

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
September 22, 2010
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions 1
Outreach - Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds Public Workshops 1
Open Government Plan..... 5
Public Involvement Strategic Planning Advice 9
Committee Business..... 11
Action Items / Commitments 13
Handouts 14
Attendees..... 14
Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 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.

Madeleine Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology will be doing evaluations for public meetings starting in October and invited the PIC committee members to weigh in on this process.

Susan Leckband reminded everyone to attend the Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds (SWBG) Committee of the Whole (COTW) on October 5 and the Hanford Site tour on October 6.

Outreach - Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds Public Workshops

The upcoming SWBG COTW will include an agenda item that focuses on subsequent public workshops that will be held about SWBGs. Steve asked the PIC committee to review the draft COTW agenda to make sure they are ready to discuss the public workshop component. He said this is an important issue for which the PIC committee has voiced interest in helping develop materials. He said this is an opportunity to try public involvement methods for an in-depth topic. Steve considered this is an important meeting and will provide a foundation for the development process of future meetings.

Regulator Perspective

- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said past public involvement events have ended with surveys. She said EPA was hoping to bring this survey process back; there will be a draft out next week if the PIC committee is interested in reviewing it.
- Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, said he submitted SWBG meeting notice in the Tri-City Herald and on National Public Radio.

Committee Discussion

- Steve said the notice that was emailed out to the PIC committee is a good tool to use for advertising the SWBG public workshops.
- Liz had some potential changes to the SWBG public workshop notice, such as taking out the use of “characterization” and to make it less confusing. She thought the information should be easily understandable, particularly by students. She added that it could be useful for the PIC committee to narrow down tools for notices. Susan said she is hesitant to take out the word characterization. She said it should remain in the notices, but it could be defined. Liz said defining characterization would work and said there should be more discussions on ways to get people familiar with the typical “Hanford vocabulary.”
- Susan L. will be doing the introduction at the SWBG COTW. She will talk about Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Advice #1 and discuss most of the HAB advice pieces in order to frame the history.
- Paige suggested having a poster with the HAB values and principles at the public workshops.
- Steve said the word “goal” has been used to describe values and principles, which gets confusing. It is important to identify what is meant.
- Susan H. asked Todd Martin if the HAB has produced a values and principles document in the past. Todd said yes.
- Dieter said that John Price, Ecology, will be visiting classrooms and talking to students about coming to the SWBG public workshops.
- Todd suggested being clear about the goals of the public workshops and reiterated the importance of being on the same page.

- Liz said the PIC should discuss which audiences are targeted and how engaged they might be.
- Steve said the venue sometimes determines the audience. Paula Call, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said the Portland SWBG public workshop will be held at the Red Lion because Portland State University was not an option.
- Paula said the PIC committee should have a discussion on social media outlets and the structure of the workshops. Steve said the PIC committee can help identify elements that belong and ones that do not.
- Paula said DOE will capture thoughts on the COTW meeting to inform the structure of future workshops.
- Liz suggested targeting the audience by anticipating who might come to the workshop. For example, the workshop at the University of Washington will be a good opportunity for students so it is important to think about how to advertise the workshop. Paula said she is concerned about focusing solely on students because meeting rooms have already been selected, and they have been focusing on an audience that is somewhat familiar with Hanford. Dieter said he is not sure how interesting this workshop will be to a college student. Liz said if going to the workshop is a requirement for a class, they will come. She acknowledged that is different than someone deciding to come after getting a notice.
- Liz said she does not anticipate social media drawing hundreds of students. She thought there should be a focus on engaging the audience. Paula said HAB input on the Central Plateau Strategy was the main reason for these meetings. They were never targeted towards students. She said there were additional meetings added to reach a greater region. She said there are no Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) requirements for public involvement this early in the process, but DOE is carrying them out because they feel it is a good opportunity to involve the public.
- Steve made it clear that the PIC committee is looking to reach a younger audience, such as students. Paige said getting new people interested in Hanford should always be a topic of conversation and public outreach goal.
- Paige added that the biggest public meetings are usually less than one hundred people. Paula said all of the venues will accommodate more than one hundred people. She reminded everyone that DOE will try to avoid acronyms no matter who the audience is.
- Gerry Pollet said the classes are interested in having Hanford curriculum incorporated into their classrooms, but they need to have the information with

enough time to be able to create curriculum. Paula said she was not aware of any curriculum for SWBGs and said this would be useful to help design the workshops. Gerry said the goal is to bring the students up to speed so they can participate.

