they are, and whether or not they should be removed.

Agency Response

Emy said that PW-1/3/6 addresses the buried plutonium and cesium on the Central Plateau, and the agencies have committed to producing a record of decision (ROD) on the issue by September. She said the comment period should fall in mid-June and at the latest by July 1. Emy said the agencies haven't taken any input on the meetings yet, but they are interested to know if

meetings should be held just locally or in other communities, and what the areas of interest are. Emy said the meetings will be on the proposed plans for the waste sites.

Discussion

Betty asked if there are opportunities to combine the meetings with other public meetings on different RODs, noting that it is hard to get the public to attend multiple meetings. Paula said the River Corridor permit and CRP will be coming out but they are after the timeframe needed. Emy said the 100 Area ROD is coming out but it is different from the PW-1/3/6 meetings will address. She said the Unit Process 1, Groundwater (UP-1) is related to PW-1/3/6 and will be in the same timeframe, but she is unsure if the agencies can meet that commitment. Dieter said the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) may not be out for public comment until October, with a ROD in January.

Gerry said he doesn't know why the agencies put out notice that they will post a plan for UP-1 when no one knows what that means. Gerry said it would be easy and would make sense to say the agencies are holding a meeting about groundwater cleanup in the Central Plateau, or about plutonium contaminated sites. Gerry said he shares Betty's concerns about meeting fatigue, as it is also important for the public to attend meetings on the CRP. Gerry suggested holding meetings in communities that have an interest in the river or issues that affect groundwater. Gerry suggested the Tri-Cities, Portland, and Hood River as locations, and the meeting should be combined with other groundwater meetings.

Barb said the unit title needs to be included somewhere at the beginning of the notice to satisfy the administrative record.

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, asked if the buried plutonium and cesium are contained in drums. Emy said it is liquid waste discharged from the PFP. She said 'buried' is not the appropriate word because it is residual contamination that has leaked into the soil; it is not a tank or a burial ground.

Laura said this advice is an opportunity to educate the general public on risk and cleanup decisions. She said the purpose of the advice is to say the Board wants the contamination removed, treated, and disposed of. She said that is the big issue and the public needs to understand the issue. Laura said it makes sense to combine the meeting with a groundwater meeting, and Hood River is a good location.

Susan Leckband said she believes the meetings should be held in communities along the river, certainly in the Tri-Cities and communities downstream. She said if there are any impacts to air quality or there is a distribution of the contaminants as cleanup progresses, those issues need to be part of the discussion as well. She said the meetings should address worker safety. Susan said UP-1 is a down gradient, and it would be appropriate to talk about specific cleanup values from PW-1/3/6 that can impact UP1. Susan said this will be the first proposed plan of this nature to come before the public and the Board. She said these meetings should set the tone and standard for upcoming meetings so it will be important to capture what went well and what didn't. Emy said she appreciated the importance of connecting waste sites with underlying groundwater units. She said UP-1 is part of the same aquifer; everything is interrelated. Emy said the agencies are working on a document to support the bigger picture.

Liz said the meetings will provide an opportunity to bring in common themes like pump and treat, the WIPP, solid waste, the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), and the other general disposal issues. Liz said that waste disposal is a national issue, and it will be important for the public to hear how all of these things are connected. Jean said that the discussions on WIPP and ERDF would not need to be detailed.

Steve said that public involvement becomes education, and the meetings need a strong educational component. Steve said the PW-1/3/6 meetings provide an opportunity to reach out to communities they don't normally go to. He said it is important to introduce the river communities to Hanford issues. Steve suggested hosting a meeting in Vancouver rather than Portland.

Gerry said Spokane should also be considered for a public meeting, and he said he will be pushing for Spokane for a CRP meeting as well. Gerry said it occurred to him as the group discussed materials and education that he would like to see the agencies put the Board's advice on PW-1/3/6 in the information packet. He said it should go out to the public to show what the advisory board has said about this plan. Gerry noted the importance of sharing this advice, and it's publication before the comment period provides an unusual opportunity.

