

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
Aug 12, 2010
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions 1
EMAB – Open Meetings Advice 1
Strategic Public Involvement Planning Advice 2
Public Involvement Opportunities and Strategy 7
Public Involvement for the Site-wide Permit (RCRA) 13
Action Items / Commitments 18
Handouts 19
Attendees 19

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 PIC committee agreed to adopt the July meeting summary.

EMAB – Open Meetings Advice

Ken Niles said the open meeting advice is fairly straight forward. He said there was a meeting in Richland regarding the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP). It was closed for the majority of the meeting. He said DOE provided an email response to his concerns and said that sub-committee meetings do not have to be open. While the Department of Energy (DOE) has the legal right to close this meeting, Ken said it is bad policy and against open government. This advice is written directly to Inés Triay, DOE-Environmental Management (EM), and there is a possibility to deliver this advice to her directly at the upcoming Site-Specific Advisory Board meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Agency Perspectives

- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said EPA understands that having closed meetings is problematic for the public and Board members. It is good to point this out, and she appreciates it.

Committee Discussion

- Madeleine Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), asked if the open meeting advice is directed at the regulators. Ken said that, while this advice is directed at DOE, the intent applies to all three agencies.
- Madeleine needed clarification on the third bullet of the advice. Ken said this bullet is attempting to capture the idea of leveraging technical knowledge by working together on related topics.
- Betty Tabbutt asked if sub-committees are addressed in the advice. Ken said the sub-committees are addressed in the first bullet.
- Shelley Cimon suggested adding the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) to the advisory bodies.
- Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, asked if it is typical to address advice to a particular person. Ken said advice is sent to DOE and sometimes an individual is specified.
- Pamela asked if there is value added by providing an example of how open participation works well. Ken did not think an example would be necessary. He said if DOE does not understand the message, an example will not help. Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), said the Blue Ribbon Commission could be used as an example. Ken said the Blue Ribbon Commission is not completely open. Emy said giving an example might be useful, but Inés knows about the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board). She added that the argument is softened when too many examples of the working relationship are given.

Susan Hayman will send out the final draft version of this advice to the full committee to determine if there is consensus to bring it before the Board in September.

Strategic Public Involvement Planning Advice

Liz said the Strategic Public Involvement Planning Advice came out of a long process concerning how the agencies can be more specific about public involvement. There has been a lot of collaborative work and a lot of the language in the advice which came from discussions in committee and at Board meetings between Board members and the agencies. She said there has also been discussion of creating a flowchart for public

involvement down the road. She said Ken Niles and Susan Leckband helped her draft this advice.

Agency Perspectives

- Pamela asked if this advice is what the Community Relations Plan (CRP) already strives to do. She said the advice should be simple and direct.
- Pamela said to add more of the process in the background.
- Emy said CRP has some bullets suggesting good public involvement, but it is not as specific as this advice. She said the strategic public involvement planning advice is elaborating on the CRP, but not really changing the spirit of it.
- Madeleine said Liz did a good job of leading the committee on the advice development process, specifically the second bullet.

Committee Discussion

- Ken said there is dissatisfaction with the current CRP.
- Steve asked when the CRP will be updated. Emy said a final date is not yet know, but they are working on it. The CRP does not usually change once it is adopted, but it is different at Hanford, where this document has been edited more often.
- Steve said the CRP can be strengthened and made more effective. In order to do this, the organization should be tighter.
- Emy said the EPA is looking to incorporate this advice in the new drafts of the CRP. She said it is stronger to incorporate HAB advice than to simply committee discussion.
- Madeleine agreed that committee discussion does not act as HAB advice.
- Steve said by looking at the meeting summaries on the strategic planning sessions, you can see how this process has evolved.
- Madeleine asked if there could be a link to the previous discussions that took place to create this advice.
- Shelley said there could be a sentence added that addresses the relation to the CRP.
- Barb said the Board has issued advice on the CRP in the recent past, and felt there should be a link to the CRP with clear considerations. Emy said there is a link in the advice bullets to the CRP.

- Pamela said the strategic plan has an ultimate goal which should be included in the advice. Ken said the goal is to look more strategically at public involvement.
- Sam Dechter said he participated in this advice development process with the PIC committee. There are a series of guidelines for the elements in the CRP and each is justified. He said the advice points out the elements that are important to include in the CRP.
- Emy said changing the title could resolve the confusion of linking the advice to the CRP.
- Pamela asked if the past advice on public involvement is incorporated in this advice. Liz said she did not reference past advice.
- Ken said an easy way to get around this would be to state that the Board provided advice on the CRP in 2009.
- Barb said she is not sure what “all levels of knowledge” means. Liz said this suggests looking at addressing the entire spectrum of people. Sam said knowledge is important to bring up because there are many different levels of understanding.
- Pamela asked about the third bullet and asked if examples would make this clearer. The PIC committee said the third bullet is understandable as is.
- Barb asked what is meant by “easily accessible” as mentioned in the first bullet in the second point of the advice. Ken said the Federal Register is not accessible and that putting documents on the Web site does not mean those documents are fully accessible. Liz said organizing information is a big part of public involvement, and there could be more accessibility tools. She said adding examples of tools was too much for this advice.
- Susan said the Hanford Website could be more easily accessible. Barb said having a tab that says documents for public review would be useful. Susan Hayman suggested a separate discussion on the Web site at a later date.
- Emy said the EPA is constantly looking at ways to make things more accessible. It is an ongoing discussion. Liz said that the advice is trying to bring up the issue of accessibility. Emy suggested saying accessibility beyond online resources. Liz said clarifying that accessibility is beyond the Web site is not necessary. The PIC committee agreed.
- Betty said accessibility can be different for people. Some people may just be after a simple summary or what the decision at hand is.
- Sharon Braswell, MSA, said some of the seven goals in the second advice bullet sounded more like a how-to list than goals. Liz said the second bullet is saying

