

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING  
July 7, 2010  
Richland, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and introductions ..... 1  
Recent Public Involvement Experiences, Opportunities and Evaluations-What Have We Learned?..... 2  
Open vs. Closed Meetings ..... 7  
State of the Site Meetings in 2010 ..... 9  
Strategic Planning Process – Synthesis and Next Steps ..... 12  
Action Items / Commitments ..... 15  
Handouts ..... 15  
Attendees..... 15

*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 (PIC) committee chair, welcomed everyone and introductions were made. He said there are some items that were raised at the executive issues committee retreat that should be addressed. He said the PIC committee has been asked to discuss ways to present cleanup successes and positive milestones at Hanford. He said there should also be discussion on membership demographics and a succession plan for the Hanford Advisory Board that recruits younger members.

Steve said another topic of discussion is the evening seminars where the public can come and learn about a single topic of interest. Liz Mattson said the proposal to have an evening seminar in conjunction with the September Board meetings conflicts with Rosh Hashanah. The committee agreed to discuss the timing of the evening seminar later in the meeting.

## **Recent Public Involvement Experiences, Opportunities and Evaluations-What Have We Learned?**

The PIC Committee discussed several recent public involvement efforts to identify what worked well, what did not work well, and future application of the lessons learned. The discussion points originally captured during the meeting on poster-sized tables can be found in Attachment 1: July PIC Committee Meeting Transcribed Flip Chart Notes, pages A-1 through A-7.

### *TPA draft change packages public meetings*

Steve said the PIC committee has started debriefs of public involvement events to shape future public meetings and find out what is working and what is not. He said the most successful meetings were the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change package meetings because there was a good meeting structure and the topic transitions made it easy to understand. There was a clear sense of how the public can participate and the speakers were very good at defining acronyms and being understandable.

- Gerry Pollett said the TPA change package meetings were for an audience that had a working knowledge of the topics. He said the TPA change package public meeting was not targeted for the broader, general public, compared to the Tank Closure and Waste Management (TC&WM) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) public meeting.
- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the purpose of the change package meeting was to create dialogue and to share perspectives. He added that the Portland meeting had difficult transitions on offsite waste.
- Liz said the format of the change package meetings was similar to a workshop, and people could interrupt presenters to ask questions.
- Pamela McCann said there was an overview of the topics and then a discussion.
- Steve said the PIC committee and issue managers helped identify the topics for each meeting. The topics were different for the two meetings.
- Liz said the amount of information provided at the meetings was intentional to avoid too much content.
- Pamela added that visuals were provided.
- Paula Call, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said there were discussions in advance of the meeting with stakeholder groups involved with Hanford regarding the dates, location, and structure of the meetings.
- Dennis said he felt he was able to give his perspective on issues, and that people were listening to him, whether they agreed or not.
- Ken Niles said at the Portland meeting some people were very angry, and Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, did a good job at not getting defensive.

- Pamela said a larger crowd might not have worked as well. Liz said the agency participation was perfect, and the proportion of agency personnel to public was conducive to dialogue.
- Susan Leckband suggested having flip chart notes on a large screen to make sure people know what was said during the meetings.
- Barb said there was a comment on elected officials and decision makers being present. Dennis said the decision makers for the agencies were there.
- Steve asked if taping the meeting in Seattle worked. Gerry said KEXP videotaped the meeting and it was posted on YouTube. Lisa Van Dyk, Heart of America Northwest (HoANW), said that people asked her for the video of the meeting. Liz said having the meetings videotaped would be useful for providing an example of meeting format.
- Steve said it was clear that people had a lot of questions, demonstrating that people do not usually have an opportunity to ask those types of questions and get a good response. Dennis said the amount of agency representatives who can successfully conduct that type of dialogue is fairly limited. He said not getting defensive is very important. Liz said the capacity and the type of dialogue is dependent on the topic and the agency members required.
- Dennis said it was useful to keep the scope of the meetings smaller and have core questions. Gerry said it was important to tell people that the questions were chosen in conjunction with stakeholders and the PIC committee, not just the agencies. Susan said to provide a clear explanation of the genesis of the meetings and where the agenda came from for future applications. She said to be respectful of other questions, but to be sure to address the questions on the agenda.
- Steve suggested providing meetings on specific topics to enable the public to gain familiarity and understanding.
- Liz said the Pre-1970 Transuranic (TRU) waste topic had a follow up meeting. It might be useful in the future to provide these follow up opportunities for focused topics.
- Susan suggested a clear list of agency and stakeholder contacts for more information.
- Liz said there is an empowerment dynamic associated with Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) meetings. This dynamic should be discussed to make sure perspectives are heard and there is a less “authoritarian” structure for public meetings, much like HAB meetings.
- Gerry said the TPA change packages meetings were designed for people that had participated in other meetings. Liz said there were some people who were there for the first time and said the meeting was useful for them. Gerry said if that were the majority of the attendees, the meeting format may not have worked. Lisa said she talked to a volunteer who was at her first meeting, and

she was not able to follow the topics. She is hesitant to say that the topics are accessible to everyone. Dennis said the messages are rarely directed toward people who have never had experiences with Hanford. Liz said having the intention of an informed audience seems to have worked for past meetings.

