

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

October 8, 2009

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1

Tri-Party Agreement - Community Relations Plan (CRP) 1

Public Meetings: Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Amendments 9

Committee Business..... 11

Action Items / Commitments 13

Handouts 14

Attendees..... 14

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Steve Hudson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee, introductions were made and the committee adopted the September meeting summary.

Steve announced that the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) retreat identified Board and agency priorities, and committed to evaluating these halfway through the year. Additionally, Steve said he volunteered to accept feedback from people who attend regional public meetings for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Change Package and Consent Decree Order regarding what worked well and what did not. Steve said he plans to synthesize and present these comments to the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board). He said he would like to do this for all public meetings to assess the effectiveness of these meetings and relay it to the Board. He asked Susan Hayman to send an email to Board members asking them to provide Steve their feedback from any public meetings they attend.

Tri-Party Agreement - Community Relations Plan (CRP)

Steve provided an introduction to the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP). He said the PIC has been asked to provide advice and help review the document, and identified a list of changes at its August Workshop. Steve said Annette Carlson, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided links to previous CRP documents and he

contrasted the initial versions with the current version. He said the original document was well-layered and had a natural progression, but this is not the case for the 2002 CRP.

Steve provided an example of a publication that Ecology released on the subject of enforcement that clearly identifies the audience. The document also has questions that follow the introductory paragraph, and it signals where additional information can be found. He said in the 2002 comments and responses to the TPA CPR, Todd Martin (former HAB Chair) commented on the purpose of the CRP. Todd said the CRP is more than a legal document that contains public involvement for Hanford decisions; it is also a working document for the public to know how to become involved. Steve said this captures the purpose of the CRP, which is meant for the public, not necessarily the agencies. In his comments, Todd recommended that the CRP be called the Hanford Cleanup Public Involvement Plan, rather than the Hanford Cleanup Public Involvement Community Relations Plan.

Steve said the PIC must reach consensus on a list of items that should be included in the CRP. He said the committee can work with the agencies on the construction and content of these topics, but needs to identify items that are needed. Steve said he thinks the document could be divided in a different way and include appendices that have more detailed information to avoid inundating the general public with too much information. He said appendixes on the desired outcomes of public involvement and on critical distinctions are needed. Steve said Gerry Pollet raised the need to differentiate between a hearing and a meeting, and a consent decree and a consent order, which are important distinctions. Steve said appendixes are easier to modify. He said the body of the text also needs to be adjusted in terms of the introductory material and the statement of purpose. Consistent items in the previous documents are sections on Hanford history, geography and geology, and Steve said he would like to see this material included in the current CRP.

Steve reviewed the list of 10 items generated at the August PIC Workshop that the PIC would like to see addressed in the CRP. Items the PIC generated in its August Workshop include references to the Freedom of Information Act, the PIC's obligation to annually release a strategic plan, making the document more prescriptive to provide a sense of commitment, and references to the Model Toxic Control Act (MTCA) requirements. Steve expressed concern about the HAB reaching consensus and said it is his hope that the list of items formulated by the PIC will move forward.

Doug Mercer said when he reviewed the CRP he focused on particular measures. He said encouraging the Tri-Parties to create a way to evaluate the success of public involvement activities is critical, and he thinks this is ambiguous in the document. He said there needs to be a clear articulation of public involvement, the role of the CRP, the goals of public participation, and strategies and measures for success. He said these issues are not tightly connected but should be. He said the PIC should reinforce the need for an evaluation or metrics method and should define what these elements of the CRP should include. Doug said members of the public who are interested but not involved in Hanford should have a clear idea of what they can expect from the commitment of time and energy, and this is

not clear from the current CRP. He said from the public comments it is clear that few people have a grasp of these issues, and he thinks it could be disappointing when their ability to be involved appears to be compromised. Doug said he was envisioning a graphic that identifies the goal of public involvement, strategies to measure the effectiveness of each strategy, and measures appropriate to each strategy, including the ability to achieve the overall goal. He said these criteria could go into a cell next to the appropriate strategy.

