

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 6, 2008  
Pasco, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions..... 1  
Public Involvement Workshop..... 1  
Tri-Party Agreement Quarterly Debrief ..... 5  
DOE-HQ Office of Nuclear Energy: Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Programmatic  
Environmental Impact Statement (GNEP EIS) ..... 5  
U.S. Ecology Low Level Waste Remediation..... 5  
DOE Public Involvement Plans..... 5  
TPA Agency Websites ..... 6  
Issue Manager Identification ..... 6  
Committee Business ..... 7  
Handouts..... 7  
Attendees..... 8

*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 Committee (PIC) vice-chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The November meeting summary was adopted.

Steve encouraged the committee and the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) to strengthen its public involvement work. He hoped PIC would be able to get a “fresh start” and look at issues in a systematic way. Steve encouraged the committee to analyze what is successful and how it should meet its obligations.

**Public Involvement Workshop**

Ken Niles introduced a public involvement workshop proposal. The purpose of the proposed workshop is to look at ways for all agencies and organizations at Hanford to more effectively communicate with the public and provide opportunities for meaningful public involvement.. Participants could include the Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), State of Oregon, tribes, HAB, Heart of America NW, Columbia Riverkeeper, Hanford Watch, Hanford Challenge, and the Hanford Information Network.

Ken proposed a ground rule to encourage a constructive and open discussion: Assign no blame for past activities and do not focus on fault or past disagreements.

For the workshop to be successful, Ken said it should operate by a pre-approved agenda, which would include a discussion of agency and organization public information and involvement goals and strategies. This would include what each agency and organization hopes to accomplish through their public involvement activities, why they engage the public, and to better understand why other groups or agencies want to engage the public. Ken also thought the discussion could identify common themes and disconnects.

Ken said the workshop could also discuss the results of agencies' public involvement survey. Ken suggested that all participants prior to the workshop identify their:

- Suite of public involvement activities
- Most effective and ineffective public involvement activities
- Unique public involvement activities
- Public involvement activities that were successful in the past but are no longer utilized

Workshop participants would also discuss what makes public meetings effective (formats, publicity, notification, etc.), how to make better use of the internet (led by a group that effectively uses the internet), how to utilize news media (radio, television, press releases, etc.), and miscellaneous public involvement activities (state/local fairs, videos, speakers' bureaus, libraries, written materials, etc.). Ken also proposed ending the workshop with a general evaluation of all public involvement activities.

Ken thought it is difficult to find enough time in the TPA Quarterly or PIC meetings to thoroughly discuss the public involvement issues that face the Board and Hanford. He hoped the workshop would serve as a forward-looking exercise and provide a solid basis for moving forward on specific public involvement activities and decisions. He thought groups could learn from each other (e.g. what activities work well).

Ken believes that through such open and honest discussion, they could find the reasons behind various disconnects (such as meeting notification and advertisement), understand and accept differences, and find a common ground. Ken's hope is that such establishment of understanding could eliminate the same discussion on specific issues year after year. He hoped that there would be an opportunity for understanding to move beyond battles over agendas and notification that often leads to repetitive disagreements and builds unnecessary frustration.

Ken thought this workshop should be held within the next few months. He said discussions on specific issues, such as the budget, could be much better if this workshop were done first.

Ken suggested that Max Power facilitate the workshop; he said Max is willing and has wide-spread recognition of being knowledgeable and impartial.

### *Discussion*

Steve agreed that there has to be ground rules on how the workshop would work and what people want to accomplish. He wanted to make sure there was some agreement prior to the workshop and good preparation.

Susan Leckband said that this workshop would not be sponsored by the Board, but the Board should participate. She asked Ken if he wants the agencies to sponsor the workshop. Ken did not want it to be a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agency workshop. He understood the financial costs

involved, and thought they could be mitigated by using Ecology's conference room or some other free facility. The other major cost would be travel; he proposed that the workshop be held in the Tri-Cities since most of the attendees are there. Also, there would likely be some costs associated with Max Power's time.

Greg deBruler discussed proposed outcomes of the workshop. Before attending such a workshop, he said he wanted a commitment from the agencies that they would follow through with commitments made at the November HAB meeting, including State of the Site advertisements. He encouraged a collaborative process and agreement with the TPA agencies to implement ideas generated at the workshop. Greg said he did not want to participate in a workshop if there is no implementation commitment.

Ken did not envision the workshop generating detailed public involvement activities. He wants a more thorough discussion on what agencies can or cannot do, and what they are willing to do. For example, Ken said as a representative of the State of Oregon, there are certain things he cannot or will not say. He thought a frank discussion about public involvement goals from agency and organization perspectives, free of accusations or discussions of past disagreements would be very fruitful. Ken said when they reach that level of understanding, the outcome can be applied to specific issues, like what a display ad should say.

Greg thought he and Ken were essentially saying the same thing, but he thought there were many timely issues that the committee and Board need to address. He was disappointed that commitments made for State of the Site notification were not honored. Instead of having a broad discussion, Greg wants the agencies engaged now and into the future to develop a budget communications piece so it does not turn out like the State of the Site meetings where cleanup delays were not discussed. He said the committee and Board need to work now on the impending budget meetings in March. He wanted to know if the agencies will work collaboratively and move forward.

