

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
September 2, 2009
Seattle, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions..... 1
Approve meeting summary 2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and Community Relations Plan (CRP) 3
Proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA 4
State of the Site (SOS) meetings and ideas for improving public turn-out 5
TPA agencies public involvement update 7
Committee Business 8
Handouts..... 10
Attendees 10

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

Welcome and Introductions

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

Steve said the August workshop was successful and helped identify public involvement issues and problems that the committee needs to address. He said many of the committee’s issues are dense and complex, and require time to analyze. Steve briefly described proposed changes to PIC’s role and function. This proposal was circulated via email and committee members did not submit any changes to EnviroIssues. The proposal has committee consensus and will be presented to the full Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) at the Board meeting. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, noted that the suggestions to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement Update (TPA Quarterly) are only suggestions; it is not PIC’s nor the Board’s responsibility to direct the TPA agencies how and when to hold those meetings.

The proposal includes:

- PIC role and function: Changes to the HAB Process Manual to more fully describe PIC role and function.
- Meeting frequency: The PIC meeting placeholder will alternate monthly between the Wednesday prior to Board meetings and during committee week (PIC currently does not meet during committee week).
- Relationship to the TPA Quarterly: PIC requests the TPA agencies to hold the TPA Quarterly on the Wednesday mornings before Board meetings, and suggests using a round-robin “sounding board” to solicit specific feedback, publicize the TPA Quarterly to encourage public attendance, and coordinate the TPA Quarterly agenda with the PIC meeting agenda to reduce redundancy.

- Committee membership: Continue the practice of allowing any HAB member to serve on PIC without encumbering their ability to be members of two other committees on the Board. If the practice of meeting alternating Wednesdays prior to Board meetings and committee week when necessary is adopted, this will not be a significant additional travel expense compared with the benefits to the HAB and TPA agencies.
- Developing advice: PIC will be more active in developing advice for Board consideration and action. While the focus will be at the policy level, there may be instances when the TPA agencies would benefit from more detailed advice.

Steve noted that PIC will continue to work on public involvement surveys, similar to the surveys created last year by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Heart of America Northwest and Ken Niles. The committee will also look at making better use of current technologies and other tools for reaching the broader public beyond public meetings. PIC is working on a template for advice, providing resources to other committees for advice-writing to ensure advice coming to the full Board is well edited, and adding public involvement tutorials to the Board meeting schedule.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, noted that Ecology also conducts an annual survey specific to State of the Site (SOS) meetings. He encouraged PIC members to send him any observations they have during any public meetings – what went well, what did not, and what could be applied elsewhere.

Steve called attention to a recent publication produced by the Oregon Department of Energy (Oregon DOE) entitled “Hanford Cleanup: The First 20 Years.” Steve said it is a very well-written and informative document that the entire Board should read. It is available on the Oregon DOE website at <http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/NUCSAF/docs/HanfordFirst20years.pdf>.

Steve also referenced a letter that Ken Niles sent to Lynn Porter, Hanford Watch, concerning TPA milestone and schedule changes. He said it is available on the Hanford Yahoo Group.

Meeting agenda topics included:

- TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP): Receive an update on agency progress on the CRP revisions and review and discuss the development of draft advice from the key points identified in the August PIC workshop.
- Proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA: Discuss how PIC and the Board can support TPA agency plans for taking this information to the public and collect feedback from the committee to determine if any Board action is appropriate.
- SOS meetings: Review and confirm the draft advice that will be presented at the September Board meeting and brainstorm ideas for improving public turn-out; identify key issues for the 2009 SOS meeting agendas.
- TPA agencies public involvement update
- Committee business

Approve meeting summary

Steve encouraged the committee to read the August workshop summary. The summary was adopted.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and Community Relations Plan (CRP)

Steve introduced preliminary draft advice regarding the CRP that he and Paige Knight developed for committee consideration and hopefully Board review at the November Board meeting. The draft advice identified several issues to add to the CRP in an effort to better inform, clarify and direct Hanford public involvement.

Discussion

Gerry Pollet commented that the advice seemed to rely too much on bullet formatting. He thought the committee had previously decided that the CRP should be a prescriptive document. Gerry thought it should still be somewhat descriptive but should have prescriptive components. Steve thought the committee decided the CRP should be descriptive.