Regulator Perspectives

- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said Steve's comments about the logical flow and background information are issues the agencies can consider to help the average reader understand how to get involved. She said environmental justice was mentioned as a needed item, and the agencies can consider such items.
- Emy said Doug addressed the need to clearly state the purpose of public involvement and the goal of the CRP. She said she is not sure the agencies should begin measuring the effectiveness and evaluating the CRP and include these issues in the document. Emy said the CRP is a guide for the average citizen, and she would like more feedback on whether the agencies should overlay the effectiveness measures with the CRP.
- Emy said she is also a project manager for EPA, and project managers generally do not look at the CRP to decide public involvement activities, rather, the project and the amount of public interest drive the amount of public involvement. She said mandating actions in the CRP does not preserve that function of the document. Emy said even if specifics were added to the document these requirements would be surpassed on projects that have high public interest since projects are driven by factors outside of what is in the CRP.
- Lori Gamache, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said DOE-ORP has used the CRP as a tool for the Consent Decree and TPA Modifications. She said the agencies try to include a 30-day notice prior to public meetings, which sometimes requires overcoming internal hurdles. She said the CRP serves as a constant reference for public involvement. Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), said according to the CRP, the comment period for a change package only requires 45 days, and based on input the agencies are lengthening this. She said the CRP provides the minimum and the agencies determine whether they want to see public involvement above that level.
- Lori said she appreciates the dialogue on the CRP. She said comments on the flow of the CRP make sense, and she would appreciate feedback that suggests topics to include but does not go in depth with the details. She said she is glad the PIC is discussing the CRP because the committee's advice points will be helpful as the document is revised.
- Annette said appreciates the PIC's comments. She said when she put the past CRPs on the Web site she should have included a link to the TPA because it is important to look at this as well. Annette said the TPA has public involvement throughout the

document, not just in Section 10. She encouraged the PIC to look at the TPA to make sure the language in the CRP and TPA work together. She said she will include a link to the TPA with the CRPs that are posted on the Web site. She said she is interested to hear about the TPA public involvement survey, and any recommendations on how to improve this process are welcome.

- Lori said the agencies have a schedule for releasing the CRP. Emy said the agencies want the CRP completed by the end of the calendar year, which has led to urgency in finishing the edits and involving the PIC and the public. She said the CRP will be addressed at the November HAB meeting. The document will be finalized and released for public comment in early spring. Steve said the PIC supports this schedule. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, asked whether the HAB will have the opportunity to see the revised CRP if it provides advice in November. Lori said the agencies would release a draft with all of the edits, and would need to see if this is possible based on the schedule.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry said MTCA has specific requirements for public notice when restricting future land uses, but there has not been a notice released since 2002. Steve suggested that a comparison between the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements could also be included in an appendix.
- Gerry said he thinks the committee's recommendations are going from requiring a strategic plan with defined, measureable goals that is updated annually to trying to write the strategic plan, which he thinks should be separate from community involvement. Doug said the CRP should clearly state the format for the annual strategic plan and the process.
- Gerry commented that there are some past issues that are important to public involvement that are included in the list of feedback, such as a minimum of a 45-day notice for planning meetings unless this is not feasible and replacing the word "strive" with a mandate for notice. He said the discussion about whether the CRP is an aspirational or prescriptive document influences public meetings. He said there was a requirement that if a group of 10 or more people requested a meeting they received one. Emy said this has never been in a CRP, but was a suggestion in a comment regarding MTCA. Gerry said it is referenced on page 18 of the CRP. Steve said a suggestion to insert this requirement was included in the 2002 comments. Gerry said the agencies responded that they would improve but this did not happen.
- Doug said the issue is that the CRP should have enough clarity and substance to create mandates or clearly stated goals and should not be left as an aspirational document. He said he wanted to see where the agencies had set the goal line so the HAB knows where it can set its goal for public involvement. He suggested that the PIC push for and encourage a clearer statement of the goal line, changing it from an aspirational to a goal-oriented, prescriptive approach.