that public involvement should be doing all these seven things. These are goals for good public involvement.

- Madeleine asked for clarification on “sense of community.” Liz said when the PIC committee thought about experiences from public involvement events, there was always a sense of community, which makes it more engaging and makes people want to be there. She said there has to be a sense of caring and relationship. Susan said that this concept also applies to national will to fund Hanford.
- Shelley suggested changing the wording from “community commitment” to “Hanford commitment”. Liz said cleanup at Hanford does not last forever and it may not be a cleanup for future generations. Ken said he does not think adding the cleanup concept is needed. The Committee agreed to leave the wording as is.
- Pamela asked for clarification on the last bullet under number three of the advice. Liz said this statement is saying there should be a CRP that is easily communicated. Barb said there is usually a public involvement plan for each agency, which is internal and is usually shared with the PIC committee for input.
- Liz said there was discussion of having a flow chart for strategic public involvement. She is not sure if it is needed or not and asked how the PIC committee feels about it. Susan said flow charts have been proven to be useful and applicable when there are changes in administration and management. They are good for longevity.
- Betty asked if legal requirements could be integrated into the flowchart to make that process more visual.
- Ken said he does not know if a flow chart will do what the PIC committee needs it to do. He does not know how it can be adequately prescriptive so a checklist might be more appropriate. He does not know how a flow chart would help decide what public involvement tools to use.
- Pamela said a checklist is helpful for planning. The flow chart might be helpful for the public to understand the pieces of the public involvement process and how it aligns with the laws like National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).
- Betty said whether it is a flow chart or check list, it comes down to how much the decision makers want to hear from the public.
- Madeleine said the agencies struggle with workshops and things that take people on the road. It would be hard to have a public involvement tool that could help with that problem.

- Sam said a flowchart could be used to make sure decisions are made; however, the detailed outcomes might not be determined with a flow chart.
- Barb said there have been tools for public involvement developed in the past that helped to determine actions based on a collaborative process. She said there is always a challenge in deciding how much time is spent on public involvement versus field work. Determining the level of interest is a big part of this decision.
- Liz said public involvement works best when it is a collaborative process.
- Sam said a flow chart has an added value because it presents a picture on what is being done. He said it helps with critiquing the process later. Liz said it has been discussed in committee that visual aids are helpful. Looking at how ideas are presented encourages innovation in meeting legal requirements.
- Susan said there could be a combination of efforts with a flow chart being high level and a detailed checklist or multiple checklists referenced in the flowchart.
- Barb said targeting audiences is not always valuable without a clear message and it is always a struggle. She said public involvement is always done around decisions so identifying the key decisions is important. Susan replied the advice states that identifying key decisions is not the only reason for public involvement.
- Liz said there are documents on future public involvement opportunities. Therefore there could be preparation for the upcoming year regarding public involvement based on what is available on which to comment.
- Steve said the need to provide information is the natural starting point for public involvement. Barb said there are clear distinctions in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Madeleine said work is driven by the different laws in which there are requirements that have different public involvement pieces.
- Liz said there can be an ongoing dialogue on the flow chart.
- Susan said there needs to be thresholds for when agencies are asked to convene public meetings. Ken said that will be hard to quantify. Barb said public involvement benefits from flexibility and collaboration. .
- Barb said money is spent on public involvement that could be spent on cleanup. Ken said a lot of money is spent on lawyers as well. Barb said there are budgets and requirements, but there has to be balance.
- Liz said there are many public involvement tools that have not yet been explored.

