

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
November 2, 2011
Kennewick, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Responses to Board Advice 239 and 240 1
Public Involvement for the Hanford Site-wide Permit 3
Public Involvement Planning..... 6
Committee Business..... 7
Attachments 7
Attendees..... 7
Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 9

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

Welcome and Introductions

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. Steve reviewed the agenda.

The committee adopted the September meeting summary and October 3 webinar summary. The committee will consider adoption of the October 11 meeting summary during the December 1 PIC call.

Responses to Board Advice 239 and 240

Issue manager framing

Rather than focus specifically on potential follow-up actions to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies’ response to Board Advice 239 and 240, Steve focused on the HAB’s overall process for reviewing agency responses to advice. Steve spoke to previous Board advice and noted that in most cases, the Board does not do a good job of tracking and following up on TPA agency

responses to the advice. He said a notable exception to this was the Board's advice on beryllium. In this case, the issue manager continued to track the advice and how it was implemented with the agencies and Hanford Site contractors; the issue manager then reported back to the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) and the Board on the advice's success. Steve said the Board should have expectations for what a successful response to advice should look like and appropriate actions from the agencies. Steve suggested that a committee member be assigned to track the advice and the response after the Board sends the advice to the agencies; the tracker could be the issue manager or other interested party. He said the Board's advice should establish goals and make clear which advice points are the most important to address first, as not all issues can be addressed simultaneously. Steve provided specific examples from Advice 239 and 240 and noted that the lack of prioritization has created issues for the Board in terms of responses and agency action, and the Board should take some responsibility if the agency responses are not what they expected.

Steve asked PIC members to consider assigning someone to track the advice and whether advice can be made more to the point. He also asked if report backs on the advice and responses should be included in Board and committee meeting agendas.

Agency perspective

Emy Laija, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the agencies would appreciate the Board taking time to read their responses, as sometimes they respond to issues that Board members subsequently miss. Emy said EPA responds to advice in a conversational mode, rather than point by point and that the advice points, rather than background information, help inform their responses.

Paula Call, US Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said she supports time on the Board agenda for reviewing responses, as the committees and Board spend so much time crafting advice. Paula said DOE responds to advice point by point, through a process that involves the issue's subject matter expert and a review by management.

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology takes the advice very seriously and it is his responsibility to make sure they respond in a timely manner. He said they try to respond to advice with specific examples of what they are doing with the advice issues and how they will respond now or in the future. He said he supports the Board spending more time on responses.

Pamela McCann, DOE-Office of River Protections (DOE-ORP), said she supports response review and noted that it will be particularly important towards the end of the year to help the committees gauge where they are with advice as they move into the next year.

Committee discussion

The following are the key points noted during committee discussion:

- Agency responses are compiled by EnviroIssues before each Board meeting and distributed as a part of the Board packet. Responses are also posted on the HAB website.

There currently is not a process for notifying the Board when responses are made available.

- At various times in its history, the Board has made a special effort to determine if agency responses addressed what the Board requested in advice. The agencies work hard to provide adequate and timely responses, and the Board should acknowledge whether or not they feel the responses address the issues appropriately. The Board should determine whether or not the advice met its goal before moving forward.
- Advice responses could be sent directly to the advice issue manager, who could report back to the Board.
- Tracking all of the advice pieces, relevant documents, and subsequent responses will be difficult. All of the documents should be provided on the new Board SharePoint site.
- Assigning someone other than the issue manager to track advice and responses would increase participation in committees, and different perspectives on if the issues have been addressed would be helpful. However, a less involved person might not be as up to speed on the issues as the issue manager is.
- The committee that developed the advice should be the first point of contact for responses. They can then decide how to move forward with the advice and report to the Board on whether the agencies are following through with the suggested actions. The Board can help the committee determine how to move forward at that point.
- Rather than instituting a new system for response review, the Board could ask EnviroIssues to provide links to the agency responses in the HAB Events-at-a-Glance emails when they become available.
- The Board takes credit for changing direction and making a difference for Hanford cleanup, but does not have a way to quantify or point to specific examples of how. The Board should be concerned about their own accountability as they ask the agencies to be accountable; following through with advice and responses is a way to do so.

Steve agreed to present the key points of this discussion to the Executive Issues Committee at its meeting this evening.

Public Involvement for the Hanford Site-wide Permit

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, said the issue manager group for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) Site-wide Permit (Permit), has been meeting with Ecology to develop a public involvement process for reissuance of the Permit. Liz noted that the Permit has been on PIC's agenda for at least three years. The issue managers held a meeting with Ecology the day before the PIC meeting to review the agencies' plans for public meetings and workshops. Notes from the meeting are provided as Attachment 1.

Liz noted the importance of educating the public on the Permit before they attend public meetings, as there is a lot of information to comprehend. She said the public meetings will be well designed as there is ample time for PIC to provide input.

Agency presentation

Dieter noted that the release date for the Permit has been pushed back to May 1, 2012. He feels this is now a firm date.

Madeleine Brown, Ecology, provided a presentation on the agencies' plan for public involvement on the Permit (Attachment 2). Madeleine noted specifically:

- The 120 day comment period for the Permit will begin on May 1, 2012, which will extend through the September Board meeting.
- Board member Pam Larsen, City of Richland, develops programs for cable TV through the Hanford Communities. PIC support of the upcoming program on the Permit is strongly encouraged, as well as any help broadcasting the program in other cities.
- Only three hard copies of the Permit will be printed, due to its voluminous size; CD versions will be provided, instead.
- A jargon key will be provided online, with links provided in the 'baseball cards'. PIC members are encouraged to suggest additional terms for the jargon key.

