

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
January 31, 2007  
Richland, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions..... 1  
Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Update – Look Ahead, Look Back..... 1  
Budget Meetings..... 3  
Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)..... 6  
Evaluation of Public Involvement..... 7  
Committee Business ..... 9  
Handouts..... 9  
Attendees ..... 9

*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**

Helen Wheatley, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The November committee meeting summary was adopted.

**Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Update – Look Ahead, Look Back**

*Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)*

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, discussed Hanford Site public involvement activities. She said that a Richland budget workshop is planned for spring 2007, and that Groundwater Remediation Open Meetings are still being held every third Thursday of the month. Among many upcoming DOE public involvement activities, Karen called out the following:

- *100 Area and 300 Area Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment*
- *Workshop on the Groundwater (200-ZP-1 Operable Unit) and the Vadose Zone (200-PW-1/3/6) Feasibility Studies:* Karen noted that the River and Plateau Committee is following these and other Central Plateau Feasibility Studies and Risk Assessments.
- *Groundwater Science and Technology Needs Workshop:* Karen said DOE is in the process of scheduling this workshop, which will be held in March (likely on March 27<sup>th</sup>). Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), mentioned that Mark Gilbertson, DOE-EM, will be in town.

Karen did not have an update on the Groundwater Project Management Plan (PMP).

*Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

Madeleine Brown, Ecology, said Ecology is preparing to submit revision 9 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site wide permit for public review this summer, which is an important topic for the committee and the Hanford Advisory Board (the HAB or the Board). Madeleine noted that Ecology is preparing a change to the permit for the Integrated Disposal Facility, which will remove permit conditions that apply to an active facility and add a condition that applies to an inactive facility. Ecology is preparing a draft permit for waste management areas of the 222-S Laboratory, which will be available for public comment this spring. Ecology will also seek public comment on a draft permit modification to add the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility to the site-wide permit; Madeleine did not have a timeframe for when the draft will be available for public review.

*Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)*

Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, deferred an update on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) until later on the agenda.

***Committee Discussion***

- Gerry Pollet asked that DOE use more descriptive, “user-friendly” titles for public involvement activities, and thought more formal titles could be used as sub-headings. Madeleine was sensitive to his concern and tries hard to use understandable titles.
- Susan Leckband thought that the DOE public involvement website could utilize links to documents or maps for further information for the public. Karen thought that was a good idea (depending on security issues) and will look into it. Barb Wise noted that all documents will be available on the website when they go out for public comment; currently some are only in draft form.
- Karen said they are currently working on an interactive calendar for the Hanford website. People will be able to see a month at a glance and public involvement opportunities, which will help the public understand the big picture of activities at Hanford. Susan thought that will be an excellent visual and Erik noted it can also serve as an archive of public involvement activities.
- Ginger Wireman, Ecology, mentioned that the draft C200 Demonstration Closure Project Plan will be released soon.
- Gerry asked why the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) activities are not included in the list of upcoming Hanford public involvement activities. Karen said GNEP is out of the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) and is coordinated out of DOE-HQ, but she could add those public involvement opportunities and designated them as an NE activity. Karen noted that there is a GNEP public meeting on March 13 at the Pasco Red Lion to review the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Barb said it is on the public involvement calendar.
- For clarification for the committee, Pam Larsen explained that GNEP is investigating communities around the country to use as potential sites for integrated spent fuel recycling facilities. The Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC) has been awarded \$1.02 million to study what role the Hanford nuclear reservation might play in recycling used fuel from commercial nuclear reactors. Dennis said ten communities around the nation will receive a million dollars for this exploration.

- Gerry asked what notice and mailing lists were being used for the GNEP meeting. Ken Niles asked if NE was receptive to help at the local level; Karen said she and Erik were proactive and met with NE to offer assistance. NE has not yet utilized them as resources.
- Gerry thought there should be meetings outside of the Tri-Cities as well, and thought the Hanford mailing list should be used for notice. Karen said they told NE that there were interested stakeholders throughout the region.
- Pam commented that it seems strange to do a Programmatic EIS without knowing where the facility will be. Dennis said DOE plans to use the information developed by the grant communities in the EIS.

### **Budget Meetings**

Helen introduced her proposal for the 2007 Budget Meetings, which utilizes a two-prong approach of 1) Using the DOE and agencies detailed budget workshop in the Tri-Cities as a public workshop analyzing the details of the 2009 budget and two-year out target, and 2) Having informative regional public meetings analyzing the budget in terms of cleanup priorities. Helen used past advice and discussions about the budget meetings to develop her proposal. Gerry further explained that the proposal is not adding meetings or additional public involvement activities, but rather changes the emphasis of the regional meetings from detailed budget information to a broader picture of cleanup priorities – what the public would do if there were more funding available, what they would cut if there was less, etc.