- Madeleine said flowcharts are elegant tools. She said the tool depends on the type of brain that is using it and if people think in lists or in pictures.
- Liz said there could be an issue managers meeting with agencies regarding a flowchart. Pam said she is confused on the goal of the flowchart. Steve said the PIC strives to have more consistency with planning and products that are successful. He said with the public involvement debriefs there has been good dialogue on qualities that work for public involvement, and these could perhaps be captured in a flowchart. He said public involvement in the past has been reactive due to scheduling and that is not always the best way.
- Liz suggested having a brainstorming session in Seattle with those people attending the HAB meeting in September. The PIC committee agreed.
- Susan said part of the struggle with flexibility is that the planning process counts on documents being out when they are supposed to be, which they rarely are. Liz said this might be a good place to begin the discussion. Steve said there should be some preparation with information on upcoming public involvement opportunities.
- Barb said the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) material came out on time. Susan said when the target date keeps moving, the process has to be flexible.
- Steve said as a more knowledgeable community on Hanford is created, tolerance is more likely and the public will be looking for more information. Susan said the public could also become more knowledgeable and less understanding. The public can be educated on issues, but there has to be caution when giving notice on things.

Susan Hayman will send it out the final draft version of this advice to the full committee to determine if there is consensus to bring it before the Board in September. Liz will follow up on a place to hold a meeting of interested PIC members to discuss flowcharts and other visual tools as a potential next piece of advice (see Attachment 1 – Flip Chart Notes for Strategic Public Involvement Planning Next Steps).

Public Involvement Opportunities and Strategy

Liz said the public involvement opportunities and strategy topics came from phone conversations that looked at the activities that are planned in order to track and prioritize what is needed for documents. Today, the agencies will update the Committee on the public involvement calendar. Following this update, the committee will discuss specific public involvement for the solid waste burial ground (SW-BG) HAB committee of the

whole and public meetings, the non-radioactive waste dangerous waste landfill/solid waste landfill (NRDWL/SWL), and public involvement for the site-wide permit.

Calendar Update

Paula Call, DOE-RL, handed out an updated public involvement calendar.

- Paula said DOE agreed on October 5th date for the SW-BG Committee of the Whole (COTW).
- She said DOE does not have exact dates for the SW-BG public workshops, but they have been narrowed down. DOE has been waiting to talk about the interest for a SW-BG meeting in Hood River.
- Ken said it seems as if the SW-BGs has been a topic that has had widespread interest in Oregon. Ken said there could be back-to-back evening meetings in Hood River and in Portland on October 18th and 19th or 20th and 21st. Paula said those two weeks work with Matt McCormick's calendar. She said the Seattle SW-BG meeting could be held on October 26th or 27th.
- Paula said DOE is waiting to hear from Liz and Gerry before deciding what date would be best for the Seattle public workshop.
- Madeleine referenced the public involvement calendar and said the NRDWL/SWL dates will most likely be moving. Paula said DOE is still analyzing the comments.
- Paula said DOE is still receiving comments and is on track for 212-N P and R Facilities Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). She said the timing of the river corridor risk assessment might change.
- Madeleine said there are four meetings in October. Paula said there will be check-ins to coordinate these efforts.
- Emy said the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies are attempting to get the draft CRP out this year. There is a meeting later this month to go over agency edits in order to get it ready to share with the PIC Committee. She said the CRP schedule should not change much. Liz asked when information will be available on dates changing. Emy said by the end of August the TPA agencies will know if dates will change for the CRP, and can provide the committee an update in September.
- Liz asked about the schedule for the 200 West groundwater Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). Emy said it is on track and there have not been any issues yet.
- Sonya Johnson, CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC), said there will be a 30 day notice on the 200 West groundwater RI/FS soon.

- Liz asked if having the SOS meetings in February and March is firm. Paula said DOE is trying to line the meetings up with the President's Budget request, which comes out on the first of February.

PIC Committee Input to the SW-BG COTW Workshop

Paula said the solid waste burial ground workshops (COTW and public workshops) are to educate people and frame the CERCLA process along with the range of alternatives within the process. She said it is important to hear the values and concerns. She said DOE is looking at characterization to analyze alternatives.

Committee Discussion

- Susan asked if the RAP committee has been consulted with regards to the solid waste burial grounds. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, said the RAP committee is discussing the solid waste burial grounds next month. Paula said DOE will be attending this RAP committee meeting. Susan Leckband suggested identifying where the decision points are and where the HAB should weigh in.
- Ken said he would like to expand on the educational aspect and provide a thorough understanding of what materials are in the burial grounds. He said it would be useful to show what types of monitoring and characterization are being used for groundwater. He said it will have to be cut down for the public, but the HAB should have an extensive presentation.
- Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL, said he is preparing an updated work plan that will have fewer phases and be easier to understand.
- Liz asked how the previous to 1970 (pre-70) Transuranic (TRU) waste topic is going to be framed. Paula said DOE is aware that they need to be very clear on how to explain pre-70 TRU. She added that the HAB might be able to see the burial grounds on the HAB site tour after the COTW.
- Ken asked about the size and position of buildings in comparison to other buildings and the river.
- Liz suggested creating a way to show what is in the trenches visually. She said when someone is drawing on paper while presenting it keeps people's attention.
- Ken said it would be good to know if there was just a two mile section that received non toxic waste or if the waste was completely mixed in the burial grounds.
- Susan said a cut-away would be useful to show the trench, groundwater and monitoring data with the contaminants that have gotten into the water table.
- Steve said one of the purposes is to make the material publically accessible.
- Paula said DOE discussed format and thought it might be useful to divide the presentations between the agencies. She said there could be room for stakeholders

to speak up and have dialogue or also for a question and answer session on a topic.