#### *DePaul University presentation*

Ken provided opening remarks. He said there has been discussion in the past by a number of Hanford stakeholders who are concerned about a potential loss of national will regarding cleanup. One of the questions raised was whether it would be possible to develop a message about Hanford cleanup that could engage people outside of this region. Ken met with students at the University of Oregon a few years ago to seek some input on developing such a method. The students, who came from throughout the nation, said the focus should be on the Columbia River, as everyone knows about the river and can sympathize with the idea of protecting important waste sources. Unfortunately, Ken never found the time until recently to pursue this idea.

While on a recent trip to Chicago, Illinois, Ken met with two classes of students at DePaul University. He contacted a number of professors at the University in advance of his visit to determine interest. One class was a graduate level environmental studies class and the second a more general undergraduate environmental class. His presentation initially focused on the Columbia River and all the benefits it brings, including water for agriculture, industry, fisheries and drinking water. He then discussed Hanford and its proximity to the river, the history of Hanford, and the risks posed by Hanford's wastes.

Ken said his presentation took about 20 minutes, followed by 20 minutes of questions from the students, followed by 20 minutes of discussion and his questions of the students. Ken noted that the environmental studies majors were very interested and many expressed interest in taking some sort of action. He said the general studies students were less engaged. Now that he has what seems to be an effective presentation and message, he is now looking for input and gauging interest from the PIC committee. He said there might be other avenues to gain national interest or expand upon this concept.

- Dieter Bohrmann, Department of Ecology (Ecology), asked if the students had any advance knowledge of Hanford. Ken said he provided some basic information. A student from Seattle said he learned more from the presentation than he has from living in Seattle.
- Liz said peer presentations given to fellow students can be very effective, since they have so much in common with the audience.
- Emy Laija, EPA, said having a course or presentation might be useful to consider. She said it is important to get the information to people before they are in their careers and have many other things taking up their time. Dennis said developing curriculum would be useful.
- Ken said the response from the professors was surprisingly receptive.
- Susan suggested having a Hanford 101 presentation or class at the high school level to get kids interested. She said public interest groups could take any interest to the next level.

- Ken asked if Ecology has developed Hanford curriculum. Madeleine Brown, Ecology, said she thinks so, but not for the college level.
- Susan said high schools are very cautious of what is presented in the classrooms.
- Gerry said that there was a survey targeting University of Washington students that showed a huge lack of knowledge of Hanford. Because of this, there was a project to develop high school curriculum for Hanford. In this process the students learned that there has to be a concerted effort to go through the superintendent and have it as part of the science curriculum in order to have it in the high school curriculum. He said there is an outline of the curriculum developed. Lisa will email the curriculum to Susan Hayman to distribute.
- Ken said that one of the professors he talked to mentioned that text books do not have anything regarding the nuclear weapons cleanup program.
- Susan said the PIC committee can work with teachers and schools.
- Gerry said curriculum based on the interest of the agencies would have credibility issues. Dennis said a professional in curriculum development would be hired.
- Ken said the presentations to the students went well and next time he will try to engender a greater interest in action. Susan said she would like Ken's presentation to be given at Hanford High school.
- Liz asked if Ken thought it would be helpful to have more than one presenter. Ken said he had a note taker, which was helpful.
- Pamela said the potential benefits of protecting the Columbia River should be made clear to the students. Ken said the intent was to see if it is possible to develop national interest, and the students were aware of Hanford. The students realized that it did not impact them directly, but the river is a national treasure. Liz said a motivation for teachers to use Hanford curriculum is to have a real world example that would prompt more interactive learning. Emy said there has to be awareness before involvement.

*100-N/NR 1/2 (general public involvement activities)*

Liz said she wanted to discuss this agency action to look at the strategies that were used for engaging the public and to identify missed opportunities. She said for this process could have lent itself well to familiarize the public with cleanup concepts and vocabulary that would apply across the site. This would make the broader concepts more understandable for future actions.

- Dennis said for the most part the public is fairly comfortable with the issues covered in this action. He said this action has a fairly long history, and is an example of the projects where discussions with the HAB result in the issues being fairly well worked out by the time they are brought forward to the public.