### ***Committee Discussion***

- Dennis said DOE presents the budget to the agencies in detail, and he agrees inviting the HAB and the public “kills two birds with one stone.” Helen agreed, and said there could be more flexibility with the regional cleanup priority public meetings if the budget workshop also serves as a public meeting.
- Ken said the lack of budget information has been difficult in the past, and meetings lacking good information are not useful. He thought it would be helpful to have a four to five year spread showing DOE-RL and DOE-ORP activities to illustrate what is “going up or going down” funding-wise. He thought it is important to explain what key projects are expensive and winding down, and therefore potentially freeing up funds (such as K Basins). Conversely, he thought it is important to show what projects are ramping up that will require more funding. Ken said it is important to know how DOE is prioritizing and where the regulators differ in priorities. Finally, Ken thought it is important to show what near and long-term TPA milestones are in jeopardy due to funding levels.
- Dennis commented that the regulators do not get all the information, either, such as how much of the groundwater funding is allocated toward carbon tetrachloride cleanup. Dennis agreed that DOE should be clearer about what would be done if there were additional funding.
- Gerry said the public needs to know, for example, that groundwater cleanup cannot be carried out at a particular funding level – then they can call for adequate funding.

- Susan said it needs to be clear to the public how their comments and input will or will not be used.
- Dennis said a good goal is to get as much information to the public as possible, after which they can choose to take action as they see fit based on the information they received. Jim Trombold and Steve Hudson agreed.
- Gerry agreed that one important purpose is to educate the public, as well as the media. Gerry also thought a product should come out of public meetings, and suggested a dot system that was used in the past to connect priorities for groundwater. He thought an outside facilitator would be helpful to conduct meetings and carry out priority exercises.
- Susan asked if DOE would own the end product; Gerry envisioned that the facilitator would create the product and provide it to all the agencies and the public.
- Pam asked if DOE will have meaningful budget material to discuss; Erik said they are expecting a memo from EM outlining what information is available for sharing and in what timeframe. Pam said that Mark Frei wanted meaningful budget discussions, and that she hopes EM holds to it. Karen said they asked EM to allow time in the schedule to coordinate with the Board and allow time for advice if necessary.
- Susan said the committee should make sure the Board understands what it has suggested to the agencies.
- Dennis said the committee's ideas are consistent with the agencies'. Karen liked the dot approach and DOE has been discussing how to make the budget more accessible to the public. She thought everyone would agree making the budget workshop available to the public, and noted that is likely to be held at the end of March rather than on March 15.
- Karen thought it was difficult to distinguish the regional budget cleanup priority meetings from the State of the Site meetings. She and Erik thought it would be more effective if DOE met and talked with smaller organizations and constituencies in the region. She said organizations (e.g. City of Richland) could host a small workshop with DOE and thought it would produce a better dialogue. She thought larger meetings bring out a public that does not know enough about Hanford to get a good product out of the meeting.
- Ginger thought a small group would have a better discussion.
- Erik added that he was unclear about how the regional meetings would look – would they be huge like the State of the Site, or small and focused?
- Pam asked about the timeframe for such small workshops; Karen said ideally in April or May, but any time up to June 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Erik said Paige Knights' Tank Forum is a example of a good meeting; Ken noted that they are public meetings.
- Pam thought it would be helpful for DOE to provide information prior to budget discussions so people or constituencies can have a better background and develop questions prior to the meeting.

- Dennis asked if these small workshops with constituencies were in lieu of the regional meetings. Barb said yes, DOE was talking about replacing the regional meetings with small briefings.
- Ken thought small briefings are useful, but was concerned with having them instead of a regional public meeting. He recognized that public meetings are not well attended, but as few as they may be, people should not lose the opportunity to learn about Hanford and comment on Hanford issues.
- Karen said DOE needs to educate the public, but it is also the responsibility of stakeholders. She said DOE struggles with getting feedback from constituencies.
- Karen said DOE will release a special Hanford budget update at the end of February or in early March. She thought it is a good opportunity for the committee or Board to send flyers out to constituencies (paid for by DOE). Karen said mailings are a tool other sites use to get feedback from organizations.
- Helen did not think it made sense to have small constituency workshops in lieu of regional public meetings. She considered the State of the Site a look-back at the year, while the budget/priority meetings are a look-ahead to the coming year. She said there is more accountability with a large public meeting, and thought her proposal was a compromise in that there would not be rigorous standards of feedback from the regional meetings as agencies are typically held to, like in the budget workshop.
- Dennis thought smaller workshops were a good idea, but not in lieu of regional public meetings. Karen thought meeting with organizations and constituencies would reach more people.
- Susan asked if DOE-ORP and DOE-RL were willing, for example, to go to Seattle for four separate meetings with various organizations instead of those four organizations coming to one public meeting. Karen said yes, but they would have to consider schedules and work with the organizations to see what would work best. Dennis said EPA would be supportive, but attendance would also be dependent on many factors.
- Ken asked who from DOE-RL would attend the meetings Karen proposed; Karen said DOE would have the most appropriate people attend, most likely be Greg Jones and Jeff Fry.
- Gerry did not support the idea of having meetings with organizations instead of regional public meetings. It is good to have additional meetings with organizations, but there needs to be public meetings with official notice and record. Gerry did not think the meetings were too similar to a State of the Site meeting. In the past, he said people have been frustrated with the narrowness of budget meetings and not having enough detailed budget information. Erik thought that sounded the same as a State of the Site meeting; Dennis thought the problem may be that the State of the Site meetings lack an identity, which is a separate question to explore.
- Erik noted that decisions regarding the budget meetings have not been made; they just wanted to present the idea and get feedback.