- Susan L. asked who is presenting in the classrooms. Gerry said John Price and some representatives from the tribes will be presenting, and a set of presenters for each course are arranged based on the focus of the curriculum. He said he is involved in scoping the classes and developing problem sets. Susan said it is good to know what views the students have seen.
- Gerry said UW Public Health will be going on a HAB tour and hopefully SWBGs will be covered.
- Paula said DOE will do what they can to customize the workshops for students or whoever the audience is.
- Gerry said John has a good grasp of presenting to a student audience. He presented for some of Gerry's students and did a very good job.
- Paige said there should be a fair amount of discussion time at the SWBG public workshops.
- Pamela McCann, DOE-Office of River Protection (ORP), said there should be some research to understand the potential interests based on where the workshop is being held. Liz said there could be a conference call to brainstorm questions prior to the meetings. Paula asked if people will be needed to answer questions during the call. Liz said the conference call would be more for collecting types of questions.
- Emy said the point of the frequently asked questions document was to hash out potential questions. She asked if the conference call would be duplicative. Ken Niles said there might be questions that nobody thought about.
- Susan L suggested the Hanford web page could have an option to submit questions. Gerry said Heart of America Northwest can develop questions that can be submitted in one document. Steve said submitting questions online is a technique that could be used for other topics as well.
- Paula said DOE would like to address some questions in the presentations so the workshop would be more than just a question and answer period.
- Pamela thought the committee was discussing two different issues: How to move forward with the workshops and focusing on students. Steve said the PIC committee is discussing targeting a younger audience.

- Paula said DOE can focus on the interests of the audience so these meetings will help DOE know where people's interests are.
- Susan L. said she made a promise to provide the advice on open meetings personally to Inés Triay, DOE-Environmental Management (EM), and she did. The advice was discussed, and she got a personal response. Inés said DOE will work hard to ensure the meetings are more open.

Open Government Plan

The purpose of this discussion was to: 1) To continue to the discussion from the September 7 PIC committee meeting regarding the purpose and need of a DOE-EM open government plan and its potential relationship with the local Tri-Party Agreement Community Relations Plan (CRP); 2) to determine if HAB advice is warranted and, if so, to identify the information needed to begin developing advice.

Gerry said every federal agency is required to have an open government plan on which the public can provide input. . DOE has an open government plan, but the committee wanted to discuss the need for DOE-EM to have a specific open government plan. Gerry said there is an opportunity to ask that programs be highlighted in the plan and include the high value data sets that stakeholders identify as being important for participation. He said there was already the open meeting advice which could also be an element for the open government plan advice. This potential advice would be separate from the strategic public involvement planning advice (next on the agenda).

Agency Perspective

- Paula introduced Ben Ellison, DOE-RL, who said he is the chief information officer for DOE-RL. He said he is a proponent for social networking and helping the communications department get started on this. He said it is difficult exchanging information, which is a critical piece of communication. He has been working on putting together a collaboration zone, similar to a share-point feature. He is working with the contractors and looking at pilot projects. He said PIC's perspective on what information the public would like to see would be helpful as he goes through this process.
- Ben said DOE is working on a "Collaboration Zone" as a way to provide online resources and information for the public. Ben would like the committee's feedback on this concept.
- Paula said the PIC could provide the specific topics that are valuable for the public.

Regulator Perspective

- Emy said she did not have much to add. She is keeping up with what EPA is doing and will have more information to share next time.
- Dieter said it is a federal directive and Ecology is following public interest.

Committee Discussion

- Laura Hanses asked if DOE-RL was approached about the open government plan. Paula said DOE coordinated internally on the plan, and reached out to some of the field offices for some assistance. She said it would be helpful for Ben to get input from the PIC committee on his efforts.
- Steve said the relationship between the open government plan and the CRP is interesting, but it is not clear what the connection is.
- Gerry said the open government plan should reflect top level goals. He said he has tried to give examples of how DOE goals for the open government plan could transfer to the Hanford's CRP. He said there could be advice on some of the topics in the open government plan and how they relate. He said there could be additional goals in the Hanford CRP concerning accountability, such as having decision makers present in person at meetings for questions, feedback and comments. He said there could be improved collaboration by engaging in dialogue about proposals long before they are formalized, showing how early collaboration shapes consideration of proposals.
- Susan L. asked how long the open government plan is. Gerry said it is on the DOE website. Doug Mercer said he sent out a document on public participation which includes links to the open government plan documents.
- Susan L. asked if the directive requires having an open government plan. Gerry said DOE-EM is large enough that it should be required to have its own plan.
- Liz said having a plan is an expectation, but not a requirement. Gerry said they are being graded by the White House, and the open government plan will be a part of that. He said it is not a law, but there is an expectation that a high profile program like DOE-EM will have an open government plan since it is one of the largest programs with stimulus money.
- Susan L. said she will ask Inés if DOE-EM will develop its own open government plan.
- Gerry suggested that PIC develop draft advice requesting that DOE-EM develop a specific open government plan. Gerry provided some potential advice concepts.
- Paige asked if advice is written in the committee meeting. The PIC committee said no. She thought Gerry's potential advice bullets needed some parameters.
- For clarification, Steve said the CRP is sometimes unofficially referred to as the Public Involvement Plan (PIP). Emy confirmed that the CRP name is being

