

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

August 5, 2009

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Status of Public Involvement at Hanford..... 2
Role and Function of the PIC Committee (part 1)..... 6
Committee Relations Plan..... 8
State of the Site Meetings 15
Role and Function of the PIC Committee (part 2)..... 20
Action Items / Commitments 21
Handouts 23
Attendees..... 23

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. The committee approved the April meeting summary. Steve encouraged board members to read the recent committee meeting summaries to keep up to speed on issues.

Steve thanked everyone for attending and said the workshop would focus on how to strengthen the way the PIC meets the Hanford Advisory Board’s (HAB or Board) responsibilities for public involvement. Steve said during the recent leadership retreat it became clear that PIC’s efforts need to be redefined. Steve thought the committee needs to formally respond to requests from the agencies by producing advice. Steve said he hopes the committee will work on how PIC can evaluate public involvement activities, make better use of technology to reach broader public, develop an advice template, and introduce an editorial area for the web site.

Susan Leckband said the Board received a letter from the Tri-party agencies regarding their priorities for the Board, and includes ways PIC can help engage the public better. Susan Hayman suggested that the committee review the letter during the discussion on the work plan.

Ken Niles distributed copies of a report that the Oregon Department of Energy put together summarizing the last 20 years of cleanup. He said the report is also available online.

Status of Public Involvement at Hanford

Ken provided the results from a survey conducted late last year about public involvement that included the agencies, community groups and stakeholders.

Question 1: Why do public involvement? Ken said the answers to this question showed that everyone does not have the same goals. Almost everyone said part of the purpose was to inform or educate. Stakeholders said the purpose was to influence cleanup decisions. The regulators said the purpose was to reach sustainable decisions. The Department of Energy said the purpose was to promote an open dialogue. Ken thought the different values for public involvement contributes to a disconnect over issues; until everyone agrees on what they hope to accomplish, there will continue to be a problem.

Question 2: Why haven't we been consistently effective? Ken said the answers for this varied. People said things like there is not always a good feedback loop; the public often does not feel heard; there is a lack of agreement on goals/objectives for conducting public involvement; some groups feel there is a lack of timely/effective notice; the agencies rely on public interest groups to notify/inform public; comment periods are sometimes too short; and there is a lack of early collaboration.

Nolan Curtis, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided a short overview of the 2009 Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agencies Survey of Public Involvement. Nolan said the survey is called for yearly in the Community Relations Plan. Ecology conducts the survey for the Tri-parties; they also conduct the assessments of public meetings. Ecology did the survey in April and May and sent out notices via email and postcard. The survey is available online and by phone on a toll free number. The survey has grown to 34 questions. The questions in the survey are based on the expectations set in the Community Relations Plan.

Nolan said the first few questions in the survey deal with how the public prefers to receive information, then the survey moves into the quality of meetings/workshops, agency treatment of input, and follow-up/responsiveness. The survey also asks for input on the agencies strengths and weaknesses and level of participation. The last section is an open comment field.

Nolan said they have set a goal for the surveys to get 60 percent of responders agreeing or strongly agreeing with the questions. Nolan said they use a value-rating scoring system to get a sum and a narrative evaluation for the survey. They removed the non-applicable answers (neither agree/disagree and NA) and averaged out answers to get a sense of the normative score. Nolan explained that they color coded the results to highlight areas where people responded positively (in green) and where the agencies need to focus on improvements (in red). Nolan pointed out that there are some areas with polarizing results, both red and green, and it will take some work to get to the underlying issues there. Nolan said overall, the results show that there are significant opportunities for improvement. The favorable responses represent a positive direction and achievement for

both the agencies and the public. Nolan thought the agencies should focus on improvements in areas where 20 percent or more of the public indicated dissatisfaction.

Nolan said he is personally concerned about the fact that data has been collected from this survey for years and there seems to be an inability to act on the data. Nolan said in general, it seems like people tend to use the data that reinforces the response they want and ignore others. Nolan felt that the agencies need to take advantage of the opportunities to improve.

Gerry Pollet presented the results from a recent survey completed by Heart of America Northwest (HOANW). Gerry said 165 individuals completed the survey. HOANW targeted people who attended meetings and were on the TPA email list or HOANW's email list. Gerry said the TPA survey had 61 respondents, 26 percent of which were government agencies and 20 percent of which were HAB. Gerry said HOANW's goal was to correlate the information from their survey with what the TPA survey found to identify where there are unmet needs and how improvements can be made to meet goals. Gerry said their survey is not yet complete and they hope to continue this effort by conducting phone surveys to get more data.

Gerry said the agencies provided the TPA email list, which consists of 600 email contacts. They also used the HOANW list, which consists of approximately 3000 email contacts. Gerry said he was surprised that the TPA list was so small given Hanford is the largest Superfund site in the nation. HOANW did some research into the TPA list and found that half of the people on the email list are government employees or contractors. Gerry said out of the remaining 300 email contacts, many of them were PR firms or people on the list for other work reasons. Gerry felt that the email list is not adequately reaching the public and needs to be expanded.

Gerry reviewed the results of the survey: 61 percent of respondents had attended a public meeting about Hanford in recent years. Out of those, 47 percent said they received notice for the meeting from HOANW, 22 percent said they received notice from the TPA list as well, six percent received notice from other citizen groups, seven percent received notice from newspaper, and seven percent received notice by word of mouth.

When asked about what motivated people to attend meetings, 43 percent said HOANW notification, 13 percent said agency notification, and nine percent said citizen group email. Out of 13 percent that received agency notice, eight percent identified email.

When asked about the quality of informational materials, 50 percent of people rated the HOANW citizens guide above a three (on scale 3-5), 28 percent of people had never received a citizens guide, 26 percent rated agency materials as good to excellent, and 50 percent had not received an agency mailing.

When asked about web site preferences, 37 percent had visited US DOE's web site, 37 percent had visited Ecology's web site, 27 percent had viewed EPA's website, 39 percent

rated the web sites above a three for helpfulness, and 46 percent of people had never been on an agency web site.

Gerry felt that incorporating meeting evaluations would be important for the overall public involvement evaluation. He also suggested targeting people who are not currently being surveyed regularly. He said there is room for improvement in meetings and material utility as well. Gerry said the survey shows a reliance on citizen groups for meeting notification. The agencies need to determine how to reach people who said they want notice through an alternative means from the TPA.