- Liz asked if having two separate rooms is useful. Susan said there were work stations at a previous meeting, which worked fairly well. Liz said it would allow for questions to be asked if the person does not following what is being said.
- Barb said this level of detail has not been shared on the burial grounds, so there needs to be dialogue.
- Ken said stopping and clarifying without creating a large interruption is good. He said a large graphic on a wall would provide a break from a long power point.
- Liz said having comments be visual so the public knows that what they say is heard.
- Paula said DOE is concerned over breaking into groups because then not everyone is heard. Susan Hayman said it works well if small groups' report back to the larger group with what they discussed.
- Barb asked if it would be hard to have a dialogue due to the amount of information.
- Doug said he is okay with providing an overview of the information with the expectation that if there are questions he will come back and answer them.
- Barb said the COTW is in October and there is a Board meeting in November. She suggested that a sounding board be used at the November Board meeting.
- Doug asked if the interest is equal between pre-70 waste and post-70 waste. He also asked about the waste after 1988 when regulation became more stringent. Barb asked if DOE could label the different types of waste in the burial grounds. Doug said he thinks DOE could do that. Liz suggested a visual to make it easy to see what is there.
- Susan asked if the risks are the same if plutonium is buried at different times. Doug said the risk is the same. Ken said DOE would not let them bury as much before 1970. He said he thinks there will be a larger interest in pre-70 waste, but there will still be interest in waste from after 1970.
- Liz suggested explaining the process of how the waste got there. It is important for the public and for the HAB in order to give feedback.
- Dieter said input on the outreach strategy will be helpful. Ken said the PIC committee will be able to tell the TPA what to include in the workshops when they go on the road.

Summary of the Committee's input on the SW-BG COTW

Purpose:

- Educate on SW-2 burial grounds – thorough understanding about what’s in them, paperwork to support this, characterization, groundwater monitoring. Take time to really provide a foundation
- Where at in CERCLA process
- Frame up range of alternatives (i.e. drives what type of characterization needs and updated work plan)
- Where are the decision points where the Board can/should weigh in
- Distribution of different types of waste streams (e.g. “trench bins”)
- Pre & post 70s TRU – how treated
- More interest in pre-70 TRU, but use judgment on workshop content based on information to share
- What created the waste and where did the different types of waste end up?
- Could include burial ground stop on the Hanford Site tour Oct 6 (if one is set up)

Audience: HAB members

Format/Materials:

- Maps/location – visual reference
- Illustrations of trenches and what they contain (drawn real time/e.g. on flip chart during presentation)
- Cut away of trench w/groundwater/water table and relationship of contaminants
- Break into sections and provide for alternative viewpoint following agency presentation(?)
- Stations – interactive Q&A and small group discussion
- Review past HAB advice
- Use PPT, but not exclusively
- “Post-it” questions
- Is there too much information to cover in one day?
 - May need a follow up session
 - Conduct a sounding board at November Board meeting – pick one or two questions/topics for HAB members to respond to

PIC Committee Input to the NRDWL/SWL Public Process

Paula said DOE completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for NRDWL/SWL that went out for public comment.

Madeleine said the closure plan for NRDWL and SWL uses a cap, which is the first at Hanford. She said the permit has to have Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) coverage, and Ecology is basing this on the NEPA action. Madeleine said the final EA will be for the State SEPA checklist. She said the closure plan will have the groundwater monitoring including the fact that there is a cap incorporated.

Committee Discussion

- Susan asked if there will be a discussion of the viability of the cap. Madeleine said that has not been decided yet.
- Ken said Oregon had concerns about the adequacy of the inventory. He said because it is the first cap at Hanford it will act as an example for the future.
- Madeleine said it sounds like people are interested in the importance of longevity, as well as the history behind this cap and the significance of the first cap at Hanford. Liz said this is a chance to explain the strategy behind using a cap. Susan said it is not just knowing what is there, but also the length of time the cap is posing a risk to human health compared to the viability of the cap.
- Madeleine said this is different because there is one action under two different topics, NRDWL and SWL, along with two different regulatory paths. Barb said the requirements are different for the two different landfills.
- Liz said characterization is important in order for people to be clear and confident as to what is in the landfills.
- Pamela asked about the threshold for why something should be done beyond what is required for public involvement. Steve said this is an opportunity for trying public involvement tools to see if they are successful.
- Barb said the agencies have not done a webinar or GoToMeeting and asked what pilot those could be used on. Liz said the pilot group could be the HAB tailored to the general public. Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, said the HAB could be the pilot group for using YouTube, as well. Madeleine said anything Ecology sends is posted on the web.