- Gerry said there were a number of issues the PIC discussed in terms of a prescriptive versus aspirational document. He said there is one CRP for the site and any other issues must meet the criteria within this document. Gerry said aspirational goals belong in strategic plans for their decision-making process, but the CRP should be a document that, like the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), says these items govern all public involvement decisions whether in CERCLA, RCRA or other regulations. Gerry said he was hoping the issue managers (IMs) would address this issue, as well as the issue of a timely response to comments.
- Harold Heacock said another issue is to have a plan that results in public involvement. He said many of the meetings have had low public participation. Gerry said he disagrees with this. He said 140 people commented on the TPA changes last spring. Harold asked the average number of public-meeting attendees. Barb said there are approximately 50-60 attendees at public meetings, not including agency representatives.
- Gerry asked what other requirements the agencies are using. He said RCRA and CERCLA have requirements and the CRP is an attempt for Hanford to go beyond these requirements. Barb said CERCLA includes a required 30-day comment period but does not require a 30-day notice. She said Hanford includes a 30-day notice when determining schedules for public involvement, which is the direct result of public input to the CRP. Emy said this is a good example of how there are various channels for public involvement in addition to the CRP. Emy said there are two levels to public involvement. For projects with high public interest, there will be a workshop regardless of what the CRP directs. She said there is also the level of the 30-day notice. Barb said the CRP provides the foundation and when there is an issue of high interest all of the agencies decide how to address this. She said this a tool to help educate, and it is not just for the general public, it is also to help project managers and contractors understand how to best support DOE.
- Susan H. said the PIC needs to determine the level of detail it would like to pursue and if it is on the same page for advice. If the committee needs to write advice for the November Board meeting it will need to be done through e-mail.
- Doug suggested that the committee determine general categories of advice on the CRP and add sub-bullets with details about each issue. He identified the following potential issues and sub-issues:
 1. Purpose and performance: Clarifying the purpose, linking goals and strategies, and having clear way of articulating those conceptually and presenting those to various audiences.
 - a. Clarify or develop purpose and desired outcomes of public participation
 - b. Clarify and describe characteristics and attributes of public meetings
 - c. One-page visual that links purpose, outcomes, activities and criteria/measures
 - d. Develop a second figure that shows how citizens can be involved in public involvement and Hanford, including an outline or process through which their views are incorporated into Hanford decisions to provide a set of

- realistic expectations and include an audience-focused figure depicting their role in public involvement
 - e. Content – other topics the PIC would like to see considered, enhanced or added
 - f. Description of the Science and Technology Roadmap
 - g. General description of environmental justice program
 - h. General description of strategic plans and their public involvement attributes
 - 2. Operations – A prescriptive piece that deals with when the calendar should be done and what this should include.
 - a. Discussion of public involvement plan calendar
- Susan H. said the committee needs to determine whether it wants to issue advice on how the CRP should be structured or if it wants to make suggestions for elements that should be included in the document.
 - Steve suggested that the Board provide general policy advice and have an underlying clarifying statement about the purpose of the CRP. He said the advice could include elements that address specific issues.
 - Doug said the purpose and performance need to be clarified and if the committee does not think the CRP has a clear purpose or a way to look at its performance then the document is not useful. He said the committee needs to evaluate the content of the document as it relates to what is needed to be effective.
 - Steve said the purpose of the CRP has been argued, but he thinks a clarifying statement could be added to the document. Doug said there is an ambiguous audience and the current document seems to be a hybrid of what the agencies use and what DOE uses to implement public participation. He said he does not think the CRP is effective for a general audience.
 - Gerry said the CRP is formatted as if it would substitute for a public fact sheet. He said the CRP is a plan, rather than a fact sheet, and the PIC should agree on its goal. He suggested that there could be a fact sheet about how to be involved in Hanford with a link to the CRP for additional information. Doug said he agrees that the CRP should be a document for the agencies rather than a tool for the general public.
 - Gerry said the CRP says it is for the agencies as well as stakeholders, but he does not think it is written in a way that is effective at showing the public how to get involved. He said he thinks the CRP is a guide for agencies and informed stakeholders. Emy said the CRP is for interested members of the public who are affected or interested, and is meant to give them a better idea of how to become publicly involved in the site. She said she does not agree that it is for the agencies. Emy said the agencies reference the CRP, but she does not agree that it is only for agencies and informed members of the public. Doug said he thinks agencies and involved stakeholders are the people who are going to look at the CRP. He said other people may read it, but there should be other documents that are specifically written to reach a different audience.