changed to PIP, but has not been done yet. The committee will continue to call the CRP the CRP until the name is officially changed.

- Paula said the CRP is a requirement driven by CERCLA. It is mandatory and is different from the open government initiative.
- Ken said Gerry has a good start and the substance is there for advice. He said he does not want it to derail Liz's strategic planning advice (next on the agenda). He said going forward with Liz's advice and giving advice on the next draft of the CRP would be good next steps.
- Doug said there should be linkages between DOE-EM and Hanford open government plans. He said he sent comments out and thinks PIC should be consistent and compare the open government initiative to the CRP. He said he created a table that includes different strategies and procedures, which can be referenced to ensure consistency.
- Liz said transparency and collaboration should be included in the advice.
- Susan L. asked if the PIC committee wants advice on the open government plan. Steve said it was discussed before, and he thought it was agreed upon. The PIC committee agreed there should be advice about the DOE open government plan.
- Emy said it seems that the strategic planning advice is on one path and the open government advice is moving forward.
- Paula said the CRP is a requirement of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), but it is not legally binding. Gerry disagreed and said it is the same as any other T-01 document.
- Paula asked if this advice would go to RL and ORP or EM. Gerry said the advice will be written for EM.
- Liz said the committee should identify why it thinks DOE-EM should have its own open government plan. Doug agreed and said that considering the size of the EM budget, they should have a tailored open government plan.
- Gerry asked about what types of data can be used for Hanford and EM. Ben said there are tools that have information that are tagged to geographical areas. He said the hard part is how to display this information and make it user-friendly. He asked if anyone has used the "environet".
- Ken commented that sometimes an agency has good intentions with being open, but sometimes staffing can limit its ability to keep a website updated, for example.
- Paige thought open government advice should reference the openness advice (HAB Advice #235).

- Susan L. said the advice should include concepts such as “going beyond the minimum” and “having a high public interest.” Liz asked what the benefit of “going beyond the minimum is” and suggested that this be articulated.
- Doug emailed a handout prior to the meeting, and noted that a table in that handout provides a good starting point on improving the quality of open government. He said “goals” and “strategy” should be used consistently. He said to be clear with principles and goals and to augment what has already been said.
- Susan L. said if this advice is going to Inés it needs to be at a high level. The committee decided that after it develops this high-level open government advice to DOE-EM, it could develop a more detailed piece of advice to send to the local DOE field offices that could focus more on implementation.
- Susan L. said the CRP has more to do with actions and the open government plan is more general. The two should be consistent, but they are not the same thing.
- Steve noted that PIC is unable to meet in October. He said November will be the first time to look at the open government plan advice. Susan thought it could be drafted via email. Liz said the email process is difficult. Laura said since the advice is short there may not be a need for much more discussion. Ben asked if the PIC committee uses SharePoint or another resource to discuss these matters online. The PIC committee said no, but they would be interested in such a tool.
- Gerry said the PIC committee should identify high level data that needs better public access. He said all the data on waste volumes should be updated and online, but this has stopped. He said the PIC committee should be thinking of topics to which they would like better access. Ben said the goal for open government is collaboration and developing what the high value data sets are.
- Gerry said that the EM open government plan should involve the Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) and describe how they have collaborated. Susan said to be careful with how this is displayed in the advice because the SSAB only meets twice a year. She said we should be careful about using examples and should rely more on process. She said to describe the process of how high value data will be identified.
- Susan L. asked if the advice is time sensitive. If so, it will have to be done by email. If it is not it can be handled in meetings. Gerry thinks it is broad enough to do without another meeting. Liz cautioned the use of just email and suggested having a separate call to discuss the advice. Gerry said he will have a draft circulated before the call.
- Doug said in the openness initiative DOE was supposed to identify ideas. This initiative says there is a chance to advocate for public participation. He said the quotation on openness comes from a Department of Justice memo driven by the President and said he will talk with Gerry about this at another time.