Liz said the agencies should consider holding smaller meetings to provide for better discussion, noting that it is easier to ask questions and participate if there is a smaller audience. She said the meeting could be recorded and posted on YouTube for a wider audience. Liz said the meeting could be held in Hood River with a goal of a maximum attendance of 40. She emphasized that the recording would have to include visual presentations.

Emy said the specifics of the meeting don't need to be identified yet; she just needs to know where to host the meetings. She asked where the Board members constituents are and where they are interested. She asked if the meetings should be held in their communities. Gerry said he represents membership in Hood River and would like a meeting to be held there. He said he's not convinced Vancouver is a better option than Portland, as the public in Portland had an issue getting to the State of the Site meeting hosted on Jantzen Beach in Portland, as it takes an inordinate amount of time to travel North during that time of day. Gerry said they may be settling for a smaller turnout if the meeting is held in Vancouver.

Betty suggested structuring the meetings like focus groups, with invitations sent to suggested participants who haven't been involved before. Betty suggested holding meetings in both Portland and Vancouver. Laura said these meetings will be a huge starting point for educating the public, and a small, invitation-only focus group might exclude people. She said she isn't sure if that type of meeting would benefit the general public. Laura said she wasn't sure about the legal requirements for the meetings, but that a small group should not represent feedback from the general public. She said Hood River would be a good location for the agencies to hear the level of concern about the river.

Liz said she doesn't think it will be a problem to have two smaller meetings and post the recordings online. She said it would prevent the public from getting burned out. She said that Portland just hosted a meeting on the GTCC EIS, and it would make sense to try somewhere else that doesn't get represented a lot. Gerry said the point of these meetings is first and foremost to

provide the public with the opportunity to comment on precedent setting decisions, which would not be well-served with just two meetings. Gerry said he believes there should be at least two meetings outside of a meeting in Richland.

Laura said it is very important to focus on people who care about the river, and that people in the Tri-Cities have frequent opportunity to attend HAB meetings, provide public comment, and see the advice. Laura suggested the HAB agendas be printed in the newspaper to give people notice of advice coming up.

Emy said the 200 Area decisions are different because they're not right on the river, but the agencies are coming out with decisions for where the reactors were near the river. She said they want to emphasize that they need to keep the river clean, but these decisions will include actions to protect groundwater. Emy said she didn't think there is a need to reach the groundwater communities twice. Laura suggested including Hood River in this round of public meetings and Portland in the next.

Liz said it is important to recognize that they will be trying for summer turnout in the middle of July. She noted a meeting in Portland in August being organized by the Physicians for Social Responsibility to address Hiroshima and Nagasaki. She suggested the agencies setup an information booth at that meeting for education, even though it will be past the comment period.

Norma Jean said education is important, and Hood River is important. She said the traffic between Portland and Hood River is hard, and that a larger meeting will be better because the public is really interested in these issues. She said the Central Plateau issues should be addressed at the PW-1/3/6 meetings because the public will want to know if it can get to the River Corridor.

Jean reviewed the main points discussed during the discussion to ensure the agencies heard the suggestions. Susan Hayman noted that these points were also captured during the discussion on the flip chart notes (Attachment 1).

Update on DOE Speakers' Bureau

Gerry said he is curious about presentations and materials being provided during the Speakers' Bureau. Gerry said one of his active members attended a Speakers' Bureau session the Monday before the GTCC EIS hearing in Portland and was disturbed that the speaker didn't know anything about the GTCC EIS hearing that week and couldn't tell the audience anything about it.

Gerry said he is very interested to hear about the goals for the Speakers' Bureau, how much money is being spent, how speakers are trained and what their messages are, and what kind of feedback mechanisms are provided for the public to provide comment on them. Gerry said DOE did the Speaker's Bureau during the early cleanup era, but it was called Hanford Visits Your Town. He said the running joke was that Hanford had already visited and people have the scars to prove it.