Summary of the Committee's input on NRDWL/SWL:

Purpose for the public process/issues to address:

- Address adequacy of inventory (characterization)
- How Cap will be monitored (instrumentation)
- Address performance/longevity of cap
- Significance of first cap*
- History of NRDWL
- The “leave it/dig it up” strategy comparison
- Length of time inventory is expected to pose a risk
- One solution – 2 regulatory paths – Are agencies following most stringent requirements?

Audience: Hanford Stakeholders (e.g. informed audience)

Formats:

- Public notice/fact sheet (List Serve, mailed) – content tailored to general public
- Webinar/YouTube channel (pilot with HAB)

* = reason for exceeding public involvement “threshold”

Public Involvement for the Site-wide Permit (RCRA)

Steve said there was a presentation on the site-wide permit back in December 2008.

Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, provided an update on the public involvement for the site-wide permit. He said Ecology is close to getting the permit finalized for public involvement. He said Ecology will cover what is in the permit along with the SEPA requirements for the permit. He said there will be ample access to the draft documents.

Ron said for the site-wide permit, the goal is to protect human health and the environment. He said this permit is required under the State Hazardous Waste Management Act and the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). He said the permit covers dangerous waste treatment, storage, and disposal sites on the 586-square mile facility. He said while Ecology has been working on the permit, the vitrification plant has also been worked on, as well as the WTP. He said the site-wide permit regulates actions of DOE and contractors. He said the requirements are enforceable. The site-wide permit must be re-issued after ten years, and it is the first permit issued since 1994. He said it has taken longer than expected to update the permit.

Ron said the first part of the permit is the general conditions for all treatment, storage and disposal (TSD) facilities in the State. It covers the effects and requirements affiliated with the permit. He said part two of the permit has general conditions for Hanford, such as the TPA’s role, training, and facility record keeping. He said parts 3-6 have specific conditions for Hanford waste sites and facilities. He said there are specific requirements for different units. For example, part three of the site-wide permit is focused on the operating facilities. He said the permit will cover double shell tanks, waste encapsulation and storage facility, central waste complex, waste treatment plant, integrated disposal facility, low-level burial grounds and mixed waste trenches, T-Plant, waste receiving and processing plant, and seven other facilities.

Part four of the permit covers corrective action areas addressing spills sites and solid waste management units. He said Ecology is making sure that all the requirements are met, which includes making sure all the CERCLA actions are also meeting RCRA requirements. He said the spill sites are old release sites and there are CERCLA plans to investigate them. He said for area cleanup plans the permit says rather than doing a separate permit, DOE will use CERCLA and do one investigation. He said the facilities were categorized depending on how they were used, and DOE is now doing one action. He said the Model Toxics Control Act is used for chemicals and other guidelines. DOE is meeting those requirements with CERCLA, and the State has the authority to review.

Ron said part five of the closure plan covers the closure units with nineteen closure sites and addresses units undergoing closure, cribs, bonds, ditches, and Single Shell Tanks (SST’s). DOE is using a CERCLA document in order to satisfy the requirements for these sites.

Ron said part nine of the site-wide permit is for post closure sites. He said this part of the permit is for sites that have been closed already but still need groundwater monitoring. He said there are remaining risks to groundwater and DOE is integrating these into the monitoring plan. He said the permit is a reminder to keep monitoring sites and to prevent releases in the future. He said the goal is to keep sites closed to avoid putting them in post closure by continuing to monitor those sites.

Ron said DOE is required under SEPA to do a review and look at the alternatives. He said for the SSTs, DOE will evaluate, investigate and make a decision. He said there is a checklist and a parallel procedure and there will be two public comments as a result. He said for the full permit Ecology will summarize the SEPA documentation in a fact sheet and address individual units.

Madeleine said that Ecology will meet requirements and will make the site wide permit accessible and understandable. She said some public involvement issues are defining why the permit matters, the documents size and readability, delay in the permit's release, access, and confusion with other decisions.

Madeleine said it is important to the State to communicate thoroughly, and Ecology is using all tools possible. She said there will be four meetings around the state and there will be a workshop. There will be a question and answer session and an information session in Richland, as well.

Madeleine said Ecology will notify people of meetings with a list serve, information repositories, radio and newspaper. She said Ecology will be doing all they can to mention the permit. She said there will be meetings with the HAB, staff-to-staff meetings with tribal nations, Oregon Hanford cleanup Board, Hanford communities and others upon request. She asked the PIC committee if there are any groups that have not been thought of.

Madeleine said the publications will include a public notice, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, online readers guide, statement of basis and a press release. She said the public notice meets the requirements of Washington Administrative Code and she showed an example. She then displayed the draft FAQ and said it will answer questions Ecology receives about the site-wide permit. She said the FAQ will be 6-8 pages long and will be available electronically. She said there will be an online reader's guide that will include information from the public notice and FAQ. She said the readers guide includes details on units, potentially a clickable map, glossary, logical group arrangements and links to the permit.

Madeleine said the complete permit will be 7,000-8,000 pages long not including "official use only" (OUO) materials. She said the permit will be available online, on CD or DVD (upon request), at the Hanford information repositories, in the nuclear waste program office, at Ecology's Yakima office and at the White Salmon public library.