Emy Laija, EPA, commented that the committee may have spent more time developing advice that is descriptive because the agencies were unsure how to implement major prescriptive elements (potential legal issues). She noted the TPA agencies have not progressed very far in editing the CRP and still want PIC and Board input. They hope to revise it by the end of 2009, but are considering all the other issues for which the public will be asked to comment and how to avoid public burnout. She anticipated having a revised CRP ready for public comment in early 2010. The TPA agencies have not yet discussed having public meetings as part of that public comment period.

Gerry requested the agencies hold public meetings during the comment period. Emy said they will definitely consider holding meetings, but also thought at the August workshop, PIC discussed that changes may not merit a public meeting. Gerry commented that in the past, if ten or more citizens requested a public meeting, the agencies would host one; now the CRP is more vague and says the agencies will host a meeting if there is considerable public interest. Susan Hayman suggested that the committee consider crafting the advice so it begins with a broad and descriptive perspective before delving into specific elements.

Annette Carlson, Ecology, noted that in the past, the TPA agencies have held public meetings for CRP revisions. Annette is Ecology's lead on the CRP revisions. Nolan thought it was important to clarify the level of prescription between the agencies, PIC and the public. The HAB's primary role is to produce policy-level advice for agency consideration; Nolan thought it may be tricky if it crosses into the prescriptive realm. For example, for Ecology it would be difficult to commit to certain elements that would obligate Ecology to exceed what is required by law. Ecology often goes above and beyond what is legally required, but may not be able to state that in the CRP.

Susan Leckband noted that DOE previously commented that the CRP is not a legally enforceable document. If an element is committed to in the CRP but not specifically agreed to in the body of the TPA, it may not be legally enforceable. Gerry thought there was a firm commitment that the CRP is enforceable. The committee agreed that it is critically important to resolve the question of prescription and related consequences. Nolan said that the perception of encumbering "beyond the law" may be a problem for some of the agencies.

Gerry commented that "commitment" may be a better term than "prescriptive elements." He said prior versions of the CRP contained more commitments, but later revisions eliminated such commitments.

Susan Hayman asked if there is an issue manager(s) for the CRP and the draft advice, and who at the agencies can help the committee reach a conclusion regarding prescriptive elements and enforceability. She noted that if the committee wants to go on record, it should issue formal advice.

Annette will compile the 1993, 1997, the current 2002 version and the 2002 responsiveness summary of the CRP into one PDF file so the committee can review all past versions.

The committee agreed that it needs more information from the agencies concerning the level of commitments that can be contained in the CRP.

Proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA

In August, PIC requested a TPA workshop for HAB members (also open to the public) in early September. The TPA agencies are planning to host a series of public meetings around the region (locations to-be-determined). The governor of Washington already committed to a public comment period on the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments from September 24 through November 9.

Discussion

Steve introduced the discussion topic on the proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA. At the August workshop, the committee identified some activities, such as the HAB public workshop in September to discuss the TPA, as well as helping the agencies with their published materials. He thought the committee should think about the best format for public meetings – is the main purpose informational or will they be more specific and seek comments on specific questions?

Nolan noted the agencies have not committed to meeting format and purpose. There are fundamental components, such as providing background information, taking questions and comments, and taking formal comments (legal requirement). Lori Gamache, DOE, said the public outreach effort for the TPA amendments is a collaborative effort between the TPA agencies. Emy noted that EPA took a somewhat lesser role in consent decree development.

Susan Leckband said prior to the workshop, PIC should identify their meeting goals and questions, such as what does the public want to hear about the TPA amendments, how will the public provide comments, and how the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) fits into it. She thought developing these goals and questions will help DOE frame up their public outreach strategy. Susan also thought the committee could urge an extension to the public comment period.

Steve also noted PIC should think about techniques for the TPA public meetings and how to evaluate the success of the meetings.

Barb Wise, CHPRC, thought the agencies should clearly define the difference between a consent decree and a consent order. She also commented that tank cleanup is a major regional issue, and a number of people will want to make public comment. The meetings and comment methods will have to accommodate a large number of people.