Gerry said he has a lot of concern about what's being presented and the cost of doing so. He would like to know how it fits with what PIC is hearing about strategic planning and public

involvement. He said he would like to receive the information he has requested in regards to budget, goals, and materials. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, clarified that the PIC identified questions for the Speakers' Bureau during a call, and Gerry sent additional questions to Cameron Salony, DOE-RL. She said this will not be the only time PIC has to discuss the Speakers' Bureau.

Paula said this discussion started in Portland when DOE previewed some of their recent videos during a Board meeting and also discussed the Speakers' Bureau. During that discussion, DOE captured some framing questions that were enhanced by the PIC call, and DOE developed answers to those questions. She said Gerry's questions only came in one week ago so they did not develop their presentation around them. Paula said DOE would be willing to discuss Gerry's questions at a later time.

Cameron provided handouts of the presentation. He said it provides people with an understanding of what Hanford is through education. He said it is a precursor to public involvement as they are trying to provide a basis of understanding from the beginning. Cameron said he has copies of the feedback forms and a fact sheet that they leave with participants after the meeting.

Cameron said the first Speakers' Bureau was started in 1983 and had a 13 year run. It was restarted in 2009 under the MSA contract after the public had been asking DOE to re-implement the Speakers' Bureau for many years. Cameron said the goal of the Speakers' Bureau is to provide timely and accurate information and to foster dialogue about the Hanford Site. He said the new effort started locally and has since branched out regionally, statewide, and nationwide. Cameron said the presentation is a customizable PowerPoint that is tailored to suit the many different audiences, e.g. technical, high schools, universities, etc. He said the Speakers' Bureau has presented in many high school history classes which provides a domino effect for reaching younger audiences.

Cameron addressed budget issues, saying there is not allotted budget for the Speakers' Bureau, and that this work is being accomplished through "other duties as assigned." He said speakers receive a single, one-hour training before their presentations.

Cameron spoke to the progress of the Speakers' Bureau from 2010-2012. He said the amount of presentations tripled from 12 in 2010 to 36 in 2011 because the public has been requesting them for their schools or organizations. 12 additional meetings are scheduled for the remainder of the 2011 Fiscal Year. For Fiscal Year 2012, Cameron will focus on expanding the project through technology, as requests have come in from as far as Connecticut. He said DOE is looking to host that meeting through Skype sometime next spring.

Cameron provided maps for where the Speakers' Bureau meetings have been held in 2010 and 2011. Cameron's presentation included three filled out feedback forms from three different Speakers' Bureau events. Cameron said the PIC and Board can help the Speakers' Bureau by providing suggestions on potential organizations that may benefit from a presentation.

Cameron said feedback from Speaker's Bureau participants is always positive and includes requests for more presentations or more time. He said questions during the presentations are as basic as "When did you stop using plutonium?"

Betty said she is struck by the history of the Speakers' Bureau, and she wonders why this is not an effort from all three Hanford regulating agencies. She asked if there has ever been a discussion about making the Speakers' Bureau a TPA effort. She said she always has concerns about progress sheets, as they can emphasize progress without putting it into the context of the size of the job or timeframe. She said DOE should not leave audiences with the message that everything is okay. Betty said she would like to be assured that the progress being reported includes reasons for the mission. Cameron said the progress updates include how far cleanup has to go, as well. He said they do not have the intention of making it look like everything is okay. Emy said EPA has its own outreach effort into schools but has a smaller staff. She said they haven't had time to develop a larger effort. Dieter said Ecology provides outreach on a regular basis, reaching out to 5th graders about groundwater issues and attending the fair and outdoorsman shows, for example. He said their effort is not, however, as extensive as the Speakers' Bureau.