Regulator Perspectives

- Sharon Braswell, Ecology, said often at public meetings, HOANW has a separate sign up list outside the main entry and it is confusing for the public because once someone signs up on HOANW's list they do not want to sign up on the TPA list. Sharon said she is happy to provide copies of the notification if people would like to distribute to their own lists. Sharon said she understands that people do not want to share their organization's lists, but thought that it was important to share resources. Gerry said they often send out information from the public notice to their lists when they feel there is a significant issue and the public needs to see it. Gerry said the agencies list is a public record and HOANW members do not want their names disclosed. Gerry said they assure people that they will not share their contact information from their list.
- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said he was surprised that there are so few people on the TPA listserv. Dennis agreed that the timeliness of the information and responses is challenging and has been a chronic problem. Dennis said there are constraints on how much notification the agencies can provide, but he suggested the committee help brainstorm ways to deal with this.

Committee Discussion

- Susan Leckband asked whether the agencies responded to the first question from Ken's survey that they do public involvement because they are required to. Ken said they may have, but he was not sure. Nolan said they did not reference the requirement because of the way the question was asked.
- Paula Call, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said she did not think there was a disconnect between the different goals stated from the first question in the survey results Ken presented. She said many of the goals Ken cited were similar. Ken said the disconnect was between the agencies wanting to inform, and stakeholders wanting to influence processes. Paula thought that the goal of sustainable decisions recognizes that some influence would be involved. She said there is a give and take and she saw these objectives as closely related.
- Paige Knight said at a meeting earlier in the year, she asked Jane Hedges, Ecology, if the Board could influence the permit process by commenting and Jane told her no. Paige said Ecology held the meeting to share information about the process, but not to take input. Paige thought this caused a disconnect between what the public was

expecting by coming to the meeting and what the agencies were trying to accomplish. Paula asked if it would have helped for the agencies to say ahead of time that the meeting was just informative. Paige thought that they should not hold a meeting if that is the goal.

- Nolan said there are different activities that the public can provide a varying level of input on. Nolan said that unless there is a legislative change, there are some activities that do not allow much input. Nolan said the disconnect happens because sometimes the agencies are able to engage the public and other times they are not and the agencies are not always able to identify the opportunities effectively.
- Gerry thought this issue pointed out a need for a strategic Hanford public involvement plan so it is clear how much public involvement will be allowed on upcoming activities. Gerry said a public involvement plan should design ways for involving the public on key items, rather than simply having a schedule of public involvement opportunities. Gerry said the schedule tends to identify decision points and there is little public involvement at that point.
- Steve thought it was important to meet the public's expectation for involvement and agreed that often the expectations are not clear up front. Ken also said that just because there is an opportunity for input does not guarantee that input will change the decision.
- Shelly Cimon felt that it was important to change the paradigm for public involvement and for the agencies to be open to having early public input. Nolan felt that there have been many cases where the agencies have come forth with a proposal and have incorporated input from the public. Ken believed that public values have been very consistent throughout the past 20 years. Norma Jean said DOE adopted recommendations from the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) and agreed to conduct the process they outlined for outreach back in 1998.
- Steve asked if Nolan had any additional data or details about the questions that are categorized red or orange on the handout. Nolan said they do not have any additional information about why people were negative in those areas. He said the survey was intended to provide an overall sense of how people were feeling. Nolan felt that the questions regarding meetings were particularly hard to gauge because presentations will never serve everybody. Nolan felt the agencies should pay particular attention to the results of the responsiveness and trust questions. He said they have opportunity to improve the perception that agencies do not respond well or completely to requests from the public. Nolan said a significant amount of people felt their input did not matter.
- Ken asked if Gerry would be willing to send emails to the HOANW list and invite people to be on the TPA list. Gerry said they have, and people do not want to be on the TPA list. In general, people who are members of several groups have chosen not to get agency materials. Susan suggested that PIC talk about how to help the agencies increase people on listserv.

- Norma Jean said people may want to hear from constituent groups instead of agencies to understand the issues and why they need to be involved. Things that come from TPA are brief and people are not being informed about what the issues are and why they should attend meetings. Norma Jean said the timing of the notice is an issue as well; if it comes out late people already have plans and cannot make it. Gerry agreed the timing of the notice needs to be extended. Gerry said this would be helpful for HOANW in order to get a citizens guide out as well. Steve said people want to know about priority items and what the key issues are.
- Susan asked if people with government or agency email addresses were given Gerry's survey. Gerry confirmed that they removed agency and government emails from the distribution because they did not think it was appropriate for those people to respond.
- Paige said when she holds a meeting she sends the notice out at least a month ahead of time and then a week before as a reminder. Gerry said they have good data on how people respond to emails and it is rare for any government agency to get a 30 percent open rate on email. Gerry said if you do not send multiple emails you are not using email the way it is meant to be used.
- Shelley suggested adding managing technology to the committees list of issues to follow up on.

Role and Function of the PIC Committee (part 1)

Steve distributed a handout that proposed changes to the role and function of the PIC, based on information from the leadership retreat, PIC meetings, and other meetings where requests have been made of the PIC. The handout outlines how the committee could meet the responsibilities that have been requested. The HAB process manual includes abbreviated statements about the PIC's role and says very little about considering issues and tracking issues. Other committees have a clearer set of goals and expectations. A HAB white paper published by the PIC does a better job of identifying goals and responsibilities. Steve thought the PIC needs to engage to help agencies meet their responsibilities. One of the things that has been asked of PIC is to provide more formal advice. Steve said if the committee wants to do this, they will need to hold meetings that allow time for discussion and response to issues. The PIC will have to modify and shift their activities and change the mission.

Regulator Perspectives

- Paula agreed that formal advice would be helpful. She said advice carries more weight to indicate an issue is important. Paula explained there are mandatory public involvement activities the agencies have to do, and anything beyond that can sometimes be viewed as taking time away from getting the cleanup done, which is the main priority for the site's engineers and scientists. Paula thought it would be helpful to have feedback from PIC on specific public involvement processes, like the central plateau cleanup or evaluation after public events. Paula suggested that feedback sometimes works well in a sounding board forum and that the PIC can continue to play a valuable role in that aspect too.