- Steve asked if these discussions are archived so newcomers can catch up to the topics. Madeleine said Ecology revised and reissued a focus sheet about apatite and strontium to help people understand the issues in the decision under public comment. Susan Hayman noted that HAB discussions would be noted in committee/Board meeting summaries.
- Liz said when discussing risk, having a real example makes it more tangible. Meetings around such topics are a chance to teach the public and get input at the same time.
- Paula said there can be educational meetings on topics that seem to be of interest in order to comment on the issue. Susan said having a tutorial on certain topics would be good, and we should decide if that should be done.
- Dennis said the 100-N Area has a particularly confusing cleanup plan. Dennis said having the agencies agree on messages is a challenge and that is why the fact sheets are so focused. Liz said other organizations have more flexibility in messaging and can have more perspectives on topics.

#### *NRDWL/SWL*

Liz suggested that this agency action was another activity to involve the public in discussions that might help them understand “bigger picture” issues across the site. Currently, public involvement on this agency proposal is principally public review and comment on the draft environmental assessment and closure plan.

- Liz reiterated that the project fact sheet on the Hanford website still lists the original comment period (it has been extended). She asked again if it would be possible to update the online fact sheet with the correct date.
- Paula agreed that this change on the online fact sheet would be good to do, and will follow up on this.

#### *2008 State of the Site (SOS) meetings*

Lisa said HoANW conducted a survey last year based on the 2008 SOS meetings. She and Gerry shared the results summarized on two handouts. There were 167 responses, and it was distributed over email. She compiled the short answer responses and highlighted the reoccurring themes.

- Barb asked if the survey was completed primarily by meeting attendees. Gerry said they did follow up with phone calls and email to the meeting attendees. The TPA list serve was used as well. He said there is roughly 600 people on the list serve and 43% were citizens not affiliated with an agency.
- Gerry reviewed the public involvement survey results. He said the results are skewed by the fact that most participants responded by email. Barb said some people on the TPA lists request to only get a hard copy of notifications.
- Gerry said an important lesson is that an open rate for an email is less than 20% and open rate of snail mail is 95%. He said because of this multiple emails are vital to get the information out. Paula said sending multiple emails is not always well received. Gerry said multiple reminders would be different.

- Gerry added that from the survey it was clear that there is value in having agencies present once a year.
- Susan asked how many responses constitute a theme. Lisa said 4-5 related responses were described as a theme.
- Gerry said half of the individuals surveyed said their questions were appropriately responded to.
- Lisa said when people were asked about the format of the meetings many said there was not enough time for public comment, and more dialogue with representatives was a large point. The feeling of being lectured was another theme in the short answers. People said they are likely to read email.
- Gerry said the format of the meetings was in a circle and agency representatives were in an inner circle (nested circles). The facilitator then took the microphone around for questions. There were informational boards instead of PowerPoint presentations. He said the meetings were fairly traditional, and there was an open house before the meeting. He said there were no break-out sessions by topic; it was open topic and the idea was to have dialogue.
- Gerry said in the survey people voiced that there needs to be better responses from the agencies to their questions.
- Dennis said the PIC Committee should look at what made the successful meetings successful. Gerry said there were three years of meetings on groundwater. He thought that having key issues and an agenda gets the conversation going.
- Liz asked if the survey answers from the meeting attendees could be cross-referenced. Lisa said this is possible, but would be very tedious.
- Steve asked if the meeting space makes a difference in the meeting dynamic. Gerry said people like the Oregon state office building because there is easy parking. It is also a more intimate space.
- Barb said the Oregon state office is more personalized. Dennis said he is always more comfortable in a public space.
- Madeleine said Ecology is required to use public facilities for their hosted meetings.

### **Open vs. Closed Meetings**

Ken introduced the open meeting issue. He said the Environmental Management Advisory Board -Tank Waste Subcommittee (EMAB-TWSC) recently held a closed meeting in Richland, which prompted concern over when meetings should, if ever, be closed. His inquiries with other HAB members indicate that closed meetings are an

infrequent occurrence. He said space limitation is one consideration, and it seems that the few closed meetings are not under local control.

To follow up on the EMAB-TWSC meeting, Ken e-mailed Terry Lamb, DOE-EM, about requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requiring that meetings be open. He said she replied that, under FACA, subcommittee meetings are not required to be open meetings. In her response she did not address his point on it not being good policy to close meetings. Ken's contacts on the EMAB did not think they would be able to influence DOE-EM's position on this issue. Ken feels there are important issues discussed in these EMAB subcommittees that the HAB and others should be able to at least observe.