The committee decided to develop draft open government advice to DOE-EM over email. Gerry is the issue manager. A draft will be ready to reach committee consensus at the November committee meeting.

Public Involvement Strategic Planning Advice

The purpose of this discussion was 1) to review past HAB advice and its relevance to the current draft advice; 2) to discuss specific committee member concerns with the current version of the draft public involvement strategic planning advice (i.e. “overarching goals”) and determine the appropriate path forward.

Liz said the PIC committee took on a strategic approach to public involvement in December by working on defining successful public involvement. She said people told stories of past successful public involvement to generate ideas. From this process, the PIC committee generated lists and a definition of successful public involvement and how it is unique at Hanford. She said the whole process was collaborative with the HAB and agencies. She said there was a list of overarching goals for public involvement and then tools drafted to meet these goals.

Liz said all this work resulted in a draft piece of advice on this process that was suggested should be included in the CRP. She said by focusing on a strategic approach to improving public involvement it was determined that the process itself would be helpful. She said the ideas are useful to the agencies and the people involved who have planned meetings.

Liz noted that the committee reached consensus on the advice in August, but there were some suggestions that were provided after the August committee meeting. Liz reviewed how those concepts were incorporated.

Liz reiterated that the advice is not “the final say” on public involvement. She said some of the additional suggestions to the advice might be stand alone issues for new advice or potentially incorporated into the open government plan advice.

The PIC committee did a line by line review of the Public Involvement Strategic Planning Advice to clarify assumptions and address concerns.

- Ken said there were no changes to the background section.
- Gerry said the advice does not make a point of setting goals for public involvement at Hanford. He said the goals for public involvement are not necessarily exclusive. He said accountability, transparency, and notice are focused on in most public involvement plans. If these major universal goals are not incorporated in the advice, it is incomplete. He said he is concerned that if the advice is adopted as is, the PIC committee will be locked into these principles. He said the advice should state that it is a product of a process and some goals are not included.
- Steve said these are the overarching principles for successful public involvement, and this document represents the main principles to do affective strategic planning.

- Gerry said the background should say that there are additional principles and elements that the Board and the public may hold and that this advice reflects the outcome of a process. He said this is not the exclusive definition of successful public involvement.
- Doug thought this advice should reference the “gold standard” for public involvement, the National Academy of Public Administration strategies, to make sure they are consistent. Gerry said it would be wise to include the National Academy as a reference point. He said the open government directive could also be referenced. Steve said those documents were not involved in the discussion, and he feels uncomfortable supporting a document he has not looked at. Gerry said his concern is consistency with what the general public and the PIC committee views as goals for public involvement. He said the topics that have been developed over the years should be referenced. He said that he brought up the use of these documents earlier in the process.
- Ken thought if the committee chooses to cite one document, it would have to cite all of them. He did not think it was particularly productive at this point.
- Liz said the process was not intended to be a research project that focused on preexisting documents.
- Paige thought this is just the first step in the process and using other documents would be starting the process over.
- Gerry was concerned because Emy said once EPA is ready to update the CRP once they receive the strategic planning advice. He said if there is a risk of this advice being the final document for public involvement, we better make sure we have not left out any essential issues. Emy said this is an ongoing conversation and is continuously being updated.
- Doug said the advice should be descriptive rather than prescriptive. He proposed to leave the advice as is and add language describing that the content came out of a process and the intention is to fit in with other public involvement documents. He said he admires the process that produced this advice, but is nervous about the way it is portrayed. Gerry agreed and thought the language could be more open ended.
- Emy said EPA does not find the advice too prescriptive. Paige asked if the EPA would incorporate the advice. Emy said the updates to the CRP will have some updates almost verbatim from the advice, and EPA agrees with the concept and spirit of what is being said.
- Doug said one of his issues is with the structure of the advice. The definitions are strategies. He said he has sent information to the committee and feels he has not been heard and that the advice could be of higher quality. Ken commented that it is important to submit changes or suggestions on the advice early in the development process. He said it is one thing to have words and suggestions on

language, but table and concepts are difficult to incorporate. Liz said it is late in the process to be providing tables.