- Lori Gamache, DOE – Office of River Protection (ORP), said she appreciates PIC being flexible to meet more regularly and putting together advice. Lori said it has been challenging to attend the PIC meetings and bring back input to her team. She said that balancing the interests between the HAB and DOE management needs is hard and she supports the idea of issuing advice. She said the recent decision on extending the comment period for the EIS was great example of how the PIC can work with the agencies to inform a public involvement process.
- Sharon thought that more frequent PIC meetings would be helpful so that the agencies can keep up-to-date on what the committee sees as the high priority topics. Sharon suggested the committee continue to think about ways the agencies can get information out to community organizations. Sharon offered to meet with organizations directly and help develop announcements for events. Sharon said she is open to creative ideas that can help them find new ways of doing things to engage the public. Sharon thought that additional PIC meetings will allow for open dialogue and feedback that will help the agencies be more effective in implementing their strategies.
- Emy Laija, EPA, said receiving formal advice would help the agencies understand what the priorities are. She thought the sounding board is helpful also to get ideas and prevent the agencies from moving forward on bad ideas.
- Dennis said he has been an advocate for changing the way the PIC does business. Dennis said that public involvement is not a priority for most Board members and the committee needs to find a way to get everyone engaged. Dennis said it is frustrating during sounding boards because often the loudest voice sounds like the final word and there are many voices that get lost. If there is a lot of energy from someone, the committee should bring the issue to the whole board.
- Nolan said he also appreciates the proposal to change the PIC and thought that increasing the work would be positive. Nolan thought specific feedback would be helpful and having models for involvement would be useful. He asked that people share examples of things that were successful elsewhere so the agencies do not have to invent everything at Hanford. Nolan reminded the committee that issues at the policy level tend to be where the agency responds best. Nolan also said he agreed that there needs to be a sense of what the goals are for public involvement. There may be agreement on some things and disagreement on others, but those should be documented so there can be a measure of success. The public involvement process needs to be sustainable and ongoing for decades and the fatigue of time may make it difficult to maintain a typical public involvement model.

Committee Discussion

- Ken added that the suggestion to issue advice is key and in some ways the committee has been unfair to the agencies by giving inconsistent feedback during discussions and failing to develop a consensus position. Ken thought the PIC should be more consistent with the way the other committees operate.

- Norma Jean thought that the technical committees usually include statements about how public involvement should be incorporated in their advice. Ken thought that was rare. Paula said over the past year she has not seen that happen.
- Paige said sounding boards are great, but the information from it needs to be substantiated by having a note taker. Paige also suggested that the process be documented so the background does not get lost.
- Shelley thought that the committee should consider headquarters' vision programmatically when thinking about public involvement at the site. She said the board has not taken the time to talk about the science and technology roadmap and understand the programmatic perspective. Shelley said there is an opportunity to change the way the PIC looks at things and be more proactive.
- Susan said she has encouraged the PIC to meet more often and issue policy level advice. The connection with the technical committees will help the technical individuals understand the public involvement element of the issues; it will also help the agencies. Susan thought this new approach will help reconnect the Board.
- Norma Jean said PIC has always been frustrated with their meeting time and length and have asked for a different meeting time in the past but there has not been money to do that.

Committee Relations Plan

Steve provided some context for the discussion regarding the Community Relations Plan (CRP). He said the document was last updated in 2002. Steve worked with Paige to review the current plan. In doing so he felt like the document was trying to act as two documents, rather than one. Steve thought that the CRP is really serving as a citizen's guide. The CRP describes the Hanford cleanup, but does not offer prescriptive material. Steve thought the CRP should be tied to a particular issue and should make recommendations to the particular issue. Steve said the CRP should include resources and key people involved and should be tightly focused.

Emy provided a brief presentation on the purpose and role of the CRP. Emy said the purpose is defined in the federal regulations (Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)). She said the places for public involvement are minimal and EPA recommends going beyond the required involvement because if the public is unhappy the decisions will not be successful. The CRP at Hanford is based on the TPA Section 10. Emy said the goal is to have one document for all public activities at the site. The document is supposed to let the public know what the agencies plan to do and how they can get more involved. The CRP is a broad plan because Hanford is a big site. The CRP at Hanford is not meant to address each unit, but to show how overall the agencies want to involve the public in the decision making.

Emy said she reviewed other sites CRPs when she first started the process of updating the plan. Emy offered to share the examples from other sites if people were interested in

seeing them. She said all of the CRPs she reviewed are different because they are geared to the specific needs of each site. There is not one way to do a CRP and the content will depend on the needs of the community. At Hanford, the CRP guides public involvement, outlines the public participation processes under TPA, and identifies how the public can participate in Hanford decision making.

Regulator Perspectives

- Sharon said Ecology has been going through the CRP to identify the areas that need changes and are looking forward to the committees input.

Committee Discussion

- Ken asked what the reference to a draft permit in Section 10 of the TPA is referring to. Dennis said that is dealing with the RCRA permit the state is issuing. There is a difference between a hearing and meetings; the reference is for a hearing.
- Susan asked if the CRP is a legally enforceable milestone. Dennis said that it is a requirement to have one, but the content is not spelled out. Dennis said as long as the plan meets the minimum requirements, it is not enforceable. Paula added that the plan has to comply with the TPA, but the things in CRP are not legally binding and it is important to understand the relationship.
- Gerry said the CRP is legally mandated and that a CRP with commitments is legally enforceable under Superfund and TPA. Gerry said if the TPA did not exist, a CRP would still be required. Gerry said this plan used to be a prescriptive public involvement plan until the 2002 revision. The agencies wanted to make it readable and in doing so made it less prescriptive. At the time, the agencies promised the public the same level of commitment and that the plan would not be interpreted as “shall” instead of “will”. Gerry felt that in its current form the plan does not meet the National Contingency Plan requirements. Gerry said the TPA sections are meant to be a rubric, and the CRP should be updated every five years and should have more detail than TPA Section 10. The CRP is supposed to be something the public can rely on, it is not meant to just be a citizen’s guide. Gerry said the public notice was supposed to be 45 days, and only under unusual circumstances 30 days. Gerry said that the change in the plan has meant that now the agencies attempt to meet 30 days which is not enough notice for the public. Gerry said there are openness areas that are not covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) that are not incorporated effectively. Gerry felt there was a need to describe a process for an annual strategic public involvement strategy.
- Dennis commented that the agencies try to make the plan better every time it is revised. Dennis said he thinks the current one is better than the one before but maybe was not executed as well.
- Shelley asked for clarification on whether the CRP should be a strategic plan. Gerry said he would hope to get a commitment to develop an annual strategic plan, but it would not be included in the CRP.