### **Regulator Perspective**

- Paula said FACA is what the HAB operates under and subcommittees do not have to follow the same guidelines as the full board. She said the reason for FACA is to have open meetings. The subcommittees take on the technical work and do not provide direct input to DOE.
- Other guidance regarding public involvement in agency actions comes through in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The requirements for public involvement under these laws are included in the TPA Community Relations Plan.
- Dieter said that Washington State has "sunshine laws" that require that meetings be open to the public. There are exceptions for those times when "executive sessions" would be needed. He said, in general, it is in Ecology's best interest to be as transparent as possible and have all meetings open.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Ken said that there was a long history of closed meetings during the early days of Hanford cleanup. Paula asked which meetings have been closed in the past. Ken said the technical meetings with contractors used to be closed.
- Ken said there are still issues with schedule conflicts. He asked if EMAB meetings are supposed to be fully open. Pamela said yes, unless the meeting is dealing with national security.
- Gerry said the exceptions for keeping a meeting open are very small, and there are specific government accountability office regulations under FACA. He said issue managers meetings are different than making recommendations to the Board. He said DOE was required to have an open government plan, and advice on this is something the PIC committee could provide. He said it would



be worth looking at the open government plan to provide input. Paula said she saw the open government plan. It was mostly a plan to make information available on the Web. Gerry said DOE was advised to have three high value databases for public involvement.

- Susan said the HAB is an EM advisory board and its committees are “subcommittees.” Gerry said he thought the policy was that anyone can attend meetings. Paula said the HAB exists under FACA, which governs it. Gerry said Ecology cannot take advice from an entity that does not meet the open meetings policy act.
- Dennis announced that EPA is trying to get a meeting together with people who work on DOE and Department of Defense (DOD) sites to discuss the open government plan. There should be invitations going out soon to go to Washington D.C. for this meeting.
- Gerry said the PIC committee should have a discussion on the open government plan.
- Ken offered to develop draft advice on open meetings.
- Gerry offered to be the issue manager for the open government plan.

### **State of the Site Meetings in 2010**

Steve said the PIC committee has an interest in making recommendations regarding format, potential dates and outreach for the 2010 SOS meetings. He said taking advantage of the time before the meetings occur to publicize and educate people will result in attracting a larger audience. He said the SOS meetings are a different type of meeting than the TPA change package workshops.

The discussion points captured on flip charts that summarize this discussion can be found in Attachment 1: July PIC Committee Meeting Transcribed Flip Chart Notes, pages A-8 through A-9.

- Madeline said the objectives for the SOS meetings have remained the same, to give the public access to the agency decision makers at Hanford.
- Susan said it is important to have a focused agenda when having access to the decision makers. Emy said having focus is important for structure. Liz said public values should be considered when choosing topics to be discussed. For the Tri-Cities, worker health and safety should be addressed for example.
- Steve said groundwater was a big ticket item that people were concerned about. Pamela said American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding was another issue people were interested in.
- Susan said values can be based on the Columbia River like Ken’s presentation. Making a common theme would be good to connect people and

get public values. Steve said there has to be a thematic thread. Ken said one idea would be asking that the agencies have presentations with just pictures surrounding a common theme.

- Emy said the EPA is not fond of PowerPoint presentations.
- Pamela said it is important to find a way to relate to groundwater, as well.
- Liz suggested there be a theme for a series of public meetings such as “what is cleanup?” There isn’t a common understanding of what this means to the agencies and the public.
- Gerry said it works best if there are specific topics that are facilitated. Susan said people get the most out of specific topics.
- Liz said having each topic posed as a question might be useful. Such as “what does cleanup mean to you?” She said it is important to approach the public wanting to hear from them, not tell them something. Ken said if agencies define what they envision as cleanup with caps and pump and treats lasting potentially for decades, it would shock the public. There are other things that could be asked however. Steve said posing questions would expose the complexity of the issues, and it is healthy to realize how intricate cleanup at Hanford is.
- Ken brought up having a balance. He said the challenges as well as accomplishments should be discussed to show what changes have been made based on public input.
- Gerry said, with the exception of Ecology, the agencies didn’t display changes made based on public comment and the state response. He said issues that the public has been involved with in the past should be tracked. Dieter said litigation may have created confusion on what could be said publicly.
- Emy asked if the SOS meetings are geared towards an informed audience. Liz said there can be informed topics that are assessable. She said things such as delays are important, anyone could understand these things at a high level and detailed questions can be asked.
- Steve said there has to be access to education. Hanford 101 can only be done so many times. He said Ecology’s fact sheets are very good for education.
- Ken said Liz’s idea of posing questions as topics makes the topics more accessible.
- Gerry said DOE-Headquarters could come and talk about topics at meetings.
- Liz said there could be beginner sessions before talking about the topics at a meeting.
- Ken said there are small groundwater models that could be used at the SOS meetings.