Ken said he felt like they will end up where they always do.

Dennis said that certain commitments were not honored for the State of the Site meetings because the agencies and the Board did not get out far enough in front of the issues far enough to plan accordingly. Regarding the workshop, he thought it would be valuable to understand why agencies will and will not do certain things. He described an advertisement Ecology used in the past ("Roll on, Columbia, roll on") as an example of wording that EPA disliked. Another example is the word "crisis;" some groups like to use it, some do not. He thought a workshop would help everyone understand different perspectives. Dennis also did not want to continually have the same public involvement discussions without moving forward to more effective solutions.

Bob Parks asked Greg to clarify if he was disappointed that there was not enough advertisement for the State of the Site meetings. Karen said she could answer; she said DOE did not collaboratively develop the ad before it was released. She said there were many reasons that did not happen, including time constraints, but DOE did agree to collaborate on the development of advertisements and did not follow through.

Greg said his other concern was that none of the agencies focused on the proposed delays to the TPA. Greg said the burden was put on public interest groups to tell the public about proposed delays to cleanup and to encourage them to attend the meetings. Greg said in November, the agencies agreed to collaboratively work on marketing and communication pieces so people would

be educated enough to attend and get more out of meetings. Greg said that commitment was broken.

Greg said he did not disagree with Ken about having a workshop, but he thought specific issues, like the budget, were time-sensitive and needed immediate attention. He thought a workgroup should flesh out public involvement and communication actions. He also said he did not want to work on something without agency commitment. Greg thought DOE was starting to do what they committed to in November by handing out a draft budget meeting advertisement.

Karen said the agencies are committed to a collaborative process, but the State of the Site meetings are an example of how that process fell through. She noted that collaboration is a two-way street and that the committee and Board should not wait for DOE to ask them for suggestions. Karen said she often asks the committee and Board to start thinking about particular issues, like budget meetings, and does not get feedback or it comes too late to be used effectively. She said it can be frustrating and hoped the committee could start addressing issues earlier to ensure DOE has enough time to discuss and consider requests.

Steve agreed that PIC did not follow through with its obligations.

Cathy McCague said the committee should think about how it wants to be involved in the public involvement workshop. The committee should also look at the agencies' public involvement strategies and decide how it wants to be involved. The agencies will discuss their public involvement strategic plan at the Board meeting on February 7.

Norma Jean Germond commended the agencies and Karen on their improved public involvement efforts. She thought outreach efforts have vastly improved in the past few years. Norma Jean liked how at past budget and State of the Site meetings the agencies had enough time to explain their concerns and were able to provide enough information for the public to learn and understand the issues.

Susan agreed that the public involvement workshop should not be a HAB sponsored event, but it is very important and relevant for the Board to participate. She said the committee needs an issue manager to participate and since it is a broad workshop, it will need follow-up work. Ken did not want the TPA agencies to sponsor the workshop; he was willing for the State of Oregon to sponsor it.

Susan thought the committee was discussing two separate but parallel efforts: 1) the public involvement workshop and 2) important, time-sensitive issues that need immediate attention. She thought for those time-sensitive issues, like the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS), the committee needs to identify how the public should be engaged.

Karen thought there should be a focused discussion during the time the Board was meeting this week to address time-sensitive issues like budget meetings. She said DOE was trying to plan ahead in anticipation of DOE-HQ issuing the guidance for FY 2010 some time in late February. She said she could meet at lunch to discuss those issues versus waiting to meet with PIC next month to discuss and obtain feedback when the planning should be well underway.

Greg volunteered to be the issue manager for 2010 budget outreach.

Ken agreed that the committee should focus on time-sensitive issues now and he would push the public involvement workshop to a later timeframe. He agreed with Susan that they are two separate and parallel efforts and should not be combined or discussed at the same time.

Dennis agreed that the workshop should happen and should discuss big policy issues; he suggested revisiting it in a few months.

The committee agreed that Greg, the issue manager, and the agencies would meet the following day (February 7) at the Pasco Red Lion to discuss immediate public involvement priorities, including the upcoming regional budget meetings.

Ken, Norma Jean and Steve volunteered to be issue managers for the public involvement workshop.

### **Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Debrief**

The TPA agencies rolled out their draft TPA Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan matrix at the TPA Quarterly meeting before the PIC meeting. Dennis said there are four or five major policy issues that they want to collaboratively work on and develop public involvement materials and processes. He said the matrix will be discussed in full at tomorrow's Board meeting; he suggested that the few PIC attendees that did not attend the TPA Quarterly review the matrix and wait until tomorrow for the full debrief.

### **Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) Office of Nuclear Energy: Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (GNEP PEIS)**

DOE-RL followed up on their commitment to find a GNEP contact for PIC. Karen directed the PIC to Debby Swichkow (202-586-1616); her contact information is also listed in the Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities (February 2008) handout. Karen was assured that is the correct contact person.

Ken noted that the GNEP proposal has been scaled back from three facilities to one facility. He said DOE-HQ is committed to returning to the two sites in the Northwest where they had public meetings. Norma Jean thought the one facility is the advanced fuel cycle facility.