Susan Hayman said the discussion at the TPA Quarterly meeting identified a few things the committee should think about:

- Extending the public comment period on the consent decree and TPA amendments to the end of November
- Central Plateau Cleanup Strategy/Agreement in Principle (CPS/AIP) are currently a separate process from the consent decree – should they be?
- Public outreach options – tools for specific demographics
- Core elements for the agenda/format (developed from the upcoming September workshop)
- Meeting evaluations

Susan asked if PIC could address any of these issues, or should they be discussed at the September workshop? She anticipates that the workshop will address more technical information; should PIC work on these issues now and have a sounding board at the workshop? Are there any other issues to add to the list? Steve said public outreach technologies should be added.

Technologies

The committee discussed various technologies that could be used in public outreach (such as Facebook and Twitter). Nolan said the agencies are adapting some of those technologies, but are not typically “cutting edge” with social networking tools. Lori said DOE-ORP is on Facebook and Twitter, and is discussing how to use those mechanisms to reach a broader public. Aubrey Bauman, Heart of America Northwest, noted those social networking tools often reach a younger audience and gain popularity by word-of-mouth.

Extending the comment period

Gerry thought the board should prepare advice stating 1) the comment period should be extended to December 4, 2) all TPA changes (e.g. CPS/AIP) should be incorporated into the same public comment period, and 3) the Board advised multiple times that no TPA change or settlement should be entered into without a long-term cost and schedule study. The committee did not think there was time to prepare advice for the September Board meeting (begins tomorrow).

Susan Leckband thought extending the comment period was the major time critical piece. The committee decided that at the Board meeting, Susan will ask the agencies to tell the Board if they can extend the comment period to December 4. She will ask the agencies to respond by the end of the following week. Nolan suggested that Susan and the committee include why they want to extend the public comment period.

Steve, Ken Niles and Gerry will work with the agencies to frame up the September TPA workshop.

State of the Site (SOS) meetings and ideas for improving public turnout

Steve described the draft SOS meeting advice that Ken Niles prepared. The draft advice was sent to committee members and gained committee consensus via email. It will be shared at the September Board meeting for consideration and adoption. The advice included recommendations regarding SOS meeting objectives, format and outreach beyond meetings.

Discussion

Gerry said the alternative perspective included in the planned presentation portion of an SOS meeting (prior to a public comment agenda item) is usually provided by local organizations. The draft advice said the alternative perspective should be provided by the HAB chair or vice-chair. Gerry did not consider the HAB an alternative perspective, but one that could also be included during the presentations. He said the alternative perspective must be preserved. Greg deBruler agreed, and thought Ken Niles did not intend that language (Ken was not present during this agenda item).

Emy thought the Board chair could provide an alternative perspective if asked, but Susan was not comfortable giving the only alternative perspective. Greg did not consider the HAB an alternative perspective.

Susan Hayman said procedurally, the advice had already gone out to the committee for review. No comments were received on the draft advice and it was confirmed via email that committee consensus was achieved. Susan thought it would be more appropriate for Gerry to propose the change at the Board meeting, given the Board's consensus process. Gerry and Greg said they did not receive the draft advice and thought since it was a committee meeting agenda item, they would have the opportunity to make changes.

Steve said the draft advice was emailed to PIC members, and PIC members saw that it was adopted as a committee product, so he felt uncomfortable making changes to the advice now since not all committee members were present. He thought the Board has had problems in the past when people make changes to draft advice outside of the committee process.

The language about who should provide the alternative perspective was deleted and shown in strike-out. The advice then read that an alternative perspective should be provided. The formatting was to ensure the change was transparent. The strike-out version will be handed out to Board members Thursday morning.

Brainstorming ideas for improving public turnout

Steve said the committee consistently thinks about how to improve public participation in Hanford issues, specifically increasing turnout for SOS meetings.

Susan Hayman said the committee currently has a placeholder for a December meeting about different technologies. She asked the committee to think about what tools are specific to SOS meetings, or is public outreach always the same suite of tools and approaches.