Jean asked if she could be provided with a copy of the CD she heard was being handed out at the presentations. Paula said they have been handing out limited copies of *The Hanford Story*, which is available on the Hanford YouTube website. Jean asked how this effort fits in with the effort of the Hanford Site Collaboration Zone. Paula said the Speakers' Bureau does not fit in with the collaboration effort because it is meant to educate people on Hanford, while the collaboration is meant to be more of a technical dialogue. She said DOE is working with a contractor to implement the program, should 2012 funding levels allow it. She said she doesn't know when it can be implemented, but that they haven't lost the concept. Norma asked if Ken Niles is aware of the Speakers' Bureau outreach into Oregon, and suggested that he might be able to provide additional support in regards to Oregon locations and speakers. Cameron said Ken is aware they will be coming to Oregon, and he will be attending a presentation in Tualatin in order to provide feedback.

Sam said he has many ideas for the Speakers' Bureau that relate to previous public meeting discussions. He said the Speakers' Bureau should coordinate with public agencies in smaller towns, like the Chamber of Commerce, and let them select the location and do the advertising. He suggested holding meetings in venues that are not used very much. He said he can see there being zero cost in getting to smaller communities. Sam said that public involvement is education, and the Speakers' Bureau is education for the public. Sam suggested using speakers with a history of positive feedback to engage the smaller communities so they can leave feeling like they know more, and feel better, about Hanford.

Paula noted that some Speakers' Bureau participants think the presentations and subsequent conversations are so great that they wish the whole community would have attended. Cameron said they are looking into providing larger meetings.

Barb asked what the range of time span is for the presentations and conversations. Cameron said it ranges from 20 minutes to one hour, noting that the meetings have never run longer than an hour. He said most people wish they could have more than 20 minutes but are overbooked that day.

Sharon said the Speakers' Bureau provided two engagements in Hood River before the Portland State of the Site meeting, and they encouraged participants to attend.

Liz asked who oversees the program and about time spent going to the engagements. Cameron said that he oversees the Speakers' Bureau, and the pay comes from their regular salary. Cameron said MSA provides the schedule. Paula said the Speakers' Bureau is overseen by the Office of Communications, with Cameron as the first person with the full task to oversee it. She said there isn't a specific charge code for it, but they are getting paid because it is a part of their duties and salary.

Liz asked when the Board faces budget shortfalls and needs to take money away from public involvement if the Speakers' Bureau be a part of that pool. Paula said it is separate and not included in regular public involvement funding.

Liz she knew more about Ecology's outreach efforts than she did about the Speakers' Bureau, which she finds interesting since Ecology's efforts are much less formal. She said she would be curious to know if the agencies can link their efforts together more. Dieter said they have met with the Hanford Communities about how to coordinate efforts, but since everyone is so busy, getting together is challenging. Liz said the agencies should talk about where the others have provided outreach and gain different perspectives.

Laura said she thinks the program is great, as any public outreach keeps the Hanford interest going. She said whatever the program is costing in the long term they will see back tenfold in community awareness. Laura asked how DOE addresses future Hanford uses during the presentations. Cameron said he is in the process of creating a new chapter for *The Hanford Story* to address future uses, but that he doesn't get specific during the presentations because they simply don't know how it will be used, other than the Hanford National Monument. He said he only touches on plans already in place. Paula said they say there are land use plans that provide for different uses because at some point in the future, the site will be cleaned up and can be used differently.

Gerry expressed concern about the lack of a budget for the Speaker's Bureau, and wants to know what the costs are and how they're being absorbed. He said it is important to track the requests, because if there are 50-100 requests in a year, DOE needs to show how they prioritize where they go. Gerry said there was a good discussion at another Hanford forum about the need for the Speakers' Bureau to address why Hanford needs two billion dollars a year. Gerry said that from viewing the handout that is not the message being broadcast. He asked DOE to identify the goal for the Speakers' Bureau and if a plan has been developed for it. He said the PIC would support the development of a plan and would like to be involved. Gerry said he is concerned about the budget because DOE says there is not even funding for a State of the Site meeting in Spokane, yet they can afford to put on these presentations.