- Steve commented that the CRP is not a PIC document, and the committee is trying to strengthen it to make sure it serves the purpose that has been identified. Annette read the purpose of the CRP, which is for DOE to develop and implement a document that responds to the need for an interactive relationship with all the community organizations at Hanford. Steve said this statement identifies a broad audience for the CRP. Gerry said the CRP is serving many different communities and should not be written as though it is a substitute for a fact sheet. Doug said he interpreted the statement that the CRP should “respond to the need,” as saying the CRP should ensure the agencies have a plan for providing for the needs for all those different communities.
- Steve said there are important operational items that merit the PIC’s attention. He said in the advice the committee can list specific items and say they deserve consideration and ask the agencies to give the committee further opportunity for discussion and input on these issues.
- Doug asked who is responsible for revising the CRP. Emy said the public involvement officers (PIOs) from the agencies are responsible. Emy is the lead and Lori, Annette and Paula Call, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), and are helping. Lori said the PIOs have two meetings scheduled for October to review the document.
- Gerry said the CRP currently says the agencies will strive to provide 45-day advance notice of meetings and comment periods. He said the Board should recommend that this is a requirement.
- Gerry said during a discussion of the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Change Package, Jeff Luke identified the issue of having the agencies respond to comments in a timely manner. He said the agencies do not have to respond to comments before decisions are signed, which is a problem if comments are misunderstood. Gerry said the HAB should recommend that the agencies respond to comments two weeks before a decision is signed.
- Harold said he agrees that there should be a response to comments, but expressed concern about the concept that the response is needed before the agencies take action. He said he thinks providing responses two weeks before a decision is signed is reasonable, but the timeframe should not be longer than this.
- Steve said he thinks a positive aspect of requiring a timely response is that it encourages more dialogue between the agencies and the public. He said this also requires the people who write the responses to be more cognizant of the quality of their communication and the accuracy of the responses.
- Gerry expressed concern that the agencies have said they would provide a comment and response document to decision-makers prior to an action being finalized. The agencies have also committed to preparing a document within 60 days of the comment period, when possible. Gerry said these are two contradicting statements.
- Liz Mattson suggested that if the advice includes the principle of a timely response to comments in order to improve dialogue, then there should be bullets showing the reasoning behind why this is important.

- Regarding the requirement for when to hold a public meeting, Steve said since this was part of a previous response to a comment the PIC could advise that this rule should be re-activated. Gerry said the guideline that 10 people were needed to request a meeting is important because it clarifies what is significant. Steve suggested that the definition of what is significant be added to the definitions and concepts page.
- Gerry said the CRP should also differentiate between a meeting and a hearing. He said there used to be a requirement that a hearing would be held in the location where the most people requested a hearing. Annette said the TPA includes a provision that a hearing will be held in the city closest to the site, which would be the Tri-Cities. She said the TPA also says a public hearing must be held if requested in writing. Gerry said there was a provision in a prior version of the CRP that included this requirement. Annette said the current CRP does not include public hearings. Gerry said there is a reference on the third page of the 1990 version of the CRP that repeats the language from the TPA that public hearings will be scheduled on request and in the location where the most people requested a hearing.
- Steve said he and Paige Knight will work on drafting advice on the CRP. Doug will provide input on re-organizing the document. Gerry will e-mail items he would like to add for inclusion in the advice. The advice will be distributed and the committee will hold a call to discuss the advice, if needed.

Potential Advice Points – CRP (as captured on flip chart notes by Susan H.)