- Liz asked if not relying on paper and not have handouts would be a useful adjustment.
- Susan said she has seen a few maps made of Legos representing waste disposition. She suggested that this concept be used on a smaller scale to show where the waste is going to go. Liz said this concept should be used with a map of Hanford.
- Steve added that having comments recorded in a visible way makes a big impression.
- Liz said at the Seattle workshop the amount of TRU waste was shown and there ended up being three different ways of capturing comments, which worked well.
- Laura said she will find out if there is going to be an all-employee meeting. This gives a forum for employees for health and safety issues, and then the SOS meetings can be directed at the public. She suggested changing the order of the meetings so that the Richland meeting is not the first meeting.
- Emy said the last week in September is being discussed for starting the SOS meetings.
- Liz said it seems as if there are too many meetings in a short time. She asked if the SOS meetings could be spaced out more. Barb said it has to do with the availability of the agency representatives that are present at the meetings.
- Madeleine said if there is too much space between the SOS meetings the issues being discussed might change.
- Emy added that there is not a push for a comment period with the SOS meetings.
- Barb said holidays and weather start becoming an issue with how far you push the meetings out into the Fall.
- Gerry said Eugene, La Grande, and Spokane should be considered for potential SOS meeting locations. Laura asked if those cities have had SOS meetings in the past. Gerry said Spokane did have a meeting a few years ago. Laura asked why there have not been any more meetings in Spokane. Barb said the interest level in Spokane was specific to an issue and the public said they did not need a meeting every year. Gerry said that should not be the deciding factor for holding meetings there.
- Emy asked if there could be other ways of participation in more cities, and then have the SOS meetings with physical contact in only certain cities.
- Ken said there were considerable efforts made to get a good turnout for the TC&WM EIS public meetings and it would be hard to duplicate that effort. Gerry agreed.

- Barb said as cleanup has accelerated it has become harder to get face time with the agencies and key decision makers. It is not that the agencies do not want to be responsive; however it has become more difficult.
- Ken suggested the possibility of having focused meetings in the future to replace the SOS meetings. Liz said there could be overarching themes to the focused meetings. Gerry agreed and said for Eugene, Spokane and La Grande there should be a meeting of sorts.
- Liz said the PIC committee should have a follow up SOS meeting phone call to talk about outreach strategy.
- Emy said there might be pushback from the agencies on what dates and how many meetings the PIC committee suggests and there will have to be discussion on this.
- Barb said the format of the meetings are important to consider to be aware of what facilities are needed.
- Susan said the PIC committee members should reflect on today's discussion to prepare for the call on SOS meetings.
- Dieter said the last week in September is a good place to start for the SOS meetings.
- Liz said Hanford challenge is planning an ice cream social to get input on the 2010 SOS meeting format and topics. She said she will send out the invitations and a survey is being developed.
- The committee decided to have a follow-up call to refine their recommendations on meeting design and outreach on July 19 at 10a.m. The agencies will also bring forward potential meeting dates at this call.

### **Strategic Planning Process – Synthesis and Next Steps**

Liz provided a handout documenting the public involvement strategic planning process and products to date. She said the PIC committee can look at what has been done and see what has the potential for advice.

Emy provided a brief update on the Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Community Relations Plan (CRP), as this document would be informed by the HAB's public involvement strategic planning advice. The CRP is a large undertaking in itself. She said EPA has tried to make the CRP flow a little more logically and handed out a new outline for the CRP. She said section 3 of the CRP, the public involvement plan, has been changed and they are looking at goals for public involvement and evaluating the process and want the PIC committee to provide input.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Liz said there was a sense that the CRP and PIC advice were dependent on each other. She said the advice pieces so far are to revise the public involvement process. She said submitting a white paper is an option to capture the journey taken and provide ideas for public involvement. A flow chart has been started and as another option and a draft strategic plan for the CRP. This strategic plan could have specific details on how public involvement will be conducted. She then reviewed the work that the PIC committee has done surrounding public involvement and said the committee needs to figure out how to draft advice from this work.
- Susan asked if these public involvement improvements would be for the HAB or DOE. Liz said it is for DOE's CRP plan. Emy said it would be difficult for the PIC committee to developing something for an agency document. She said providing suggestions on public involvement would be the best way to inform the process.
- Gerry asked if the agencies have signed off on annually updating the strategic public involvement plan. Steve read the agency response to the advice that requested an annual update to the public involvement plan. The response said annual updates would not be able to be added to the CRP. Gerry asked if the updates could be an appendix on the web site.
- Liz said the process that the PIC committee went through has generated many ideas and some layers might relate to the CRP and some may not. Liz said the PIC committee could draft advice on the public involvement plan or aspects of it. She said there is also the potential flow chart on public involvement for the Hanford site. Susan said that flow charts are valuable but take a long time to create. Emy said it seems that the materials the PIC committee has produced can be integrated and considered for the CRP.
- Gerry asked what the second bullet under Section III on the public involvement plan outline means. Emy said that was a mistake and should read "regulatory decision processes".
- Ken said there are some SOS meeting topics that could be advice as well.
- Susan asked if when DOE gives HOA information they just forward it on. Gerry said usually but not always. He said all HOA materials have links to other information also.
- Barb said a few years ago there was advice on public involvement, and reminded that advice should remain policy level.
- Liz suggested that the process of creating a white paper could narrow these ideas. Barb said there are also opportunities to look at ideas graphically. Pam said it is important to understand the basis of why advice is being crafted. Susan said there is usually a background section to look at the basis of the advice.