Gerry said he questions how appropriate it is to have a contractor be a presenter for the Speakers' Bureau, as they would be representing a federal agency. He said if a presenting contractor gets asked a question about government policy on treaty rights and future land use, Hanford could be in trouble if the contractor answers it. Gerry asked if DOE is allowed to share budget and planning information. Paula said that when the Speakers' Bureau was restarted a year ago, there was unknown interest, so now that they have interest they are very excited. She said the maturing program deserves a plan, and they will start discussing it as the program grows. Cameron said that for a speaker to present in Spokane would mean a mileage reimbursement and that's it. Sam

said even a mileage reimbursement means there's a cost and budget. Susan Leckband said PIC would like to hear from DOE once they have thought about a plan.

Jean said PIC would like to hear the topics they will be addressing, especially future use. She said DOE can have a lot of influence over who they talk to, noting that the Yakama Tribe has heard inaccurate information about what has been presented. Jean would like to ensure there isn't any bias.

Paula said the Speakers' Bureau is a genuine grassroots effort to get information out because DOE is passionate about it. She said there isn't a budget or a plan, but they are to the point where they will take the program seriously and develop a plan and some goals. Paula said she is hearing a lot of negativity from PIC members, and the intention of the Speakers' Bureau is not to be negative or biased. She said she felt DOE was being criticized for doing something they thought was right. She said there is no reason why the federal agency responsible for cleanup of Hanford cannot go out to the public, and they don't always have to do outreach with the regulators.

Gerry said he had a positive conversation recently about the Speakers' Bureau being a tool to explain why DOE needs two billion dollars a year for Hanford cleanup. He said he would like PIC and DOE to look at the program as it matures. Gerry said he would like more information, and he knows DOE has heard his feedback.

Susan Hayman said the PIC has also been saying they would like to know what the other agencies are doing in terms of outreach, and there are more conversations to come.

Tri-Party Agreement – Revision 8

Naomi Bland, DOE-RL, provided a presentation on the changes being made to the TPA. This will be the eighth revision, and the new edition will be roughly the same size as the last.

Naomi provided background information on the document, noting that Revision 7 is nearly four years old. Naomi said the new edition will include all 109 TPA Change Packages that have been approved since Revision 7 was issued, with an addition of four new TPA Change Packages. She noted TPA Change Packages did not include changes that were significant enough for public comment.

The four current TPA Change Packages address changes in the Legal Agreement, Action Plan, Appendix C, and Appendix F. Naomi said most of these changes are minor editorial changes, factual updates, or changing out older documents for newer versions.

Naomi reviewed the timeframe for Revision 8, concluding that it is expected to be available in printed copy for September 2011. Naomi provided information for how to find the up-to-date version of the TPA text online.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said the agencies wanted to share this document with PIC. He said the TPA Change Packages for groundwater and associated tank milestones was the most important

information to make sure was included in the new hard copy. Dennis said they are making changes to the legal agreement, but that a past CRP included a clause of significance so that administrative type changes need not go out for public comment. Dennis said they wanted to demonstrate where the significance comes into play. He said another major change was taking EPA out of the RCBRA process, as they had been included to date.

Jean asked if that change was being made because Washington State has more authority at Hanford than it did in the past. Dennis said that in 1989, when the TPA was written, EPA was still included as a part of RCBRA, but has since delegated that task to the state.

Jean asked where the definition of significance is provided in CRP. Barb said page 10.

Jean asked what will happen to the Mutual Cooperation Funding Agreement that was included in Attachment 3 of Revision 7, which is now being removed. Dennis said the document is out of date and funding provisions are in a different part of the document. He will follow up with Jean.

Betty asked if the Revision 8 will include visible edits so readers can see where the changes were made. Emy said it will be a clean hard copy. Dennis said changes are marked in the TPA Change Packages, but that the Revisions must be signed and printed as clean copies.

Betty asked how long the change packages are. Terry said there have been 109 TPA Change Packages since the last printing, and that by the time the new revision is printed, there will be need for more changes.