- Clear statement of purpose, nature, role of CRP
- Format/organizational suggestions
 - Example: “Enforcement” doc
 - Use of appendices
 - Desired outcomes
 - Critical terms
 - Measurements
 - Hanford history
- Advanced public notice of 45 days when possible prior to public meeting
- More commitments (replace “strive”)
- Timely response to comments, and provide these to the public two weeks before decisions are signed to allow for better dialog between decision-makers and those who comment
- Requirement for when to hold public meetings/hearings – if 10 people request a meeting (see 1990 CRP, page 3)

Audience – CRP (as captured on flip chart notes by Susan H.)

- Agencies
- Interested and affected public (involved stakeholders and organizations)

Public Meetings: Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Amendments

Steve said the PIC wanted to receive an update from the agencies on their plans for public meetings on the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA Amendments to discuss the format of the meetings and provide feedback to the agencies.

Lori said the public meetings are scheduled for October 26 in Hood River, October 27 in Portland, October 29 in Richland, November 9 in Spokane and November 12 in Seattle. The meetings will begin at 6 p.m. with an hour-long open house. At 7 p.m. the agencies will provide presentations on the Consent Decree and TPA Amendments, which will be followed by a local perspective. Lori said there will be time on the agenda for a question-and-answer period, during which members of the public can make a formal comment to a court reporter stationed in the back of the room. After a short break the court reporter will move to the front of the room. She said public comment will begin around 8 p.m.

Committee Discussion

- Laura Hanses said the presentations from the agencies should be compiled to reduce duplication. Liz said the agencies should consult each other before and provide the presentations in a package but still have separate presentations.
- Sam Dechter said there was a question about incorporating public comments, and the response was that this depends on the requirement for public comment since the Consent Decree does not require a comment period. He suggested that there should be a response to public comment, whether this is required or not. Gerry said Jeff recommended that the response to comments should be provided before the documents are signed or the Consent Decree is presented to the court.
- Gerry said the agencies should be ready to discuss this issue in public since they have not addressed the issue in public for two years.
- Sharon Braswell, MSA, asked whether a court reporter will be available during the beginning of the open house from 6-7 p.m. Gerry said there is a new state law that specifies that public comment at a hearing needs to be in a location where everyone in attendance can hear the comment. Lori said she will look into this requirement. Annette said this new rule will be noted on the agenda if it is not possible to provide comment in the back of the room, as has been done in the past.
- Steve asked whether there would be a facilitator. Lori said Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, will facilitate the meetings. Gerry commented that there was negative feedback from the last public meetings she facilitated in the spring. Lori said there is already a contract in place for facilitation, but this is something she can be mindful of. Steve said the PIC discussed issues that it observed and would like to see in the context of the State of the Site meetings. Lori said she thinks it is a good idea to look at this, although these meetings are different than the State of the Site meetings.
- Laura asked whether the local perspectives have been identified for each location. Lori said these have not yet been identified.