Committee Discussion

- Susan asked if the burial grounds are closed. Ron said yes because the burial grounds are lumped together with the trenches. Therefore, some are open and some are closed.
- Ken asked what the consequences are for non compliance. Ron said under the Hazardous Waste Act violators are subject to a fine up to a \$25,000 per day.
- Sharon asked if people will be re-commenting on the permit. Madeleine said the public can comment on the entire permit, including what they have already commented on.
- Ken said Madeleine has done a great job making the FAQ understandable.
- Madeleine said she is looking for input on dates, locations, and other groups to include with the meetings. Ken said Vancouver might be a better location than Oregon. Ken said he thinks there might be more interest in Vancouver.
- Liz said it is important to look at why the site-wide permit is being brought to the public. Madeleine said there might be some aspects of the permit that people are more passionate about. Liz said there could be general education on the permit and then a focus on what people are interested in. Madeleine said the permit will have an introduction.
- Barb asked if it makes sense to have an executive summary of the site-wide permit. Madeleine said she is unsure how the permit could be summarized understandably. Sharon said she thought there was going to be a summary for each unit. Madeleine said that would still be a large undertaking. Ken said there have been summaries on other topics that were 70-80 pages and still not sufficient.
- Liz asked what is the most salient piece of the permit that should be conveyed to the public. She said it is important to understand why the public should pay attention to the content of the permit. Madeleine said it is important to know that Hanford is vast and under regulation. She said the permit is protecting human health and the environment. Liz said it is important to think about the take home messages for the public. She said there could be a focus on site geography or cleanup levels and how they are enforced. Madeleine said geography is a good one for the permit since there are 44 different parts of Hanford in the site-wide permit. She said the extent of the contamination would also be a good take home message.
- Barb asked if there is anything that the public could easily understand from a regulation standpoint. Madeleine said tanks and the closure plan are the biggest pieces of the permit.
- Sharon asked if the permit is agreed upon by the TPA when it goes to comment. Ron said when the permit is ready for comment; it is Ecology's action, so it not necessarily agreed upon by the TPA. He said the permit is intended to focus on the operating facilities and the waste in the facilities.

- Liz said it is hard to explain the nuance of cleanup and there are a lot of examples in this permit, which could be an opportunity to explain what closure means. Madeleine said the topics could be arranged as old waste, new waste and where the waste is going.
- Ken said there are too many things to communicate within the site-wide permit. Ron said communicating this amount of information is a struggle. He said maybe the readers guide, a power point, or a map is the answer. He said it would be useful to be able to look at the aspects of the permit that interest the reader. Ken said the FAQ is a good starting point.
- Barb asked if Ecology will be doing a site-wide permit every ten years. Ron said many of the facilities will be gone. Madeleine said the operations will shrink.
- Barb said it is important to consider what will be in the site wide permit in the future.
- Barb said she is overwhelmed with how the permit can be made meaningful for the public.
- Susan said there are basic things that Ecology has asked the PIC committee to be involved in that could be included on a future agenda as a discussion. She said PIC could give Ecology a suit of options and help provide guidance.
- Ken said he knows this is a regulatory process, but people do not care about the process. It is important to talk about projects rather than process. The public likes examples.
- Liz said the cradle to grave concept could be used to follow a few projects in order to see how the site-wide permit affects the process. Madeleine said that concept is easy to grasp.
- Steve said TSD and closure could be a tool. Madeleine said using TSD works well for regulators, but it might not work well for the public. Madeleine suggested making a table to organize these actions.
- Madeleine said advice on approach might be premature.
- Susan asked if this dialogue is useful or satisfactory to Ecology when there is a time crunch. Madeleine said she finds the conversations fruitful, but she does not think she needs advice based on the ideas discussed. She said the thoughts are parallel.
- Ron said it would be helpful to have examples of public involvement to show what should and should not be used.
- The PIC committee agreed to revisit the site-wide permit in September and have products to help Ecology in October. Susan asked if the PIC is having a call next week and suggested discussing the six items Ecology provided to have a head start for September. Steve agreed and said the PIC committee will have a chance to think about these items and address what they can. Madeleine said she will

digest today's conversation and tell PIC what to focus on during the committee call.

- Ken said it might be useful to look at alternative grouping of the FAQ to better cover the site-wide permit.