- Susan suggested having the Tri-Cities budget meeting adjacent to a HAB meeting or during committee week. Helen requested it not conflict with Earth Day or the GNEP public meeting. Cathy said it will be discussed further on the committee call.
- Pam commented that Tri-Cities public meetings often draw disgruntled workers, and asked if a meeting could be scheduled for them so budget meetings can stay focused. Karen agreed and said DOE is trying to do more internal outreach. She thought employees will still attend public meetings because they want to be heard and advocated for. Erik agreed and said they have been advocating for a separate worker concerns meeting, even though workers will probably continue to utilize all forums.

The agencies and committee agree on having an open, public, detailed budget workshop in the Tri-Cities. However, the committee did not think having small, constituency and agency meetings should be used in lieu of public regional cleanup priority meetings, and the committee will need to continue that discussion with DOE.

### **Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, presented an update on the series of proposed workshops for the TC&WM EIS. She noted that the Model Technical Review Group (MRTG) met in December 2006 on the preliminary model and will continue to meet throughout the spring and have a final report close-out meeting on July 12, 2007. Mary Beth noted that some meeting dates are tentatively scheduled, as well as some workshop topics – DOE is looking for feedback on what some workshops should be about. She noted that any changes will be posted on the website.

#### ***Committee Discussion***

- Gerry asked about the February 15 workshop on Alternatives and Cumulative Analysis; Mary Beth said it will be held at the Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) building, tentatively scheduled from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. She said there will be a presentation on alternatives, but did not know the presentation format. She will distribute more information as it is available.
- Pam asked if DOE will share drafts of the TC&WM EIS with the Board. Mary Beth said she would like to get feedback early in the process. Workshops may be more informal and dialogue-focused, or there may be drafts available for review.
- Pam asked if the tribes were involved; Mary Beth said they are working on a vadose zone paper with Dirk Dunning for the April 16<sup>th</sup> workshop.
- Ken pointed out that workshops in June and September are open to stakeholder suggestion; Mary Beth said DOE considered that people may not want to talk about a particular topic, and is open to topic suggestions.
- Susan asked how large the TC&WM EIS will be. Mary Beth said it will be big – there are currently 19 alternatives, plus cumulative impacts. She thought it will be a challenge to present it in an understandable manner.
- Ken asked how long the public will have to review the draft TC&WM EIS; Mary Beth did not know yet. Susan and Ken both stated that it will take a serious amount of time to

review. Madeleine commented that the size of the document and review time may be a subject for future advice.

- Pam asked about EPA and Ecology's level of involvement; Mary Beth said EPA has not had much involvement, but Ecology is a cooperating agency and has done a fair amount of work on things such as presentations on the tasks, the structure of public outreach, quality assurance, etc.
- Pam asked if the process is going well; Mary Beth said overall, she is pleased.
- Pam asked how Inez Triay has been involved; Mary Beth said she is the senior policy person on the EIS, and signed the settlement, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and the quality assurance plan. Mary Beth said they talk to DOE-HQ on a policy level on a fairly routine basis.

### **Evaluation of Public Involvement**

Helen asked how the committee can enhance overall HAB public involvement as defined by the charter, and how the committee can support the HAB, especially in the face of budget challenges. Helen thought there needs to be a good feedback mechanism and evaluation of public involvement as outlined in the Community Relations Plan (CRP). Helen thought the PIC could create a usable package for the agencies outlining what good public involvement should be, or perhaps have a workshop with an evaluation expert.