- Nolan said that the agency lawyers should talk to the committee about the enforceability of the plan under the TPA. Nolan said he did not feel comfortable weighing in on whether what Gerry said is true, and would like the agency lawyers to weigh in on this topic.
- Annette Carlson, Ecology, asked which version of the plan Gerry thought was better. She said there was a 1993 version and 1997 version before the 2002 version. Gerry asked which one the agencies held public meetings for. Annette said they have always done meetings during revisions. Annette said it is important to understand which version the committee thinks was a better one.
- Norma Jean asked if Oak Ridge or Savannah River have a prescriptive process. Emy said she has not had a chance to review the details yet, she mostly focused on the structure of the plans in her initial review. Gerry suggested looking at Region 10 successes for public involvement. Dennis clarified that individual projects also have a plan that has more detail. Other sites like Idaho and Moses Lake have plans that were written ten or twenty years ago and never updated, but for each issue there is a plan that is implemented.
- Ken asked the agencies if they strive to meet 30 days for notification or 45 days and how often 45 days is reasonable. Nolan said generally what drives their practice is to look at the legal requirements. They will try to do better than what is required if they can, but they strive to meet the requirement. Dennis said EPA has someone whose role is to be the process cop and that person tries to make sure they meet the 45 days.
- Ken asked why they can't push back a deadline in order to meet the 45 day deadline. Dennis said if they are in a hurry to get something done, it is often because of a seasonal deadline or work load issue. Dennis said it would push back the cleanup and delay work. Ken felt that this is an indicator that something is not working if there are deadline issues at the end of the planning process. Dennis said PW 1, 3, and 6 was a good example where the agencies gave the public notice 16 months ago, and then after long debates actually developed a proposal and needed to move forward quickly. Dennis said they do the best they can and really do try for 45 days.
- Ken said no one wants to impact cleanup but said it seems like sometimes the processes gets held up at HQ and then the crunch is put on the public. Nolan explained that there is pressure on the agencies to meet a schedule once the technical decisions are made. If they try to expand the public involvement process beyond what is required, they get push back. Ken commented that the agencies know what activities are coming up. Paula said they often do not know what is coming up. For example, they have one major contractor that does not have an approved baseline, so they do not know what is coming out from that contractor. Paula said once the Mission Support Contract is executed it will help integrate between the teams.
- Steve asked if the CRP has ever had an introductory statement that describes what the document is supposed to do. Emy said there is a purpose statement in the first few pages of the document. Steve did not think the statement included served the purpose it needed to. Paige suggested putting the statement closer to the front. Gerry agreed the purpose needs to be clearer and a major portion of the plan should include

commitments. Steve agreed the plan should be clear about the information the public will be provided.

- Emy said she was concerned about adding a strategic plan because the schedule changes so much they may not be able to issue a notice when work gets pushed back. Gerry said that there is the difference between a strategic plan and a schedule. The plan would say “we expect the document to come out on x date and here are the goals for that project.” If the date gets pushed back, you still implement the things you said you were going to in order to fulfill the goals. Shelley added that if the site had a strategic plan, the public would know about activities before they become emergencies when they do not need to be.
- Paige said the plan needs to include why you are involving the citizens. The explanation of why you are doing it should include a general end result that you hope to achieve (ex. a sustainable cleanup that the public is behind). Ken noted that some of that information is included in the introduction section.
- Shelley said the public expects that the same amount of consideration is given to the public comment period that is given to the technical process; i.e. the public process should be proportional to the technical process.
- Dennis said if the committee wants a commitment to develop a yearly plan it would be helpful to know what critical elements would be part of that plan. If a plan was agreed to, that would need to be a new commitment that is written into the CRP. Dennis clarified that outlining major public involvement activities and values should go in the CRP, and if the agencies were to do a strategic plan, the mechanics of how and when the public is notified would go in the annual plan.
- Sharon asked if the committee views the briefings and information the agencies share at committee meetings as early involvement. Sharon said Ecology has taken information about the site-wide permit to the River and Plateau Committee and have developed frequently asked questions/fact sheets based on their feedback so that when the public gets the document it may be easier to review. Sharon said they are trying to do work early even though they are not ready to release the formal document. Norma Jean agreed that the public involvement has been an iterative process between committees and that PIC considers this part of the public process. Steve said the public involvement for the site-wide Permit is a good example of what the committee is asking for.
- Dennis said he thought the prescriptive details that the committee is looking for is in the project-specific plans. Dennis said he would like to see the CRP updated and there is a window of time to do that now. He said if the committee thinks it will be simple, then updating should move forward, but if it is going to take longer and be more involved then the committee should help the agencies set a schedule.
- Paige suggested that the committee focus the rest of the discussion on indicating changes that are needed to the CRP and determine if advice is needed. Ken said he thought the advice should ask the agencies to work with the Board to develop a strategic plan. Ken asked how that recommendation would be received by the agencies. Emy said that referring to the strategic plan in the CRP itself is problematic

and she could not say if that is something they could do until she discusses it with their lawyers.