- Gerry said with data from a survey shows where meetings have fallen short.
- Liz said the PIC committee could draft advice listing the public involvement goals and suggested tools. Barb said to look at the overarching principle in what has been developed.
- Ken, Steve and Gerry said they would draft advice on meeting design and principle.
- Liz said she will work on the public involvement principles advice. Susan said she will help Liz.

### **Committee Business**

Susan Hayman handed out the six-month work plan to the PIC committee. This was discussed, and Susan will update the plan accordingly.

Steve said CRP should be discussed in the August meeting.

Ken said the open government plan should have more discussion. He said the TC&WM EIS, and the consent decree has yet to come.

Madeleine said the PIC committee should have a discussion on the design of workshops and public involvement approaches for resource conservation and recovery act and dangerous waste. Laura asked if there is a date associated with this. Madeleine said she is not sure, most likely within the next 9 months.

Steve said there should be discussion of the TPA quarterly. Dieter said there is a phone call in July on the TPA quarterly.

Gerry said he might be away in august but the open government plan should be distributed for committee review.

Ken said he will distribute draft advice for the EMAB subcommittee being open to the public. Liz asked who from the agencies attends the EMAB meetings.

Steve said there was a draft document on Ecology's public involvement for its RCRA permit that Ron Skinnarland did. Madeleine said it needs to be updated. Liz said if it is updated it would be good to collaborate with the PIC committee.

Gerry said he could be the issue manager for the public involvement on the site wide permit. He said there should be discussion on access to the drafts within this.

Gerry said the PIC committee should discuss the scope of the open government plan and potential advice could be done on issues discovered.

The PIC committee agreed to distribute the open government plan and move the discussion to September.

Liz said a review of the public involvement calendar for the next year should be done. Emy said the dates might change, however it would be good for planning purposes.

Steve said board priorities should be discussed by the PIC committee.

Dieter said Ecology posted the public involvement calendar on their webpage. He said it is called “printer friendly TPA calendar”.

Ken asked if there is news about when the burial ground workshop is going to be. Emy said this workshop got pushed from the summer to the fall. Susan suggested talking about the burial ground workshop on the EIS call. Ken said the PIC should talk about the Burial ground workshops to see if there is a PIC piece.

The PIC committee went over the August meeting topics and discussed moving the potential evening seminars topic to April.

**Action Items / Commitments**

- Plan an evening seminar
- Lisa to send Susan H. curriculum link > Susan to distribute to PIC
- Script and presentation to Susan H. to distribute as requested
- Identify topics of interest for public discussion, outside of public comment period
- DOE to follow up on updating on-line NRDWL-SWL fact sheet (extended comment period)
- Should PIC provide advice for board to consider re: EM open Government plan? – Gerry/ Open meetings and EMAB sub-committee - Ken
- Susan L. to provide general counsel communication re: HAB subcommittees to Gerry

**Handouts**

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

- Public Involvement Plan Outline: Draft CRP outline, DOE, July 2010.
- Public involvement strategic planning process-HAB PIC committee, Liz Mattson, July 7, 2010.
- Public Involvement Survey: results, HOA, June 30, 2010.
- Summary of short answer responses from the public involvement survey, HOA.

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

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

**Others**

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Blair Scott, EnviroIssues
	Emy Laija, EPA	(on phone) Lisa Van Dyk, HOA
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, MSA



## **July PIC Committee Meeting - Transcribed Flip Chart Notes**

### **Event Debriefings** *(originally captured on poster-sized tables)*

**Event:** TPA Draft Change Packages Public Meetings

**Purpose(s) of the Event:**

- Discuss specific aspects of the change packages
- Provide public input
- Create a dialogue on Hanford cleanup

**Locations:** Portland, Seattle

**Format:**

- Targeted an informed, knowledgeable audience tracking issues
- Kept smaller size group by “limiting” outreach
- Workshop format: Brief presentations with display boards and handouts (no PPT)
- Focused on 3-4 topics of specific interest to these locations
- Quick review and then discussion
- PIC/issue managers submitted topics of interest. Stakeholder conference calls also provided potential topics. PIC/issue managers then refined topics with agencies, as well as the dates, meeting location and meeting format

**What worked well?**

- There was a sense of structure to the meetings – set expectations
- Clear sense of how to participate in the meeting
- Facilitator management of the meeting structure and timelines
- Presenters: Asked each other to clarify information that might be confusing to the public
- Good graphics – foam core boards and handouts
- Felt I could give my perspective and be heard (agency and public)
- Flip chart notes: The summary captured the content and tone well