### **U.S. Ecology Low Level Waste Remediation**

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said the U.S. Department of Ecology Low-Level Waste Remediation and Public Involvement Plan has impacts to Hanford, but it is not a TPA issue. He said the Washington State Department of Ecology will use its public involvement process. The public will be able to comment on the public involvement plan and will have the opportunity to get on the state listserv. He said Ecology views it as a Washington State Department of Ecology activity.

Susan noted that it is outside the HAB scope, but individual organizations can get involved.

### **DOE Public Involvement Plans**

Greg said at the Greater than Class C (GTCC) EIS meeting in Troutdale, Oregon, the person running the meeting said there is a new public involvement plan being developed at DOE-HQ that will be implemented. He asked if the local DOE offices knew anything about it.

Karen looked into it and the DOE-Office of Environmental Management said there is no new plan being developed. She thought he may have referred to a GTCC-specific communications plan. Greg said he was unable to find more information online.

Ken thought the GTCC EIS was supposed to be out in the summer with follow-up public meetings.

### **TPA Agency Websites**

Greg said he was unable to find on the DOE and Ecology websites a good picture of upcoming issues and events in 2008. He thought the websites should show all issues and the timeframe they will be addressed so the public can plan their schedules accordingly. Karen said that information is on the DOE Calendar of Events. She said DOE had previously provided a tutorial to the PIC on it, and could do another.

Karen also noted that the DOE-RL and DOE-ORP websites are undergoing redevelopment. DOE is currently forming a focus group to get ideas on what the websites should look like. Rich Buelis the lead and in addition to people involved with Hanford activities, he is looking for individuals outside the Hanford network to gain outside perspectives (e.g. local business). She thought PIC should identify an issue manager to participate in the focus group; there are participation opportunities this month.

Greg volunteered to be the DOE website redevelopment issue manager.

Dennis noted that the EPA Region 10 Hanford website has been temporarily shut down for updates. He said it will be improved and live again in about a month.

### **Issue Manager Identification**

Dennis asked PIC to assign issue managers to specific topics on the draft TPA Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan matrix.

Cathy noted that the technical committees have issue managers for those issues and asked if PIC should have issue managers for the same issues. Dennis said yes, it would be good to have both since they are cross-cutting issues.

Susan said this is an opportunity for real work. She hoped someone would volunteer to be issue manager for TC&WM EIS public involvement. She said they need to start building how they will convey information to the public and identify what they want from the public.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Manager(s)</b>
TC&WM EIS	Greg deBruler
River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCRA) Site-Wide Permit	Gerry Pollet ( <i>tentative</i> )
Website Focus Group	Greg deBruler
Public Involvement Workshop ( <i>on hold</i> )	Ken Niles, Norma Jean Germond, Steve

	Hudson
2010 Budget Development	Greg deBruler
Groundwater 200 ZP-1 Proposed Plan	Steve Hudson, Greg deBruler

The committee will identify other issues managers for issues presented on the matrix.

Susan thought Shelley Cimon would be the issue manager for Central Plateau Waste Site Cleanup 200 PW-1, 3, and 6 Proposed Plan.

Nolan noted that the RCRA Site-Wide Permit is not currently designed for public consumption. The agencies are at the point of formatting it for public use and need committee input now. It would be very difficult to go back and change it once it is formatted.

### **Committee Business**

Susan requested scheduled conference calls to ensure the committee responds quickly to DOE's request for support and input. Steve asked to have focused calls, such as a call dedicated to discussing the TC&WM EIS.

Susan also suggested having issue manager meetings. She said the committee cannot simply complain that DOE is not doing what it wants DOE to do; the committee has the opportunity now to take action.

Maynard suggested having joint conference calls with applicable technical committees; the committee agreed that would be helpful for time-sensitive issues.

Karen asked if it made sense to establish a public involvement agenda item on other committee agendas to ensure integrated discussions. Cathy thought that could work if PIC members committed to being involved with other committees.

Susan thought it was smart to meld technical and public involvement pieces together.

Maynard asked that technical committee agendas be provided to PIC issue managers so they can be involved; Cathy will start copying PIC members on the technical committee meeting agendas.

Susan requested that the matrix be sent electronically to all PIC members.

Greg committed to attending the next River and Plateau Committee meeting for the Groundwater 200 ZP-1 Proposed Plan agenda item.

Susan was excited for the public involvement opportunities and thanked the agencies for the matrix; she thought it is a good roadmap.

The next PIC committee call is on February 21<sup>st</sup> at 11:30 am.

### **Handouts**

- Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities (February 2008) – TPA agencies
- TPA Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan matrix (draft) – TPA agencies
- Workshop on Hanford Public Information/Involvement (draft) – Ken Niles

---

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg deBruler	Susan Leckband	Bob Parks
Norma Jean Germond	Laura Mueller	Betty Tabbutt
Harold Heacock	Ken Niles	
Steve Hudson	Bob Parazin	

**Others**

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL/ORP	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, FH
Carrie Meyer, DOE-RL		Joanna Burger, Rutgers/CRESP