- Gerry said to consider putting the strategies under the overarching principles. He said to make it clear that the advice is providing examples. Gerry noted that public involvement is not just stakeholders contributing to the development of the activity; it includes empowering stakeholders to be involved and influence the decision-making process. Gerry also thought the advice should note that agencies should be held accountable to the public.
- Barb said the advice is trying to identify how stakeholders are involved and how it is successful.
- Ken said to incorporate the concept of early input on the scope of the decision. Liz said if you are invited into the scope of a decision that is a type of public alternative. Barb said to add involvement in selection of alternatives.
- Paige said it is important to show what changes were made due to public feedback.
- Liz said Gerry's suggestion on effective notices should be in the advice. Gerry said to say effective notice in relation to how the decision will affect public values.
- The committee discussed the SWBG public work shop notice. Gerry said the notice did incorporate HAB or public values. Steve thought it may have been crafted that way so it could to speak to a variety of audiences. Gerry said the notice has to describe how the action will affect public concerns. Liz said there can be future advice specific to notice.
- Referencing the draft advice, Paige asked how public meeting goals could be quantified. Gerry said the amount of comments is a good indicator. He said a goal is something that is measurable. Gerry suggested adding a bullet about being accountable for meeting goals. Ken thought the committee should consider what might happen if the goals for public involvement are not met. Sam Dechter suggested adding consistently evaluate the public involvement effort in light of the goals established for the activity.
- Liz thought separate advice on effective notice would be valuable. Barb asked if the committee could identify examples of effective notices; Ken said he could find some. Gerry said the Model Toxics Control Act has a definition saying that a notice must be provide a description on what resources will be disrupted.

The committee reached consensus on the draft advice. It will be reviewed by the facilitation team and will be on the agenda for the HAB November meeting.

Committee Business

The committee discussed a variety of topics and developed a draft six month work plan.

Responses to advice

- Liz thought PIC needs to have more robust discussions on the agency responses to its advice. She said there has not been a process of looking at the influence the responses have on the PIC committee's process.

CRP

- Liz asked if PIC can see the revised CRP before it is out as a draft. Dieter said Ecology can take that into consideration. Emy said the agencies will begin updating the CRP in January; the public will be able to review it at that time.
- Liz said the PIC committee should also take time to look at other documents developed on public involvement.

State of the Site meetings

- Steve reminded everyone that the State of the Site meetings will be held in April. Liz suggested that the committee begin planning for the State of the Site meetings in December. Emy said sooner would be better so the EPA can start planning the meetings.

TPA Quarterly meeting

- Emy said EPA was planning on having their last TPA Quarterly meeting before the Board meeting in November.

Other topics, six month work plan development

- Liz said the PIC committee is considering a full day meeting in November. Potential meeting topics include
- Steve said the PIC committee should have a debrief of the SWBG workshops and discuss the evening seminar concept in November.
- Barb said budget process could be ready for discussion in December.
- Steve said the PIC committee has been asked to find a way to communicate what the site will look like in 2015. Liz suggested putting that topic in December. Barb suggested having this be a joint topic with the River and Plateau committee.
- Madeline said Ecology would like to discuss tank closure. Liz said the Tank Waste Committee wanted to start talking about tank closure workshops and wanted the PIC committee to be involved.
- Liz asked when the RCRA Site-wide Permit would be available for review. Madeleine said the permit will not be ready before January.
- Ken noted that the Greater than Class C EIS is supposed to come out in January.
- Gerry said access to DOE records and having to extend public involvement plans when records are not available would be a good topic for December.
- Steve said a discussion on demographics of the Board and new membership should be discussed. Ken asked if that is a PIC lead; Liz thought that could be a full Board discussion.

October, November and December work items (from six month work plan)

October:

- The committee will have a conference call to discuss and review draft DOE-EM open government plan advice (note: committee consensus should be achieved prior to November Board meeting packet distribution) [Issue manager: Gerry].
- Confirm DOE need for feedback on “Collaboration Zone” and deadlines.
- Review agencies’ evaluation surveys that will be used at burial ground public workshops.
- The committee will not meet in October.

November:

- Discuss “Openness Part 2,” or how the local DOE office could implement a DOE-EM open government plan; will likely result in a second, follow-up piece of advice to the local DOE offices.
- Related to openness advice to the local DOE offices – discuss DOE’s “Collaboration Zone” (Ben Ellison) using the Hanford website, and the potential use/archiving of diagrams for technical clarification.
- Debrief the burial ground workshops.
- Discussion of public/HAB evening seminar.
- State of the Site public meetings; debrief of ice cream social. Discuss potential and impacts of coupling budget with State of the Site.