- Gerry said for the Portland and Hood River meetings the State of Oregon should be a formal presenter because they have a settlement for which official public comment needs to be collected. Sharon said there is a separate Consent Decree with the State of Oregon. Gerry said there should be public comment on that Consent Decree. He said the public interprets this agreement as part of the whole package even though it is a separate Consent Decree. Sharon said the Consent Decree DOE has issued is with the State of Washington. Gerry requested that DOE have a discussion with the State of Oregon regarding whether they will take public comment on their Consent Decree at the Portland and Hood River meetings. Lori said a copy of the Proposed Consent Decree with the State of Oregon is included in the TPA Change Package, but it has a header that specifies that this is background information and not for public comment. Gerry said the primary public concern is in the letter of agreement about offsite waste. Annette said the agencies can look into this issue.
- Gerry asked how long the opening presentations will be. Lori said the length will be similar to the presentations at the spring meetings, which had a 20-minute agency presentation overview, a local perspective, and 20-30 minutes for questions and answers. There would then be a break before public comment begins. Gerry asked why the question-and-answer session is not captured as part of the meeting record. He said he thinks it is important to include the answers to the public's questions. Gerry said if there is a question about if the state and DOE are aligned on the issue of whether the moratorium on offsite waste will end, it would be important to have that in the record for interpreting that agreement in the future.
- Liz said she thinks it would make facilitation smoother if the question-and-answer session and public comment are mixed together. She said she thinks it is difficult for the public to differentiate between questions and comments, and this could inhibit the discussion. Lori said the question-and-answer time would be an opportunity for the public to ask clarifying questions to better understand the material, and during the public comment period it becomes a formal hearing process. Sharon said the difficulty in mixing these is that the agencies would then have to interpret what is a formal comment versus a question-and-answer statement. She said the agencies do not respond to the questions and answers during the formal hearing process. Gerry said the facilitator needs to be clear in saying that questions that imply comments are not recorded unless they are repeated later as a formal comment. Lori said she appreciates the feedback on ways to make this process more successful.
- Liz commented that the materials announcing the meeting say public "meeting" rather than public "hearing" and this should be corrected.
- Gerry suggested that during the open house period from 6-7 p.m. there could be tables that are clearly marked as having information on specific issues, such as the vitrification plant.
- Gerry said one of the information needs from the workshop is to clearly identify parts of the Consent Decree and what is court enforceable, what is in the TPA, and interim milestones that are not enforceable. He said which wastes are part of the offsite waste moratorium also needs to be clarified because this has been misleading.

- Susan Leckband said the attorney at the workshop who described aspects of the Consent Decree in layman's terms provided a good explanation, and this should be provided at the public meetings at the same level or higher.
- Sam said the way the package and summary of changes are organized is confusing and a better description of what the changes are is needed.
- Steve said he recorded a list of format and protocols for future meetings. Gerry said evaluation forms are provided at TPA meetings and it would be helpful to discuss this feedback.
- Susan H. noted that there are three committees working on advice principles, so if there is something the PIC needs to articulate to bring into that advice it should be identified. Laura said she thinks providing feedback for the series of public meetings is sufficient. Gerry said he promised Jeff that he would bring the issue of the comment response process forward as separate advice. He said the PIC's advice principle should be the same as the CRP advice, which is that the agencies should respond to comments two weeks before an agreement is signed.
- Gerry suggested that the PIC should advise that the comment period should also include comment on the Oregon Consent Decree. Steve said he would contact Ken Niles to find out the status of this. Gerry said he is surprised that public comment may not be taken because the State of Oregon is a formal party and not just a local perspective. Steve said the Hood River, Portland and Richland meetings will take place before the next HAB meeting. Gerry said even if the advice is not issued in time for these meetings there could still be a public comment period.

Committee Business

The committee reviewed its six-month work plan and discussed potential November meeting topics.

Regulator Perspectives

- Emy said PW-1, 3, 6 should be pushed back to December or January. She said the goal is to have the feasibility study finalized by December, but this has been pushed back since PW-1, 3, 6 were paired with CW-5. She said the PIC is being asked to provide input on the workshop for the proposed plan.

Committee Discussion

- Steve said a major item is tracking the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS), and an IM is needed to track this. Susan L. suggested that a PIC IM should work with IMs from the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) to track this. She said Larry Lockrem submitted a statement of work to hire an expert to help the HAB review the document, a Committee of the Whole (COTW) is scheduled for

December, and a January workshop may be helpful. Susan L. said an update on the statement of work is needed from DOE-ORP. Lori said she received this from Larry and has forwarded it. Gerry volunteered to be the PIC liaison on the TC&WM EIS.