Susan Leckband asked if the online version of the TPA is updated as changes occur. Dennis said it is. She asked if there is any expectation of major changes to the document as a result of serious funding profile reductions. Dennis said the changes in that case won't be to the Legal Agreement or the Action Plan, but it may change the deliverable dates. He said that given the budget profile, the agencies know that plans for the Central Plateau will need to change. Susan clarified that work itself will not be changed as a result of funding, but that it may be pushed out. Paula said that when DOE doesn't receive a funding allocation that will allow them to meet certain milestones, they begin talks with the regulators.

Dennis said sections 148 and 149 of the agreement aren't changing, but that they will in the future because they are really out of date. He said the sections relate to the budget and how EPA, Ecology, and the public should engage in budget issues. Dennis said it is always amazing when something that seems simple to update is actually not. He said it is difficult to create new parts of the document when there isn't anything new to compare it to.

Susan Hayman asked the expectation the agencies have for PIC members regarding this update. Dennis said he would like to see PIC bring up the revision in committee meetings and Board discussions. He said the agencies can address it in their updates to the Board, but that they didn't want to surprise the PIC. Susan Leckband said that since the revision isn't really a public involvement issue, it will be more appropriate for the agencies to address it with the Board.

Liz said she printed Revision 7 a while ago when TPA Change Packages were coming out and found it to be a very interesting read. Jean asked if the public can challenge decisions made by the TPA agencies. She asked if there is any way the public can challenge a public consent order

or ROD. Dennis said the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) statute governs how they make decisions, and CERCLA has provisions that the agencies can be sued if the public doesn't like what they're doing. He said it would be independent of the TPA. Dennis said he didn't know if the public could challenge the information in the TPA Agreement, but that they can certainly try. He said he doesn't know what kind of process that would be.

Committee Business

Emy reminded everyone to attend the TPA Quarterly Review Update immediately following the PIC meeting.

Review Follow Up Items

Susan Hayman reviewed follow up and action items.

1. Susan Leckband will write an op-ed about State of the Site meetings and the Hanford budget.
2. Speaker's Bureau:
 - a. Cost and how costs are being tracked
 - b. Plan for Speaker's Bureau, including priorities, how decisions are made to allocate funds, and goals
 - c. Appropriate use of contractors for speakers
 - d. Coordinate efforts with other agencies
 - e. Topics.

Comprehensively Update the 6-Month Work Plan

The PIC discussed the upcoming year and whether or not to hold PIC meetings both before the Board meetings and during Committee Week. The committee decided to plan for only pre-Board meetings in order to accommodate joint topics with other committees that need time during Committee Week, in addition to the more technical committees filling Committee Week with day long meetings. The PIC will use conference calls and webinars to fill in for in-person meetings when issues need to be addressed in off-months. The PIC will plan Committee Week meetings when necessary.

Susan Leckband congratulated the PIC members on integrating into the technical committees. She said the reduced travel and in-person meetings will help with the budget and provide opportunities to address important issues.

The PIC tried to plan around the month of December, knowing that the Board is considering taking that month off due to budget constraints.

The PIC discussed topics they would like to see placed in their six month plan. Some items were added due to timing with other Board issues, and other items were left in the holding bin in order

to accommodate issues with shorter timeframes. The agreed upon Work Plan is attached (Attachment 2).

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Rebecca Holland	Liz Mattson
Earl Fordham	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Norma Jean Germond		Betty Tabbutt
Laura Hanses	Susan Leckband	Jean Vanni

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Cameron Salony, DOE-RL
Naomi Bland, DOE-RL	Michele Gerber, URS Corp	Barb Wise, MSA
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Sharon Braswell, MSA	Emy Laija, EPA	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Follow up to Advice #239 Agency Responses

1. How public values influence decisions (PIC to look at)
2. TPA agencies have said they don't intend to have the strategic plan as part of the CRP. Do intend to have one, just not as part of the CRP.
 - a. Committee Actions to follow up agency responses?
 - i. Would like it incorporated by reference
 - ii. Desire to identify "common threads" among project-specific plans
 - iii. Provide context with calendar

Page 1

Follow up to Advice #239 Agency Responses (cont'd)