- Paige thought it was important to identify the strategic plan as something that is codified in the CRP so that it happens every year. Nolan felt that if the Board addresses this as advice it will help clarify what the intentions are and will beg a response from the agencies. Gerry commented that many of the details of the plan may not be at the policy level and therefore may not belong in advice from the Board. Gerry thought the advice should focus more on the level of collaboration on the CRP. Nolan agreed that the committee should focus on the larger policy issues to put forward as advice. He said it would be difficult for the agencies to move forward without the advice.
- Gerry asked what the process is for updating the CRP. Emy said the agencies discussed bringing the proposed CRP revisions to the HAB during the September Board meeting and get feedback. Emy said her goal was to finish necessary edits by end of this calendar year (Dec. 2009). In 2010, the agencies would provide notification for the public comment period in the spring. The agencies would announce the comment period again at the February TPA Quarterly meeting. Emy said the update would help make the CRP a more useful document. Emy said she would hate to see the update take a year or two to complete because it is so outdated already. Emy said she would prefer to keep the strategic plan on a separate path so it does not delay the revision. Paula reminded the committee that the HAB meets in September and November so there are two opportunities to provide input on the CRP update.
- Gerry commented that the CRP is key to good public involvement and hopes that the agencies will hold a workshop with the PIC to provide more details on the proposed revisions. Gerry also suggested going out to communities around the region to get input on the CRP revision. Gerry thought it was important to share specifics about the type of outreach that would be done in each community when a particular issue reaches a certain level.

The committee brainstormed the items that they thought were missing or needed to be updated in the current CRP:

1. “Openness” areas (FOIA)
2. Annual updated strategic public involvement plan
3. More prescriptive
4. 45 days pre notice for hearings and comment periods; unless extenuating circumstances
5. MTCA requirements
6. Funding for public involvement
7. US Ecology site
8. Science and technology roadmap informs decisions at Hanford (background)

9. Environmental justice program

10. Clarifying: what is a public meeting vs. public hearing vs. public workshop? What meets the requirements? When are we committed to holding public meetings, and where?

- Paige asked for clarification on what openness areas means. Gerry thought it was important to include responsiveness to FOIA requests in the plan. Gerry said that Washington State Governor Gregoire just made a commitment for getting data from public agencies to the public, and the requirement applies not only to records of decision but also to open meeting requirements. Gerry felt these requirements belong in the CRP so the expectations are clear. Lori said there currently is a FOIA process that includes open meetings. Ken clarified that none of this information is spelled out to the public. Gerry said that at least once a year there is an argument under the TPA about compliance with the Washington State's Open Meeting Act as opposed to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements. Nolan said there are FOIA processes identified, but they are not necessarily followed. Nolan asked the committee to consider the enforceability or consequences of requesting specific changes like this to the CRP.
- Paige said that Appendix A in the CRP includes the references to other laws that apply. Paige asked how what Gerry proposed would be different than how the laws are referenced currently. Gerry said the plan currently describes a minimum requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The plan does not say how the Hanford site will respond to FOIA request. Gerry said he would like the language to be more prescriptive so that people know where to go to find data about the area of the site they are interested in. Ken thought that might be too prescriptive. He suggested language that would say cleanup decisions are public information and the agencies will strive to assist in being responsive to document requests. Ken thought this approach states a value for the process without being too prescriptive. Steve suggested that the prescriptive details would be in the strategic plan.
- Shelley asked for clarification on why the MTCA requirements would be important to include. Gerry said the work plans in 100 Area involves a proposal to restrict future use of the resources and under MTCA and public notice is required when resources will be restricted. Gerry said this process is not being utilized currently.
- Why is funding on the list? Gerry said he would like the CRP to show a commitment exists to fund public involvement.
- Steve said he liked the idea of having a strategic plan included in the CRP. Emy reiterated her concern about being prescriptive because she was not sure how specific obligations could be incorporated in the plan. Emy said she would hate to see the Board spend time on this advice and have the agency lawyers come back and say that they cannot incorporate the prescriptive material. Gerry reminded Emy that earlier versions of the plan were prescriptive so there should not be a problem with going back to the way the plan was originally. Gerry said this document is supposed to be updated every two years, and it has been more than that since it has been updated so he did not understand what the rush was to get this done. Emy clarified that there is not a specified timeframe for updating the document because it is not a DOE

document. Gerry said in that case there is no rush and the agencies should take the time to do it right.

- Gerry commented that the public believes that the system is broken and the CRP is an opportunity to fix the system and build trust. Gerry said constituents in Spokane have not had a meeting in their area in years despite their requests. The CRP currently says you can get a meeting on request but does not say when and how DOE will provide meetings and the requests are not being fulfilled.
- Paula commented that Emy is trying to help the committee understand how this information will best be perceived by the agencies. She reminded the committee that the agencies are bound by the law and it may not be easy to put prescriptive things in this plan.
- Paige asked if the strategic plan is a place where more prescriptive information can be included for the agencies to test how that might work. Paula said it is possible, but a strategic plan is not part of the law. Paige asked if the Board would have to propose changing the law to institute a strategic plan. Nolan said a strategic plan would have broad goals and objectives and the strategies for public involvement will not change unless there is consensus on the goals. Paige said the methods and strategies will have to change over time because of the length of the project. Nolan said adding anything to the plan that would obligate the agencies to do something above and beyond the law is problematic because they are only bound by the law.
- Nolan asked what would happen if the agencies do not meet the request for the amount of public meetings or another prescriptive approach that the committee suggests. Gerry suggested that the agencies should commit to not adopting the work plan unless the goals of the outreach were accomplished. Gerry said if the agencies believe in public involvement, then they should be striving to meet these goals. Gerry did not feel this was different from when the technical people say the plan does not meet the RCRA requirements so the work plan is not issued. The public involvement process should be just as important as the technical process and if the agencies do not meet the commitments then they should not move forward.
- Paige asked the agencies what items on the list fit into what they are currently looking at as part of the revision process. Emy said she liked the ideas for an environmental justice program and the suggestion to define the public processes for what qualifies as a public meeting.
- Susan felt that if the committee is passionate about this issue they should issue advice through the full Board. Susan said the agencies have given the committee their input and as a committee the issue managers need to develop the advice.
- Ken suggested that the issue of relying on public meetings as a default outreach tool should be added to a future PIC meeting agenda for discussion.
- Steve suggested adding the desired outcomes of public involvement to the descriptive portion of the document.
- Steve and Paige agreed to act as issue managers for drafting advice for the Board in September on the items from the list that people agree on currently. Shelley agreed to help draft the language for the environmental justice piece. Gerry also said he would

help after he returns from vacation. Paige mentioned that DOE has a strategy for environmental justice and has produced a brochure that is very informative.