Public Access to Site-wide Permit Documents

- Jessica Dales, Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) said there is concern that Hanford documents have not been available for review or comments. She said HoANW would like to make the documents more available for the public and media. She said there is a concern over stamping things Official Use Only (OUO) without explanation. She said documents can be legally reviewed without specifying as to why the document is for OUO. She said it is not in the spirit of open government laws. Lisa Van Dyk, HoANW, said part of the concern is that if there is not access to the document or opportunity to review the documents, it makes it is hard to create citizen guides.
- Ron said Ecology is working on an online searchable document and a reader's guide. He said Ecology is exploring how to make the site-wide permit accessible.
- Susan asked if there will be any OUO pages when the document comes out. Ron said many of the OUO pages have to do with maps that provide geographic positions. He said there will most likely be OUO maps in the permit, but the OUO pages will be a small percentage. He said Ecology is in litigation over the previous permit and is mindful of concerns.
- Susan asked if any part of the draft site-wide permit will be made available prior to the release for comment. Ron said if someone wanted to look at the drafts they could come and look at them in person. He said it might be hard to interpret due to all the comments from the document being reviewed; however, people can have access through the public disclosure act process. He said there are interim additions to the permit that show how the document has evolved and a fact sheet as to why certain things have been changed. Madeleine added that the drafts will not go online until it is out for comment.
- Steve asked if the comment period will be extended. Madeleine said that extensions are being considered. She said the comment period is already 90 days instead of 45 days. Liz said the HAB has asked for extensions in the past.
- Liz asked how long it takes to read through the site-wide permit. Ron said Ecology respects that people do not have time to read it all and might not be interested in the detailed steps.
- Ken said the size of the document does make a difference for how much time it takes to review. Madeleine said the review time depends on a lot of things.
- Liz said from a public perspective, it took 6 years to get the document out and the comment period should be extended.
- Susan said historically when the Board asked for extension, there was a reason and the agencies usually complied.

Summary of the Committee's Input on the RCRA Site-wide Permit

Purpose:

- Educating on Hanford
- Provide info to enable public to decide what they want to focus on in their permit review
- Using info to help people understand cleanup, site geography
- Extent of the mess
- Understand requirements for operating sites/facilities
- Understand requirements for corrective actions
- The “nuances” of cleanup
- What “closure” means
- New waste, old waste, where is the waste going?
- How is the waste treated?
- Set up for future closure plans
- Relationship of this permit to other decisions (e.g. tanks)
- Focus on “products/outcomes” rather than “process”
- How does permit help advance cleanup at Hanford?
- Illustrate “cradle to grave” concept

Format/Materials:

- Executive summary?
- One place where people start?
- FAQ – group the questions for ease of use

Public Access to Documents for Site Wide Permit Review

- Would like on-line/searchable documents
- Concern with DOE “official use only” – what are applicable regulations for this?
- Concern with adequate time for review and development of citizen guide for 7-8,000 page document within 90-day comment period.

Committee Business

The PIC committee reviewed the follow up items and decided what will be discussed on the committee call. The committee chose to meet on September 8th from 12:30-4:30. Susan Hayman will create a draft agenda for the committee call.

Action Items / Commitments

- Potential use of attachment to HAB advice that provides introduction/background to advice for general public (Executive Issues Committee)
- Potential use/archiving of diagrams for technical clarification

- Opportunity to create a “systems” look at inter-relationship of NEPA/CERCLA, RCRA, etc. (future topic)
- When do we know we’re done> public understanding of cleanup levels
- Future discussion on the website (future topic)
- Barb to provide “criteria” of when you need to do public involvement to committee
- Have an informal work/strategy session in Seattle (During Board meeting week) to take “next steps” further. (Liz to arrange)
- Update public involvement calendar September 8 PIC
- SOS meeting discussion > October PIC meeting
- Open Government plan > September
- SW-BG > update on COTW design and public workshop outreach (September)
- SW Permit > September

Handouts

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

- Draft HAB advice on Openness of U.S. DOE EMAB subcommittee meetings, Ken Niles.
- Draft HAB advice on Public Involvement Strategic Planning, Liz.
- Identifying Decisions that Require Public Participation.
- Public Involvement for the Site-Wide Permit, Ron Skinnarland and Madeleine Brown, August 12, 2010.
- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar 2010-2011.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Ken Niles
Sam Dechter	Liz Mattson	Betty Tabbutt (on phone)
Steve Hudson		

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Blair Scott, EnviroIssues
	Emy Laija, EPA	Earl Fordham, DOH
		Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Yanett Gonzaga, MSA
		Barb Wise, MSA

August PIC Committee Meeting - Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Next Steps for Strategic Public Involvement Planning

1. Look for opportunity to develop flow chart
 - a. Tie this into legal requirements (NEPA, SEPA)
 - b. Don't know if flowchart will get to tools, mechanisms
2. Develop a checklist for determining tools/mechanisms
 - a. Need to be mindful of "will" of decision maker to use public involvement

Page 1

Next Steps for Strategic Public Involvement Planning (continued)

3. Develop tool to help identify need for public meetings/workshops... how many, where, etc.
 - a. Maybe that identifies opportunities beyond legal minimums (thresholds?)
 - b. Research existing tools>will any apply?
4. Use checklist/Flow chart as an evaluation tool
5. Tools that encourage an innovative, visual process

Page 2

Next Steps for Strategic Public Involvement Planning

6. Flowchart with "pointers" to checklists
 - a. Identify "natural starting points" (regulations, decisions, etc.)
7. Look at "criteria" when working on flowchart/checklist

Page 3

PIC Input on NRDWL/SWL (poster)

Purpose:

- Address adequacy of inventory (characterization)
- How Cap will be monitored (instrumentation)
- Address performance/longevity of cap
- Significance of first cap*
- History of NRDWL
- The "leave it/dig it up" strategy comparison
- Length of time inventory is expected to pose a risk
- One solution – 2 regulatory paths – Are agencies following most stringent requirements?