## ATTACHMENT 1

- Smaller crowd resulted in better dialogue
- The ratio of agency reps to public participants was good and resulted in better dialogue
- Videotaped by KEXP and posted online (YouTube) – providing access to others
- More opportunities to ask questions and get thoughtful answers
- Had the “right people” there (agency and public)
- The presenters/agency folks actually answered the questions
- Dynamic of more equality of perspective and audience
- It was made clear that the issues were selected by the stakeholders

### **What didn't work well?**

- Portland meeting was not as structured, due to the off-site waste discussion (different meetings, different discussions)
- There were a couple of really angry people. The positive side of this was that Matt kept “cool” and Dennis was able to get back on track with his “folksy” style
- Some complaints about the smaller crowd
- Needed better ID of agency personnel , their role and decision-making responsibilities

### **Future Application?**

- Specifically identify meeting goals and the audience
- Ability to answer questions in real time
- Project flip chart notes so that they are easier to see as they are being written
- Opportunity to bring in elected officials/other agency decision-makers
- Videotape to show as examples of meeting formats and to help those who cannot attend (including decision-makers)
- Need to build agency capacity for this type of dialogue
- Good to have “focused” topics – consciously keep topics limited to core questions

## ATTACHMENT 1

- Clear explanation of the genesis of the agenda, who is speaking for which agency, and a **focused** agenda
- Opportunities for public interest groups to host topic meetings
- Clear contacts for more information: Both agencies and stakeholder groups
- Format targeted for “Hanford literate”

**Event Debriefings (cont'd)**

**Event:** DePaul University Class Presentations (by Ken Niles)

**Purpose(s) of the Event:**

- To provide educational opportunities for those outside of the area
- To test opportunities to reach a broader out-of-area audience (to develop interest at a national level)

**Locations:** DePaul University, Illinois

**Format:**

- Audience-specific
- Presentation followed by discussion
- Presentation focused first on the Columbia River (uses, values)
- Focused second on questions from the students
- Focused last on synthesis/discussion

**What worked well?**

- Incentivized about 20% of the students to some sort of “action”
- Most engaging for the environmental studies students
- Contacted instructors in advance to assess interest
- Provided a notetaker

**What didn't work well?**

- While it worked ok, would have more discussion about “action” next time

**Future Application?**

- Join a group of interested citizens
- “Peer” presentations (e.g. college students to college students)
- “Online” mini-course with some personal visits to classes
- Develop curriculum

## ATTACHMENT 1

- HAB “Succession planning” application
- To generate national awareness
- Develop a 2-hr class for students – then carry to national level by interest groups
- Standardized presentation for Board members to use if interested
- Use of existing curriculum (Univ. of Wash, Paige Knight)
- Board advice to develop curriculum
- Provide compelling reason for curriculum inside and outside of the region

Page 2

---

### Event Debriefings (cont'd)

**Event:** 100-N/NR 1/2 (general public involvement activities)

**Purpose(s) of the Event:**

- To provide public information and solicit input

**Locations:** N/A

**Format:**

- Fact sheets
- Comment periods
- Prior HAB involvement/discussions

**What worked well?**

- All the past interactions with the HAB on this topic

**What didn't work well?**

- [none recorded]

**Future Application?**

- Focused topic discussion to help build vocabulary and familiarity with cleanup and contaminants – Use this as an opportunity to build public capacity
- Provide context for how “small” decisions fit into the big picture

Page 3

---

**Event Debriefings (cont'd)**

**Event:** NRDWL/SWL (general public involvement activities)

**Purpose(s) of the Event:**

- To provide public information and solicit input

**Locations:** N/A

**Format:**

- Fact sheets
- Comment period (extended)

**What worked well?**

- Comment period has been extended

**What didn't work well?**

- Online facts sheet still shows the old comment deadline date

**Future Application?**

- [none recorded]

**Event Debriefings (cont'd)**

**Event:** 2008 State of the Site Meetings

**Purpose(s) of the Event:**

- Face time with the agency decision makers
- Not tied to any one topic
- Chance for dialogue

**Locations:** Seattle, Portland, Hood River, Richland

**Format:**

- Room in "nested circles"
- Agency in the "inner circle"

## ATTACHMENT 1

- Facilitator walked the microphone around to people who wished to speak
- Display boards (no PPT)
- Introductory remarks, alternative viewpoint, Q&A
- Open house before the meeting began
- Display space for agencies and stakeholders

### **What worked well?**

- Opportunity to meet with decision-makers
- “Good, bad and ugly”
- Following up on previous year’s comments

### **What didn’t work well?**

- Email notices: the “open rate” for email vs. printed mail is less
- Getting answers/responses to questions
- Facilitation – didn’t allow for follow up questions, etc.
- Tough context with the lawsuit (negotiations)

### **Future Application?**

- When sending email notices, send reminders to improve chance that people will read them
- Have decision-makers there and really listen to the concerns
- Put some structure on topics, and then allow time for other questions/discussion
- Good parking
- Easy to find location (e.g. Oregon state office bldg)
- “Intimate space”/Informal space – “public” facility (vs. hotel ballroom)