- Paige asked if the plan should be fully developed before it is referenced in the CRP. Ken did not think that was necessary and suggested that there could be two stages for the advice, the first to suggest the strategic plan addition, and the second to describe what the Board would like to see in the plan.
- Nolan suggested that it would be useful for the Board to work on defining the desired outcomes of public involvement. Shelley also suggested adding a strategy for achieving the goals.
- Susan said that because the PIC has met fewer times than the technical committees, it is important that the advice that is brought forward is clean, easily understandable and has consensus in this committee.

State of the Site Meetings

Sharon provided a brief history of the State of the Site (SOS) meetings and how they evolved since they were first held in 2002. Sharon said the meetings originated as a forum for TPA senior managers to get in front of the public to talk about “the good the bad and the ugly” of the cleanup. Typically, the program managers ended up being the ones that presented because they were in charge of the project that was being discussed. The meetings started as an Ecology concept, but the agencies jumped in to support it. Todd Martin, former HAB chair, had previously given a HAB perspective at the meetings and discussed the advice that was produced in relation to how cleanup was going. Sharon said in the past, the League of Women voters served as facilitators for the meeting.

Sharon said they received feedback after the first few years of the meetings that the presentations were too long, it took too long to get to public comment, and that an alternative perspective was needed. In 2006, Ecology proposed changing the concept of the meetings, including a new name, to make them more of an open house format. Sharon said the name stayed the same, but an open house informational display concept was added to the meeting and the agencies invited organizations that were related to Hanford (HAB, tribal nations, Oregon, HOANW) to set up informational tables.

Sharon said in 2006, Norma Jean made a proposal to strengthen the meetings by having senior managers staff the booths to allow informal discussions during the open house. A lot of feedback was received on the one-on-one process, and the consensus seemed to be that it took away from the large group discussion. Over the years, the feedback has been consistent that the presentations need to be shorter, but after the 2007 and 2008 meetings, the feedback was that the public did not get enough information about the key activities and that a stronger facilitator was needed. In 2008, during the September PIC meeting, there was a commitment made that committee members would attend the SOS meetings and develop feedback for the agencies. Steve intended to provide that feedback before the 2009 SOS meetings. Sharon said she could not find any information on feedback she had received from the PIC from last year’s meetings.

Sharon said feedback over the years has varied; some people said the meetings were informational but not a good format for public input. The results from the SOS evaluations show that 78 percent of people thought the meeting was an opportunity to learn about Hanford issues, 45 percent thought the materials were easy to understand, and 91 percent said they were treated fairly and with respect. Sharon said the written comments they have received about the meetings included: need more information and explanation of materials provided by the agencies, information is not complete, questions and comments were put off, vague answers, problems bounced around without responses, and structure of the meeting needs improvement. Sharon said they received positive comments about the semi-circle format that was used for questions last year, and that the facilitator did a good job. Sharon said they specifically hired a facilitator that did not have a relationship to Hanford to ensure they would be neutral.

Sharon said she felt that the presentations had become rushed and that they are not providing enough time for the managers to present on the information they would like to share. Sharon said having senior managers at these meetings is a wonderful opportunity and the time they are allocated should reflect that. Sharon said the pre-meeting open house format has gotten shorter, too. The agencies are thinking of holding the meetings in October this year, and would like feedback from the committee about the SOS meetings and the progression of how they have evolved. Sharon said they particularly need input on how to strike a balance between the many desires for what these meetings should accomplish. Sharon also wanted have a conversation about whether these meeting are valuable and should continue.

Regulator Perspectives

- Paula said DOE believes the meetings are valuable and see it as an opportunity to talk to the public, tell them what was accomplished, discuss the challenges that came up, and share what is ahead for next year. Paula said the local meeting last year was dominated by worker concerns. Since then, DOE is planning to hold separate meetings with workers to try to address that issue. Shelley said this has been a tradition every year at the local SOS meeting. Sharon said she was glad that workers show up to these meetings and use them as a format to talk about their issues.
- Emy said EPA thought the meetings are a good opportunity to share information. She said the agencies should consider the other needs from the public for these meetings.
- Nolan said that agencies have gone through a process to compress meetings after receiving feedback about the length, and now it sounds like people want to hear more from the agencies. There is definitely a need to do regional meetings and involve stakeholders. It is clear from the evaluations that local audiences are going to bring up the issues as they see them. Overall there is a lack of consensus in how the meeting should be directed. Nolan encouraged everyone to work collaboratively on these meetings because it is the agencies attempt to get information out and get people at these meetings.
- Lori agreed the SOS meetings are important. She said after last year's meeting in the Tri-Cities they heard the workers concerns and afterward started strategizing on

creating new opportunities for worker input which was a positive outcome. Lori said they welcome input on how to improve these meetings.

Committee Discussion

- Steve said he completed the report that was requested after the 2008 meetings, but that he was not able to present it at the meeting last year because the agenda ran over and it was not rescheduled.
- Paige said she is looking forward to reviewing Steve's report from last year. She agreed the SOS meetings are important and said that the public in Portland expects that these meetings will be held, and the turnout has been good. Paige said the feedback from 2007 shows that people are becoming more educated. Paige agreed that the presentation by the managers has gotten too short. She said she did not like the old format where the public would not have a chance to talk until nine p.m., but thought the presentations could be a little longer. The public looks forward to hearing leadership perspective. Paige said last year in particular the managers did a good job of handling the questions from people with issues.
- Norma Jean thought that allowing the agency managers five to six minutes each was enough, and seven minutes should be the maximum allowed. Norma Jean said the managers should point out the areas that are the most important for people to know about. Norma Jean thought it was important for people to hear the concerns that the agency people have, and that by sharing this information people will become empathetic with the agencies in dealing with the issues. Norma Jean felt that the notifications in the newspapers are not effective. She said it is difficult to create something that will grab folks and get people to attend the meetings. Norma Jean explained that the pieces put out by Hanford Watch and HOANW get a turnout because they are good at identifying the issues. The notification has to be phrased differently so people want to come and find out what is happening. She clarified that it does not need to be alarmist, but needs to pose an issue so people want to know more about that. Norma Jean said the SOS meetings are important and the more people that come each year, the more people that get educated.
- Gerry said he was thrilled to hear the agencies and representatives say that the meetings are valuable. Gerry felt that the major goal of the meetings is direct citizen input to top decision makers and accountability of decision makers to the public. Through the SOS meetings, the concern about goals for groundwater were heard and provided an impetus for changes to the TPA on groundwater. Gerry agreed that five to six minutes for presentations was adequate, and seven minutes maximum should be allowed. He said that allows for approximately 30 minutes of presentation total before an alternative view point is provided or public comment is allowed. Gerry said it is rare for anyone, including U.S. senators to have more than five minutes for presentations. Gerry reminded the agencies that the meetings are not an opportunity to show off every building that was torn down over the past year. The goal should be to focus on what was heard from the public and what the agencies did with that input. Over the last two years, the agency representatives have not been willing to talk about TPA changes. Gerry said that needs to change because the public wants to hear about

it. Gerry supported the agencies' efforts to work collaboratively to develop an agenda that allows public discussion on issues. He also thought it was important to have a strong facilitator.