Audience: Hanford Stakeholders (e.g. informed audience)

Formats:

- Public notice/fact sheet (ListServe, mailed) – content tailored to general public
- Webinar/YouTube channel (pilot with HAB)

* = *reason for exceeding public involvement "threshold"*

Page 4

Solid Waste Burial Ground Workshops

October 5-COTW

October 18-Hood River, 19-Portland (Evening Meetings)

OR

October 20/21-Evening Meetings in Oregon

October 26-Seattle

Page 5

PIC Input on: Solid Waste Burial Ground COTW (poster)

Purpose:

- Educate on SW-2 burial grounds – thorough understanding about what’s in them, paperwork to support this, characterization, groundwater monitoring. Take time to really provide a foundation
- Where at in CERCLA process
- Frame up range of alternatives (i.e. drives what type of characterization needs and updated work plan)
- Where are the decision points where the Board can/should weigh in
- Distribution of different types of waste streams (e.g. “trench bins”)
- Pre & post 70s TRU – how treated
- More interest in pre-70 TRU, but use judgment on workshop content based on information to share
- What created the waste and where did the different types of waste end up?
- Could include burial ground stop on the Hanford Site tour Oct 6 (if one is set up)

Audience: HAB members

Format/Materials:

- Maps/location – visual reference
- Illustrations of trenches and what they contain (drawn real time/e.g. on flip chart during presentation)
- Cut away of trench w/groundwater/water table and relationship of contaminants
- Break into sections and provide for alternative viewpoint following agency presentation(?)
- Stations – interactive Q&A and small group discussion
- Review past HAB advice
- Use PPT, but not exclusively
- “Post-it” questions
- Is there too much information to cover in one day?
 - May need a follow up session
 - Conduct a sounding board at November Board meeting – pick one or two questions/topics for HAB members to respond to

Page 6

Input on RCRA/Site-wide Permit Public Process

1. Maybe go back to Vancouver, rather than Portland
 - a. WA state
 - b. Diversify audience

Page 7

Ecology Requests of PIC (re: site-wide permit public process)

- Workshop location
- Workshop Design
- Ways to organize readers guide
- Other groups to talk to
- Other publications

Page 8

PIC Input on: RCRA/Site-wide Permit Public Process (poster)

Purpose:

- Educating on Hanford
- Provide info to enable public to decide what they want to focus on in their permit review
- Using info to help people understand cleanup, site geography
- Extent of the mess
- Understand requirements for operating sites/facilities
- Understand requirements for corrective actions
- The “nuances” of cleanup
- What “closure” means
- New waste, old waste, where is the waste going?
- How is the waste treated?
- Set up for future closure plans
- Relationship of this permit to other decisions (e.g. tanks)
- Focus on “products/outcomes” rather than “process”
- How does permit help advance cleanup at Hanford?
- Illustrate “cradle to grave” concept

Format/Materials:

- Executive summary?
- One place where people start?
- FAQ – group the questions for ease of use

Page 9

Public Access to Documents for Site Wide Permit Review

1. Would like on-line/searchable documents
2. Concern with DOE “official use only” – what are applicable regulations for this?
3. Concern with adequate time for review and development of citizen guide for 7-8,000 page document within 90-day comment period.

Page 10

Next Steps (re: site-wide permit public process)

1. August call: Ecology to identify which items the PIC committee is to focus on in September
2. September Meeting: Address Ecology list in more detail
3. October: Review of draft products, etc.

Page 11

Draft Agenda for September PIC meeting

12:30-4:30 on September 8

- Open government plan – 45 minutes
- Site wide permit – 60 minutes
- Advice-information – 15 minutes
- SWBG COTW and Public Workshop outreach – 60 minutes
- Update on public involvement calendar – 30 minute

Page 12

Follow Up

1. Potential use of attachment to HAB advice that provides introduction/background to advice for general public (EIC)
2. Potential use/archiving of diagrams for technical clarification
3. Opportunity to create a “systems” look at inter-relationship of NEPA/CERCLA, RCRA, etc. (future topic)
4. When do we know we’re done> public understanding of cleanup levels
5. Future discussion on the website (future topic)

Page 13

Follow Up (continued)

6. Barb to provide “criteria” of when you need to do public involvement to committee
7. Have an informal work/strategy session in Seattle (During Board meeting week) to take “next steps” further. (Liz to arrange)
8. Update public involvement calendar September 8 PIC
9. SOS meeting discussion > October PIC meeting
10. Open Government plan > September
11. SW-BG > update on COTW design and public workshop outreach (September)
12. SW Permit > September

Page 14