- iv. Re-title "calendar" to "Strategic PI Plan"
 1. Use text to define different approaches to public involvement
 2. Online tool (as scroll over event, pop-up with more information, themes, etc.)
 - v. Audience for plan?
 1. Public – to provide for more informed participation
3. Follow up opportunities
 - a. Individual comments on CRP
 - b. Committee Sounding Board
 - c. Board Sounding Board

Page 2

Follow up to Advice #240 Agency Responses

1. PIC would appreciate periodic updates on Hanford Collaboration Zone
2. PIC committees – more discussion on "measurable commitments"

Page 3

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Format for SOS Meetings

1. Presentations
2. Moving around room with microphone for questions
3. Provided glossary of terms
4. Facilitator with background

Page 4

Debrief of SOS Meetings: What worked well and why?

1. Audience questions – microphoned
2. Great facilitation – informed, good sense of audience
3. Relying on Earl and Ken to address “Japan incident” questions
4. Good agency response to HAB format suggestions
5. Handled Lloyd’s question well (Portland) about nuclear power generation (Energy NW)
6. Holding SOS in conjunction with HAB meeting (Portland)
7. Downside to holding it in conjunction was that the advice process suffered on Thursday (not so well)

Page 5

Debrief of SOS Meetings: What worked well and why? (cont’d)

8. Agencies – tough to be at all-day HAB meeting and then all evening meeting (not so well)
9. Liked round tables with white table cloths
10. Managers not “pedestaled” but seated at tables
11. Portland and Seattle – interest groups helped with turnout, many new faces
12. Portland – Todd did better at allowing comments (not just questions) – flowed better
13. Question/comment cards for follow-up (agencies developing responses)

Page 6

Debrief of SOS Meetings: What worked well and why? (cont’d)

14. Kudos on Ecology’s public radio outreach (PSAs), also print media
15. Overall outreach by agencies and interest groups really helped
16. Ask at the end “Does that answer your question (e.g. Dennis Faulk and Doug Shoop)

Page 7

Debrief of SOS Meetings: What DIDN’T work well and why?

1. Good conversation at Open House, but spilling into meeting room (couldn’t hear)
2. More time for Open House discussions (maybe better transition to give five minute warning)
3. Some participants overwhelmed by information at the table

4. Budget exercise difficult for some participants (more time to devoted to explaining it in Richland)
5. Follow up OP-ED didn't address offsite waste concerns expressed (Richland)

Page 8

Debrief of SOS Meetings: What DIDN'T work well and why? (cont'd)

6. Explaining game with buttons – difficult to hear and understand (interest group discussions) – Portland – proximity to Open House
7. Not good response on invitation for topics (TPA)
 - a. Hanford Challenge followed up with individuals via emails

Page 9

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Future Applications

1. Success of meetings and outreach may make future meetings in Spokane and Hood River possible
 - a. Spokane “downwind” community from Hanford
2. Agency meeting – need to consider that to the public, “it’s all Hanford.” Look for opportunities to provide information on issues that may arise (DOE issues, Ecology issues, etc.). Satisfy the issue, provide feedback. Balance between addressing questions, and illuminating how “site” is managed (Energy NW, other issues).
 - a. Offer to get back to people

Page 10

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Future Applications (cont'd)

3. Develop a “system map” that shows context and interconnection (applies to #2 concerns, too)
 - a. Have this at all public meetings
4. Post-meeting informal conversations to talk about impressions
5. Track kinds of topics for questions and comments, by location

Page 11

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Feedback on budget exercise

1. Feedback from facilitator (Todd)
 - a. Too complex to combine SOS with budget workshop
2. Exercise itself
 - a. Too low response
 - b. People didn't follow instructions in some cases
 - c. Information agencies did get was helpful
 - d. More “stars” than “dots”
 - e. Need more time to explain exercise

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Feedback on budget exercise (cont'd)

3. Future ideas – fill out at home, online after meeting
 - a. Raised hands (rather than filling out)
 - b. Need information to inform choices
4. Keep choices simple: safety, environment
5. Maybe add key contaminants of concern for budget items (i.e. content)
6. Useful to indicate for next year's meetings the alignment between what public said versus agency priorities – maybe HAB weigh in? (news release?)