- Shelley said she supported what Paige and Norma Jean said. Shelley said there was a time when management was not receptive for these meetings, and she was glad to hear that has changed. Shelley felt the meetings in Portland went well last year. Shelley thought that ten minutes for presentations seemed like enough, but there were times in the past when it was nine p.m. before the public had the opportunity to talk and that was too late. Shelley agreed that someone with a good sense for drama should help get excitement and turnout at these meetings. Shelley also said that Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, and Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, were great presenters last year and did a good job at being human and frank as they talked about safety and other issues. Shelley would like to see that happen again.
- Ken agreed that the meetings are important and that the facilitator was good last year. Ken felt the presentations have gotten too short, and because of that, Dave struggled to get through important material last year. Ken thought ten minutes sounded appropriate. Ken said it is a big year with the stimulus money and other important issues and there needs to be adequate time. Ken said Oregon has tried to engage college campuses, but has not had great success. Ken thought it would be good to try to increase the student turnout. Sharon supported this idea and said if anyone had contacts at a local college she would be happy to send them information or meet with them before the meeting. Gerry said at the TPA meeting in Seattle, students presented and gave comments. Gerry also said students from the University of Washington public health department attended the SOS meetings in the past.
- Ken commented that when Gerry holds a pre-meeting for HOANW it sometimes changes the focus of the meetings and pre-loads people to be combative, which is not productive.
- Susan thought the goal of the meeting was to be educational and provide an opportunity for the heads of the agencies to hear the public. Susan said she believes in these meetings. She also agreed the presentations are too short. Susan said she likes the display portion of the meetings. Susan said she thought it was important to highlight the ways the public can get engaged. Susan said she did not understand the purpose of the local perspectives, but said she would do that if others felt it was important. Susan said it was important to make the meetings compelling without scaring people.
- Steve said that he remembered that meeting respondents said they liked Jane Hedges and that she should present again. Steve said she did a good job of providing context for what she was talking about by framing what Ecology said they were going to do last year, what they did, and what they plan to do next.
- Doug Mercer thought the goal of the meeting was to bring attention to Hanford risks. Doug did not think the SOS meetings should be issue-driven but should be about providing context and the broad aims of cleanup. Doug thinks shorter presentations are good and personal engagement with higher level managers is positive. Doug also supported the stakeholder group involvement. Doug did not feel it was necessary to

create drama because there is drama inherent in the work and it needs to be real. Doug said the government is far behind on tools for outreach and marketing to engage the public. Doug suggested making the focus of the meeting bigger than just the one day and to try to generate interest during the week surrounding the meeting. Doug suggested getting media attention, getting a spot on a talk show, and creating a buzz around the issues to help advance the broader goals and cleanup objectives at Hanford. Doug said the number of people attending the events is not a good indicator of interest because very few people actually attend meetings. Doug said he has lots of contacts at schools and can help engage students. Doug said high schools as well as colleges should be targeted and suggested using social media to get interest. Doug suggested creating opportunities for involvement like holding facilitated bike tours, or creating a scholarship to help groups come out to the site.

- Norma Jean said she wanted to clarify what she said earlier about the notification, she said the notification did not need to be alarmist but could be phrased in a way that they agencies are asking a question “how should we cleanup Hanford?” Norma Jean suggested using something that will help the public understand there is a problem and they should get involved. Sharon said the meetings are not structured for public involvement but are informational. She said they will not be doing a formal comment response document so to pose a question may narrow the discussion unnecessarily. Sharon said the meetings should be an opportunities for top decision makers to talk with the public and hear what they are thinking. Norma Jean clarified that she was just suggesting a way to get people to the meeting, not how to structure the meeting. Sharon said she did not want to mislead anyone and end up not meeting people’s expectations. Paula suggested a “did you know” type informational piece for the notification. For example “did you know the most contaminated nuclear site is right here in the northwest?” Shelley liked this idea and suggested including something that tells the public to come talk to the decision makers and hear what they have to say. Shelley said if the agencies incorporate some of the cleanup numbers it will help generate the drama that Norma Jean was talking about.
- Susan thought the committee should issue advice on the feedback for the SOS meetings. She said this is an opportunity for PIC through the Board to issue policy advice for the goals of the meetings. Susan said the committee can give further input as the meeting agenda develops, but this is a chance to go on record about what the Board thinks the goals ought to be. Paige agreed. Susan Hayman suggested that the committee reference the Board’s 2006 advice on SOS as a starting place.
- Nolan felt the meetings should not solely focus on areas of disagreement. He said it is important for the agencies to talk about where they are succeeding so the public can identify where there is common ground. Nolan agreed that it is useful for managers to hear directly from public on these issues. Nolan said the feedback from the meetings has showed that there are a lot of things that work, and the agencies should be sure not to lose that when they consider restructuring the meetings. Nolan also said that different people learn in different ways so having multiple formats for sharing information is helpful. Nolan said the focus tends to be on these events but people should remember that Hanford is a relationship because of the scale and timeline.

These meetings are one chance to have an interaction about Hanford and develop constituencies.