- Steve said comments about what worked well and what could be improved at public meetings should be sent to him, and he will present these findings to the Board. Susan H. will work with Steve to send an e-mail reminder.
- Steve said he wanted to re-introduce the idea of having evening seminars that also serve as public meetings. He said Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) is a topic that would interest the public and the HAB. He suggested that the PIC could develop a proposal for this at its January meeting.
- Gerry suggested moving the RCRA workshop from November to March in order to avoid a conflict with the TC&WM EIS comment period.
- Steve said looking at innovative ways of using technology to better inform the public about HAB activities is an important issue for the PIC to address.
- Gerry said the CRP topic for November is for initial discussion and input, and then the PIC will review the revised version. He asked whether the committee will need to look at the document again in the spring. Emy said the agencies want to release the CPR to the public in the spring, but it was asked that the committee review the rough draft before it goes to public review. Sharon said January would be a realistic timeframe for this.
- Gerry asked when the PIC should conduct a discussion of the CRP public meetings. Emy said this should take place in March, at the latest. Sharon said the Agreement in Principle (AIP) will also go out for public comment at the end of December or beginning of next year. She suggested this be addressed in December or January as well.
- Gerry said the committee should discuss the strategic plan for public involvement for the year. Steve said this is a great discussion topic, and asked whether this has been codified. Sharon said this is a fluid process that includes the RCRA workshop and site-wide permit. Steve suggested Gerry prepare something for discussion about the elements that would be in a strategic plan.
- Gerry said the agencies started creating a matrix of goals for public involvement and asked for a copy of this document. Lori said that has evolved into a public involvement calendar. Sharon said she will try to find the tool that described audiences and goals of outreach to send to Gerry so he can update its content.

Six-Month Work Plan (as captured on flip chart notes by Susan H.)

- November
 - Strategic plan for public involvement
 - CRP advice
- December
 - Using technology in public outreach
 - CRP – Review of first draft
 - PW-1, 3, 6 workshop planning

- January
 - TC&WM EIS
 - TPA Change Package public process – Lessons learned for AIP
- February
 - State of the site meetings
 - CRP public meeting input
- March
 - RCRA workshop
 - Evening seminars – proposal development
- April
 - No potential topics identified

November PIC Meeting Agenda Topics (as captured on flip chart notes by Susan H.)

- CRP Advice
 - Review final
 - Committee lead: Steve
 - Agency leads:
 - Time allocation: 30 minutes
- Strategic Plan for Public Involvement
 - What should a strategic plan include?
 - How to serve committee and agency needs?
 - How to keep details current?
 - What are objectives of plan?
 - Committee lead: Gerry
 - Agency leads:
 - Time allocation: 60 minutes

Action Items / Commitments

- Annette will include a link to the TPA with the CRPs that are posted on the Web site.
- Steve and Paige will work on drafting advice on the CRP. Doug will provide input on re-organizing the document. Gerry will e-mail Steve additional items he would like included in the advice. The draft advice will be distributed and the committee will hold a call to discuss the advice, if needed.
- Lori will look into the new state law that specifies that public comment at a hearing needs to be in a location where everyone in attendance can hear the comment.
- Annette said the agencies will look into the issue of whether public comment is being collected for the State of Oregon Consent Decree.
- Steve will contact Ken Niles to find out the status of the State of Oregon's Consent Decree and whether public comments are being accepted.
- Steve said comments about what worked well and what could be improved at public meetings should be sent to him, and he will present these findings to the Board. Susan H. will work with Steve to send an e-mail reminder.
- Sharon will send Gerry the TPA strategic plan for FY 2008-2009.
- Gerry will be the PIC liaison on the TC&WM EIS, as needed.

- Gerry will work with RAP and TWC on the Proposed Consent Decree and TPA modifications draft advice.

Handouts

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

- Public Involvement: TPA Change Package and Proposed Consent Decree, October 2009.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Sam Dechter | Steve Hudson | Doug Mercer (Phone) |
| Laura Hanses | Susan Leckband (Phone) | Gerry Pollet |
| Harold Heacock | Liz Mattson | |

Others

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP | Madeleine Brown, Ecology | Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues |
| Ali Hoppes, DOE-ORP | Annette Carlson, Ecology | Molly Jensen, EnviroIssues |
| | Emy Laija, EPA | Aubrey Bowman, Heart of America |
| | | Carly Jensen, Heart of America |
| | | Lisa VanDyke, Heart of America |
| | | Sharon Braswell, MSA |
| | | Barb Wise, MSA |