Nolan commented that Hanford constantly competes for attention, and thought that unless people are outraged, they do not show up for meetings. He thought it is difficult to maintain a high level of urgency for all Hanford issues. The broader question is communication – what is the purpose of knowing about Hanford? SOS meetings are only the tool, not the purpose. If a member of the public did not attend a meeting, would they still have access to the information? Nolan said there needs to be other mechanisms of public information. He urged the Board and agencies to find other models of public outreach to imitate, such as using online video clips from an SOS meeting so that people can choose to view any or all segments of the meeting.

Greg thought the agencies struggle with issue identification, and said the public interest organizations are good at helping the agencies identify the hot issues at Hanford. To generate more interest in SOS meetings, the agencies should explain the purpose of the meetings, show cleanup successes, what they are struggling with and where they want input. Greg said people

will be interested if the agencies genuinely want their input. Greg described a meeting in the past where the public helped force out the tough issues, and the DOE managers learned from the experience and appreciated the input. He said the agencies should ensure there is a compelling reason for the public to get involved.

Emy noted that meeting turnout should not be the only measure of public involvement success or failure. Doug Mercer agreed. Steve noted that was the consensus at the workshop, that public meetings are only one tool out of a suite of many.

Doug said PIC should not think of any individual meeting outside the suite of public engagement activities; what can SOS meetings do to serve the collective interest and engagement? Doug thought the SOS meetings should be thematically focused on the next generation of stakeholders. He thought if Hanford adopts a theme of involving a younger generation, it should then consider what tools and infrastructure to develop. He suggested developing a “virtual community” and also a school study module based round the Hanford Site.

Nolan thought the agencies should develop an informational piece highlighting the good and bad at Hanford. It could be distributed annually before SOS meetings so people can learn beforehand and come to the meeting with some context. He thought it would help generate more informed and useful comments and questions. Emy thought these SOS meetings may be the first step of many for improving public involvement efforts.

Barb noted at one point, the TPA mailing list had 10,000 names; it now has around 2,500. She thought some people have passed away, or their focus changed. She gets letters from people saying they know cleanup is going on and they do not need updates unless something major happens.

Nolan asked if PIC recommends moving this year’s SOS meetings to the spring and keeping them separate from the consent decree meetings. Steve said yes, the agencies should separate the topics and move the SOS meetings to the spring.

TPA agencies public involvement update

Annette provided the TPA public involvement calendar and reviewed some of the upcoming public involvement activities.

- TPA amendment and consent decree: The public comment period is currently scheduled for September 24 – November 9.
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site-wide permit 90-day public comment period: Nolan said the permit is critical but was not confident Ecology will have the draft permit ready for public comment in early October. Ecology will update the calendar.
 - Gerry said PIC and the agencies have discussed the importance of this comment period not overlapping with TPA consent decree comment period.
- Milestones M-15 and M-91 change packages 45-day public comment period: October/December timeframe
- Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework public comment period (August 24 – November 30): Barb said this DOE document is intended to provide the public with clear information about Hanford. The 90-day public comment period focuses on the

readability and usefulness of the document. The document went out to listserv contacts and is on the Hanford Events Calendar.

- PIC was going to discuss this document today but it was superseded by the TPA consent decree update. It will be on the next committee meeting agenda.
- Ken Niles thought the document contained useful information but its purpose could be clearer.
- Central Plateau waste site cleanup 200 PW-1,3, and 6 and CW-5 proposed plans: Public workshops are planned for the winter of 2009. EPA feels these are prime sites for final decisions.
- Public involvement opportunities for the AREVA dangerous waste permit, Columbia River Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA), and the 100 and 300 Area Component of the RCBRA are to-be-determined.

Lori noted DOE-ORP will soon announce a 15-day public comment period for the 242-A evaporator. Ken Niles thought that was a short comment period; it can take that long to receive the document in the mail.

Barb said the agencies sent out a notice for an explanation of significant difference for 100 HR-3 and 100 KR-4. It discusses changing the location of groundwater wells because the chromium plume has moved.

Gerry said the public involvement calendar should include the release of the draft Greater Than Class C EIS in November. Annette will check on the dates and add it to the calendar. She also welcomed any suggestions for making the calendar easier to read. Barb will update the calendars on the website.

Committee Business

PIC will have a committee call on September 17 at 11:00 am.