### ***Committee Discussion***

- Helen asked if the CRP should be used to focus the evaluation discussion; Dennis said the agencies perform ongoing evaluations and he does not find the CRP annual evaluation requirement useful and thought it could be dropped.
- Ginger said there are many ways to evaluate public participation. She said meeting attendees can be contacted after the meeting to get feedback – why they attended, how they were notified, what they thought of the meeting, would they attend another meeting, etc. She said sign-in sheets could be used to contact past attendees – ask them why they have stayed involved for multiple years or why they never attended another meeting. She thought Ecology may be amenable to hiring a professional research firm to contact people who are engaged with Hanford issues. Ginger said Nolan Curtis, Ecology, has talked about hiring a public involvement specialist for some time, and wondered if it has not happened because the Board has not advised it, or if it is out of Ecology's budget.
- Ginger asked the committee to think about why people who are notified of public meetings do not attend, and what could be done differently to attract more attendees.
- Gerry agreed with Ginger, and noted that Heart of America Northwest had presented a public involvement survey at the last PIC meeting, and thought it could be used again. He also suggested using a survey card to ascertain why the public does not attend.
- Helen asked if the committee should work on a piece of advice on public involvement evaluation.

- Bob Parazin asked what metrics have been utilized. Dennis thought it would be more useful to investigate why more people are not engaged or are not attending public meetings, versus the specifics of how to do an evaluation. He thought a general discussion of how to do evaluations is not useful. Rather than a piece of advice, he thought it would be more useful to have a discussion on how to engage people, why they do not participate, and develop an evaluation form to get feedback.
- Jim thought a workshop would be beneficial to discuss more effective outreach. He thought there are other methods of public outreach besides meetings, such as public television. Jim thought DOE and the Board should reach out to people rather than asking people to come to them.
- Karen thought the committee was on the right track and would like to work collaboratively with the HAB to develop evaluation tools (e.g. phone calls, mailers, etc.).
- Susan noted that since the CRP requires public meetings, it behooves the Board to get as many people to attend as possible. She thought an email to the current listserv asking a series of questions – why did you attend, what would it take for you to attend – would be useful. She thought the Board could create a “Public Meeting Guidance” based on advice to reach the goal of a more informed public.
- Bob thought the committee should address the diversity of opinion on the importance of public involvement. He thought there was a difference between why agencies want public involvement and why stakeholders want public involvement.
- Erik clarified that “meeting” and “public involvement” should not be used interchangeably. A meeting is a tactic and public involvement is a strategy. Helen agreed that public meetings are mechanisms. Erik thought a big question was why are people not attending public meetings – what are DOE and the Board competing with?
- Ken wondered if people were getting satisfactory information on Hanford from other sources. He thought the end goal cannot be public meeting attendance, but thought the lack of attendance should be evaluated. Madeleine agreed, and cited disenfranchisement or prior satisfaction on Hanford issues as possible reasons for non-attendance.
- Helen suggested having a workshop or an agenda item to flesh out the committee’s ideas and to develop tools for public participation evaluation. Gerry suggested creating an outline for the workshop and having a conference call to develop an agenda. He also suggested getting an outside view of what works in similar arenas, such as a panel to help shape goals and define mechanisms and evaluation tools.
- Karen thought it would be good to investigate other sites’ successes or failures.
- Barb noted that there may be resources on the Board who understand and have played a critical role in public involvement already, such as Shelley Cimon. She thought a discussion within the committee would be a good first step, using Madeleine and Ginger as resources.

The committee will develop a public involvement workshop or agenda item to discuss public involvement tools and mechanisms of evaluation.



## **Committee Business**

Barb noted that the administrative record and all its process are being reexamined and revamped. She asked that committee members email her suggestions, complaints, concerns, and ideas to help in the revision process. She said examples would be helpful, such as an index or map. Barb said she would make an announcement to the full Board as well.

Gerry thanked Barb for reexamining the record. He asked if the Idaho administrative record is on the homepage; Barb did not know but will check.

The committee will have a conference call to plan a public involvement workshop and has a February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting placeholder.

Next steps and topics for future meetings:

- 2007 budget meetings
- Evaluation of public involvement

## **Handouts**

- Recommended Changes for 2007 Budget Meetings – Helen Wheatley
- Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities – TPA Agencies
- TC&WM EIS Public Information Outreach Plan – Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP
- TC&WM EIS Tribal, Stakeholder, and Public Information Opportunities – Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP
- Tri-Party Agencies Annual Evaluation of Public Involvement Activities and Participation 2006 – TPA Agencies
- Does What We Say Make Sense? – TPA Agencies

---

## **Attendees**

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet	
Pam Larsen	Jeanie Sedgely (phone)	
Susan Leckband	Jim Trombold	
Laura Mueller	Helen Wheatley	
Ken Niles		
Bob Parazin		

### **Others**

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Innovations (phone)
		Karen Hale, CH2MHill
		Joy Shoemake, CH2MHill
		Lynnette Bennett, WCH