Debrief of SOS Meetings: Feedback on budget exercise (cont'd)

7. Suggestion – letter from HAB that reflects on what SOS heard about budget priorities
 - a. Share with constituents
 - b. OR – OP-ED piece on HAB values, concerns, alignment with agency priorities, public input, how to stay involved
8. Suggestions for agency:
 - a. Follow up thank you in newspaper/radio/other media for attending meeting

Public meetings for PW 1/3/6 – CW-5

1. Look for opportunity to combine topics for summer meeting, e.g. “cleanup of groundwater in plutonium sites on Central Plateau
 - a. Board values would encompass both [PW 1/3/6, CW-5, UP1, ZR1 (since down gradient)] – but leave off alphabet soup.
2. Communities – Tri-Cities, Hood River, Portland
3. Educate people on risk and clean up decisions (RTD)
4. Air quality and employee safety

Public meetings for PW 1/3/6 – CW-5 (cont'd)

5. Also discuss general disposal issues (WIPP, ERDF, etc) – may not need to be super detailed, but a useful educational component
6. Maybe Vancouver? A different river-impacted community
7. Include HAB advice in informational materials for meeting
8. Consider planning around a smaller audience, record and post on YouTube.

Public meetings for PW 1/3/6 – CW-5 (cont'd)

9. Risk, S&GW cleanup, cleanup decisions and levels, AQ, safety for workers, ERDF/WIPP, pump and treat, CoC, HAB advice
10. Hood River, Richland (Tri-Cities), Portland – (Vancouver - Focus Group, by invitation, smaller venue)

PIC moving forward

1. Full day placeholder for Wednesday pre-board meeting.
2. Take “joint topic” opportunities with other committees.
 - a. EIC discuss need for additional time on technical agendas.
3. TPA quarterlies – still try to coordinate them with PIC meetings

Follow Up Items

1. Susan Leckband will write an op-ed about State of the Site meetings and the Hanford budget.
2. Speaker’s Bureau:
 - a. Cost and how costs are being tracked
 - b. Plan for Speaker’s Bureau, including priorities, how decisions are made to allocate funds, and goals
 - c. Appropriate use of contractors for speakers
 - d. Coordinate efforts with other agencies
 - e. Topics.

Attachment 2 – PIC 6-Month Work Plan

<p style="text-align: center;">June <i>(Committee Call)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Meetings for Groundwater Cleanup of Plutonium Sites on the Central Plateau 	<p style="text-align: center;">July <i>(Committee Call)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of CRP review
<p style="text-align: center;">August <i>(Committee Week)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CRP review (prior to public comment period) – potential advice development for September 	<p style="text-align: center;">September <i>(Pre-Board Meeting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public understanding of cleanup levels- Clean doesn't mean "all gone." (opportunities to make this a thematic tie with 2015 Vision) Risk Communication How the HAB is seen by the public as its own "public involvement effort" Debrief from public meetings on groundwater cleanup of plutonium contaminated sites on the Central Plateau
<p style="text-align: center;">October <i>(Committee Call)</i> <i>TBD</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">November <i>(Pre-Board Meeting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What's the right level of involvement for what kind of topics? Ways to reach younger audiences (what's working, other ideas) How to distribute the Hanford PI workload (agencies/interest groups) Involving other communities (Spokane, etc) What components should be in agency strategic plan? Debrief CRP public meetings Working with agency responses and how they influence future work, strategy for moving forward

Holding Bin

- Develop proposal for a specific HAB-sponsored public evening seminar (e.g. Thursday night of Board meeting) – to further education and public involvement goals
- February: Post-decision agency engagement techniques (Dennis Faulk's request for committee input)
- April: Discussion of agency responsiveness to TC&WM EIS