Susan Hayman developed a table to help the committee identify meeting topics, objectives and time allocations for the next month's meeting.

October meeting topics

Topic	Purpose/notes	Committee lead	Agency lead	Time allocation
Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework	Identify any missing components or required changes; see how it can be used as a public involvement tool (not a decision document)	Ken Niles	DOE	45 minutes
CRP	Agency clarification and previous versions of the CRP; revisit/revise draft advice	Steve, Doug Mercer, Paige Knight	TBD	2 hours
Review change packages and approach to public involvement	Pros/cons, advice development, integrated framework for proposed changes to the TPA	Gerry	TBD	
Proposed consent decree and	Can format/protocols be generalized to a template for future meetings?	TBD	TBD	30 minutes

amendments to the TPA				
-----------------------	--	--	--	--

The committee also reviewed and revised the six-month action plan (only four months were filled out at this meeting):

Six-month Action Plan

Meeting	Topic
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW-1,3,6 workshop • RCRA public workshop
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using technology in public outreach • CRP
January	TC&WM EIS
February	SOS meetings

Discussion

The committee decided to wait to discuss the M-15 and M-91 change package until they get more information from DOE.

Doug was interested in issuing a white paper to provide input to the agencies about metrics and measures for a successful CRP. Susan thought the committee could discuss this in October and discuss potential advice for the Board.

The committee discussed whether or not change packages should be lumped together or separated for the public. As the change packages are released and the public is invited to comment, is it better to put them into a once-a-year event rather than ask the public to comment on them piece by piece? There may be different perspectives on the Board – do you hold up work waiting for one single public involvement period? Gerry did not think one could analyze the trade-offs if the change packages are separated. He also thought the public needs to see all the TPA changes at once. Barb thought this may be a technical issue with a public involvement component.

Regarding using the meetings for the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments as a template to use for future meetings, Susan Leckband thought the committee might not have the resources to tackle it. Gerry did not think it requires an issue manager at this point; it could be a general committee discussion. Susan Hayman encouraged the committee to identify a point person for the topic.

After the HAB September workshop on the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments, PIC will meet to discuss the framework for public meetings at the end of October. It will not wait until its regularly scheduled October committee meeting because it would be too late to provide input to agencies. The committee will ask for a planning status update at its October meeting to see where the agencies are in finalizing the public meetings.

Lori asked how meeting planning will work – should they schedule planning conference calls and meetings through PIC? The entire Board? Gerry said PIC is only a part of it; many other groups in the region are interested in helping.

Susan Hayman noted that the committee does not need to meet every month if there is nothing pressing. She will email the meeting topic information to the committee to confirm.

This might be Nolan’s last PIC meeting; he will be moving to Savannah River in the near future. He said it has been his pleasure and honor to work with the committee and the Board.

Action items

1. Request for HAB members to let Steve know the outcomes of public involvement events that they are involved in – the successes and failures.
2. The committee needs more information from the agencies to determine how specific the CRP can be, and if it can contain commitments. Annette will compile the 1993, 1997, the current 2002 version and the 2002 responsiveness summary of the CRP into one PDF file so the committee can review all past versions. She will send this to Susan Hayman to distribute.
3. Agencies will be asked to respond to the request to extend the public comment period to December 4 for the proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA.
4. Steve, Ken and Gerry will offer to help design the September workshop.
5. After the HAB September workshop on the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments, PIC will meet to discuss the framework for the October public meetings.
6. Lori will send information ASAP to the committee on the 15-day comment period for the 242A Evaporator Environmental Assessment.
7. Annette will inform the committee on the status of the Greater than Class C EIS indicated for release in November.

Handouts

- Draft advice for State of the Site meetings
- Draft advice for updating and editing the TPA CRP
- TPA and Agency-Only Public Involvement Calendar (September 2, 2009)

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Greg deBruler	Doug Mercer	Gerry Pollet
Steve Hudson	Laura Mueller	Steve White
Susan Leckband	Ken Niles	

Others

Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Annette Carlson, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL (phone)	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	Emy Laija, EPA	Barb Wise, CHPRC
		Aubrey Bauman, Heart of America NW
		Lisa Van Dyk, Heart of America NW