December:

- Discuss RCRA Site-wide Permit
- Discuss effective notice; potential advice
- Discuss access to records and extending comment periods when records are not available
- Potentially see early copy of draft CRP (agencies checking possibility of this)

Action Items / Commitments

- The committee will have an October committee call.
- The committee will reach consensus over email on the open government advice to DOE-EM
 - Gerry is the issue manager. A well-developed draft will be distributed to the committee prior to the October call.

- Following the DOE-EM open government advice, PIC will develop more detailed advice to the local DOE field office about how to implement an EM open government plan.
- Emy will send public burial ground workshop survey to EnviroIssues to send out for committee review.
- EnviroIssues will resend COTW and public workshop notice to committee (was sent on Monday 9/20)
- EnviroIssues will send out the DOE open government plan web address to the committee.

Handouts

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

- Draft HAB advice on Incorporating Public Involvement Strategic Planning into the Community Relations Plan, Liz Mattson, September 9, 2010.
- HAB Public Involvement and Communications Committee Strategic Approach to Public Involvement at Hanford, PIC committee, September 9, 2010.
- Proposed addition of goals for Hanford Public Involvement Plan organized by overarching goals of Open Government Directive and USDOE’s Open Government Plan, PIC committee, August 12, 2010.
- Synergizing our various ideas to improve the DOE/EM public participation, Doug Mercer.
- The President’s Open Government Directive, USDOE’s Open Government Plan and Hanford Clean-Up, Gerry Pollet, September 8, 2010.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Tom Carpenter	Paige Knight	Doug Mercer (On Phone)
Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	Ken Niles
Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson	Gerry Pollet
Steve Hudson	Todd Martin	

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrman, Ecology	Earl Fordham, DOH
Ben Ellison, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP (On Phone)	Emy Laija, EPA	Blair Scott, EnviroIssues
		Sharon Braswell, MSA

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

SW Burial Ground Workshop

- Susan Leckband > give intro/background @ COTW
 - Refer to past advice and values
- Public workshops > keep focused on identified goals
 - Identify different audiences and how to specifically target
 - Not necessarily targeting just “students”?
- PIC conference call for public – students – after Oct 5 COTW
 - Gather questions to help shape public workshops (add to FAQ)
 - Agency support
 - PIC synthesize and provide to agencies
- Use Hanford.gov to reach students for similar purpose
- Part of overall issue of reaching a younger audience
- Different locations = different format/level of knowledge?

Open Government

- Define “high value data”
- Describe process of how EM openness plan will work with regional stakeholders to identify high value data and other elements
- DOE “Collaboration Zone”
 - What should be “out there?”
 - What information? Valuable data sets
- CRP should reflect open government plan
- DOE open government plan available at energy.gov/open homepage
- Similarities and differences between directive and plan
- Advice content
 - Why > EM not represented in DOE open government plan
 - HAB sees the need for EM to have its own open government plan – explain why
 - DOE > what is EM not doing, which is why HAB thinks there should be an EM plan
 - Written to EM > asking for specific EM open government plan; short, high-level advice
 - EM open government plan should involve SSABs in plan development...should be “polled for their input” – involving in development would be difficult (e.g. reaching consensus within EM-SSAB)
 - Advice/open government plan should be relevant to CRP
 - “How and should”?
 - How to be open
 - Information available online
 - What is a priority
 - Consider DOE’s ability to implement/resources
 - Why > refer to EMAB advice #235

- Why > see Doug's table – improve quality, legitimacy (be clear on principle goals)
- Why > high public interest - Susan L
 - Beyond minimum – identify the benefit of doing so (example: trust)
- Consistent/not contradictory to CRP advice
- Acct., transparency and collaboration
 - i. Principles to government plan
- “We will work with local DOE field offices”
- What form will this take? Second piece of advice with more detail

Action items/follow-up

- Have October call
- For open government advice to EM – reach committee consensus over email
 - Have great draft ready to discuss on October call
 - Issue manager – Gerry
- PIC will develop follow-up to EM open government advice – advice to local field office about how to implement an EM open government plan
- Emy > send public burial ground workshop survey to Susan Hayman to send out for committee review
- EnviroIssues
 - Resend COTW and public workshop notice to committee (was sent on Monday 9/20)
 - Send DOE open government plan link