- Shelley said she thought the committee should focus on how to help the agencies get the turnout. She suggested having a brainstorming session during the committee's next meeting to come up with innovative ideas and help the agencies try new things.
- Sharon encouraged the committee to attend the open house portion of the meeting and set up information about all of their organizations. Sharon said she would like to see that hour as a time for everyone to come together and talk with the public. Norma Jean suggested including the open house hour in the meeting notification so that people understand that they can come at six p.m. to attend the open house; that was not clear in the past

Goals for the SOS meeting:

- direct public input to decision makers
 - accountability of decision makers to public
 - share accomplishments
 - share critical issues/problems
 - educational
 - for people to hear from agency heads
 - sustain interest in Hanford challenges/risks
 - framing the whole rather than issue-specific
- Susan Hayman asked if everyone thought all of the goals could be accomplished during one meeting. Some committee members felt they could all be accomplished, others disagreed. Gerry said the public has said that the goals have been met in the past. Gerry thought that some goals may not be as much of a focus during the meetings, but they are touched on. Nolan thought there are too many goals and one problem with the meetings is that there are too many things that people would like to accomplish through one meeting.
 - Paige commented that the meeting will never make everyone happy all of the time. She said the committee can help make the meetings better by improving the presentations and making sure questions are answered.
 - Ken volunteered to draft advice based on the discussion to bring to the September Board meeting. Paige and Steve offered to help with the advice.

Role and Function of the PIC Committee (part 2)

Steve asked the committee to review the handout that explains the changes that the committee is proposing. Steve said the idea is to bring this proposal to the Board in September. Susan Hayman said that she would send the handout out to the full

committee, and added that if everyone agreed it would be brought to the Board to get their support in changing the committee's structure and function.

Ken said he preferred to have time to read over the whole handout and submit edits via email before the Board meeting.

Sharon clarified that TPA Quarterly public involvement meeting referenced in the handout is an agency meeting, not a PIC meeting. Susan explained that the handout was identifying the conflict between the two meetings since they are typically held on the same day.

Nolan said he encouraged the effort to change the committee structure to respond to issues. Nolan asked how committee membership work would since the committee was open to all members in the past. Susan said this is outlined in the handout and encouraged everyone to read over the proposal.

Susan asked if the agencies have supported the change in the committee structure in terms of funding. Paula said DOE tracks work plans for each committee and can include the PIC's work plan in their process to evaluate how many meetings are needed for the year. Paula said the work the PIC does is necessary and DOE is prepared to support it.

Gerry suggested adding a bullet under the committee's role that that says "working with the agencies to update an annual strategic public involvement plan." Gerry thought that there was some information missing from the charter and asked that someone review the charter to see if there is any information about how the PIC should work with the agencies on the annual evaluation of public participation.

Susan Leckband suggested that the committee send any comments or edits to Susan Hayman and that she would work with Ken and Steve to get the proposal ready for the Board.

Action Items / Commitments

Annette distributed a new public involvement calendar. Paula said she had a few items to add. First, DOE is putting out a Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework document as an educational piece. Paula said they would like to take public comments on the document from mid-August to mid-November of this year. Second, Paula said near the end of year, DOE will come out with new dates for the M-15 and M-91 change packages. Paula said the River and Plateau Committee will review that work, but it will include a public process as well. Gerry said the responses for public comment have not been issued for the last change package. Paula said the responses to the last set of comments are going through final review this week.

Emy said EPA is hoping to have a final version of the PW 1, 3, and 6 Feasibility Study later this month. They are thinking of combining this with the proposed plan for CW-5,

and will put them out for public comment in the winter. Shelley asked about ZP-1. Emy said they have talked about including the ZP-1 record of decision (ROD) in P-1.

Susan asked when the 2015 vision is going to the public. Paula said DOE developed that with input and is moving forward on fulfilling that vision. Susan thought the document should go out to the public because it deals with reducing the site, and the ROD strategy. Paula explained that the document does not make any decisions but outlines a process. Ken asked if the managers could talk about that vision at the SOS meetings. Paula said they will talk about how they are implementing the vision. Susan asked if the committee should review the vision in terms of if there is anything that needs to be addressed with the public. Paula said that the ROD strategy has been given to RAP for review.

Committee work plan

September topics:

- Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework
- CRP
- SOS turnout

October topics:

- Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework
- CRP
- M15 & M91 change packages
- RCRA public workshop

November topics:

- PW 1,3 and 6 public workshop

December topics:

- Technology outreach
- CRP

January topics:

- TC&WM EIS public workshop

Advice moving forward to the Board:

- SOS (Sept.)
- CRP (Sept., Nov., Feb.)

September meeting topics:

- Topic: Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework
- Framing questions: provide feedback to agencies on public involvement, ask questions about content/use, readability input, how should DOE talk to public about this document, understanding regulating agency perspectives on the document

- Agency leads: Matt McCormick, Emy, Sharon
- Timeframe: 45 minutes

- Topic: CRP
- Framing questions: development of more prescriptive advice for November
- Committee leads: Steve, Gerry, Paige
- Agency leads: Emy, Sharon and Paula, Lori
- Timeline: 45 minutes

- Topic: SOS turnout
- Framing questions: brainstorm ideas for October meetings, key issues for agenda
- Committee leads: Ken, Gerry
- Agency leads: Emy, Sharon, Paula, Lori
- Timeframe: 45 minutes

Handouts

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

- Proposals: PIC Committee Role and Function, August 5, 2009.
- Heart of America Northwest Public Involvement Survey Results, July 31, 2009.
- 2009 Hanford Tri-party Agencies Annual Public Involvement Survey, Washington State Department of Ecology, July 31, 2009.
- Hanford Site Tri-party Agreement Public Involvement Community Relations Plan, Tri-party agencies, January 2002.
- Tri-Party Agreement and Agency-Only Public Involvement Calendar, August 5, 2009.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Shelly Cimon | Doug Mercer (phone) | |
| Norma Jean Germond | Ken Niles | |
| Harold Heacock | Gerry Pollet | |
| Steve Hudson | | |
| Paige Knight | | |
| Susan Leckband | | |

Others

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP | Sharon Braswell, Ecology | Earl Fordham, DOH |
| Paula Call, DOE-RL | Madeleine Brown, Ecology | Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues |
| | Annette Carlson, Ecology | Emily Neff, EnviroIssues |
| | Nolan Curtis, Ecology | Aubrey Bauman, HOANW (phone) |
| | Ginger Wireman, Ecology | Peter Bengston, WCH |
| | Dennis Faulk, EPA | |

| | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| | Emy Laija, EPA | |
|--|----------------|--|