**State of the Site Meetings**

**Objective**

1. Public access to decision makers

**Design**

- Identify topics and public values surrounding these
  - Groundwater
- Decisions related to these issues

Page 6

---

**State of the Site Meetings: Design Thoughts**

1. Identify issues and public values that surround them
2. Use pictures only in presentations
3. Identify central issue “thread” that weaves through all meetings
4. Identify specific focus topics for each meeting
5. Identify a difficult technical issue that you can develop educational programs throughout the years around

Page 7

---

**State of the Site Meetings: Design Thoughts (cont’d)**

6. Specific topics, facilitated with structure, with opportunity at the end for other discussion.
7. Set up each topic a question (e.g. what does cleanup mean to you?)-may be risky to ask this
  - a. Agencies respond to how the public answers this
  - b. Expose complexity of issues
8. Have a balance between what’s been accomplished, and what the challenges are (Framed for each focus topic)

Page 8

---

**State of the Site Meetings: Design Thoughts (cont’d)**

9. Accountability – what changes have been made based on public input (framed for each focus topic)
10. Highlight/speak to issues people involved with this past year – e.g. TC&WM EIS, burial grounds, off-site waste, cleanup of tanks, “why are there delays” etc.
11. Solicit input from PIC, other HAB, other stakeholders – iterative discussion with agencies – to determine meeting topics
12. Provide good background resources for background reading.

Page 9

---

**State of the Site Meetings: Design Thoughts (cont’d)**

13. Potential question: “why is Hanford still “on the list” for off-site waste?”
  - a. Ask HQ to come out
14. “Pre-session” to familiarize people with Hanford – collaborate between agencies and interest groups (e.g. ken’s presentation, etc.)
  - a. Movement exercises, etc.
  - b. Aquarium for groundwater flow
  - c. Legos/map – waste sites in NW/States



## ATTACHMENT 1

15. No handouts. Don't rely on paper to communicate information
16. "Huge" 3-D site geography map/cutaway
17. Record comments in visual way

Page 10

---

### **State of the Site Meetings: Design Thoughts (cont'd)**

18. Multiple ways of capturing comments
19. Provide all-employee meeting(s) ahead of SOS meetings to enable SOS meetings to better focus on public
20. Order meetings so that Richland isn't the kick-off meeting

Page 11

---

### **State of the Site Meetings: Dates/Location**

1. Don't have Richland as kick-off meeting
2. Space meetings, e.g.
  - a. Portland/Hood River (one week)
  - b. Maybe on/week?
    - i. Oct 6-7, 18-19 > No Go for Oregon
3. Portland, Hood River, Eugene, Spokane, Richland, LaGrande, Seattle
  - a. Use live broadcast/webinar as an option?
  - b. Strategy: might not hit every place every time
  - c. Identify when you will be at Spokane, LaGrande, and Eugene...

Page 12

---

### **Strategic plan next steps**

1. Advice on Section III of CRP
  - a. Goals
2. Other specific advice, e.g. regarding annual commitment to reach communities like LaGrande, Eugene, Spokane (Strategic approach/plan)
3. Long-term flow chart
4. Advice on principles for meeting design concepts, (per 7/7 flip chat notes) include information pieces, outreach, etc.
5. White paper re: strategic planning process

Page 13

---

### **Strategic Planning – Potential Advice**

1. "public involvement principles"
  - a. Definition
  - b. Goals
  - c. Tools/techniques (related to goals) – Liz, Susan L.
2. "Advice on meeting design/principles outreach" – Steve, Gerry, Ken

Page 14

---

### **Follow-Up**

1. Plan an evening seminar
2. Lisa to send Susan H. curriculum link > Susan to distribute to PIC
3. Script and presentation to Susan H. to distribute as requested
4. Identify topics of interest for public discussion, outside of public comment period
5. DOE to follow up on updating on-line NRDWL-SWL fact sheet (extended comment period)

Page 15

ATTACHMENT 1

**Follow-Up (cont'd)**

6. Should PIC provide advice for board to consider re: EM open Government plan?  
– Gerry/ Open meetings and EMAB sub-committee - Ken
7. Susan L. to provide general counsel communication re: HAB subcommittees to Gerry
8. Gerry to get open government document to Susan H. to distribute/post
9. Check out Ecology's nuclear waste program homepage > "printer friendly TPA calendar"
10. Ask on EIC call about burial ground workshop dates.
11. Follow up SOS call (outreach, other design thoughts, venues/size)

Page 16

---

**Follow-Up (cont'd)**

12. Committee member will reflect on design notes in preparation for SOS call
13. Agencies will identify available dates prior to SOS call

Page 17

- 
- SOS call 10AM – July 19<sup>th</sup>
  - TPA quarterly call – July 22 10AM