Madeleine encouraged PIC members to provide feedback on the plan for public involvement. She provided examples of the baseball cards as edited by the Permit issue manager group and asked PIC to provide further feedback.

Committee discussion

The following are the key points noted during committee discussion:

- Additional terms to include in the jargon key include: Model Toxic Control Act, RCRA, alternative requirements, Corrective Action Decision (CAD), Record of Decision (ROD), incorporation by reference, and right to appeal.
- Madeleine provided an example agenda for the public meetings on the Permit (Attachment 3). The committee reviewed the agenda and provided suggestions for improvement, including:
 - Beginning a meeting at 6:30 p.m. on a weekday may be too early for Seattle. A 7:00 p.m. meeting might be easier for the working public to attend. The agencies should ask interest groups in the various locations to provide suggestions for day and time in their communities.

- The public does not need to know, in detail, how the Permit is organized and meeting time should not be spent reviewing it. A handout may be provided to demonstrate how the Permit is organized.
 - As per Madeleine's suggestion at the issue manager meeting, the public meeting should begin with a story to demonstrate what life was like at Hanford before RCRA, and how the agencies work with RCRA and the State Environmental Policy Act of 1971 (SEPA).
 - A handout to describe how the different regulations like RCRA, SEPA, and the TPA work together for Hanford cleanup would be helpful in order to understand where the Permit intersects with these other regulations.
- DOE and EPA are currently engaged in a review and comment process with Ecology; anyone can provide comments during the comment period. The public meetings will address how the public can provide official comments.
 - The Hanford Communities program will be filmed in March, and may be advertised through Hanford's listserv.
 - The "Visit gallery of units" item on the public meeting agenda is meant as a time for attendees to review posters, speak with agency representatives, and collect information they are interested in.
 - There will be public interest in off-site waste and emergency planning for the Tri-Cities in addition to post closure issues. There should be room in the gallery for the off-site waste topic and for public interest groups to present an alternate point-of-view.
 - Operating units is not identifiable language for most people. Display titles should use language that is more immediately known, like geographic areas, facilities, etc. The agencies should work together to make sure the verbiage connects between what they tell people and how comments are provided, as someone providing comment on something other than what the permit name is could be confusing.
 - The issue manager group will address meeting time allotment with Ecology, as spending too much time educating the public may cause frustration if people are mostly at the meeting to provide comment.
 - The role of the moderator will be important to set attendee's expectations and keep to the agenda.
 - Changes to the baseball cards as suggested by the issue manager group include larger titles, simple maps, color coding, and an added section called "What's the risk?" The cards will link to each other according to relevance and will also link to the jargon key. The committee suggested the cards link to additional sources on the Hanford website.

Liz reviewed the next steps for public involvement on the Permit. Ecology will further update the agenda, baseball cards, and involvement plan based on PIC suggestions. The issue manager group will discuss the Permit during the December River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting and involve PIC and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on certain topics, including an agency-sponsored public workshop or Committee of the Whole meeting. The next issue manager group meeting for the Permit will be in January.

Liz noted that the issue managers covered the Corrective Action Decision – Record of Decision (CAD-ROD) topic with John Price, Ecology, at yesterday’s issue manager meeting.. They also discussed emergency planning, a topic that Liz thinks should be brought before the Board.

Public Involvement Planning

Liz said that the purpose of the public involvement planning exercise is to consider issues for public involvement that don’t necessarily relate to the TPA public involvement calendar, as that is the typical area of focus for PIC. Liz referenced a handout that summarized issues Board members think should be considered for public involvement, as identified in a survey conducted by EnviroIssues (Attachment 4). She asked PIC members to consider topics for public involvement that may be addressed formally, informally, or through personal/organizational commitment. Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters and HAB chair, noted that it is the responsibility of Board members to do public involvement on their own time, in addition to what is required of the TPA agencies.

Committee Discussion

The committee discussed topics that may be timely for public involvement within the next six months. Topics are not necessarily the responsibility of PIC to address, but could be a topic for another committee or for an individual member to address. The committee assigned topics to a timeframe based on when public involvement on the issue would be timely; timeframes may change based on document availability or interest levels. Identified issues will be provided to the Executive Issues Committee and circulated to other committees as necessary; other committees can choose whether to address the issues or add their own. The issues and their timeframes include:

- November 2011: Process Waste 1, 3, and 6 and Cooling Water 5 (PW-1/3/6 and CW-5) ROD.
- December 2011: Contaminants of concern/graded approach.
- January 2012: How clean is clean; long term stewardship/institutional controls/public access and use; River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment Human Health Assessment; characterization.
- February 2012: K Area Proposed Plan; out-year budget; State of the Site meetings; Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and worker safety; WTP technical issues and public confidence.

- March 2012: Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS); Greater than Class C EIS; RCRA Permit; tank closure; Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment.
- April 2012: Hanford Public Involvement Plan; emergency planning; other River Corridor proposed plans.

Committee Business

Review Follow Up Items

Susan Hayman reviewed follow up and action items.

1. Public involvement planning topics check-in on next committee call (*revisit each month during committee calls/meetings*).
2. TC&EM EIS monthly question (*revisit with the work plan update each month*).
3. Inform and involve public after remedies selected (*a topic for a future committee meeting*).

Comprehensively Update the 6-Month Work Plan

The committee updated their 6 Month Work Plan based on interest level, timing, and work load. The updated work plan is provided as Attachment 5.

Determine future meeting needs

The committee will hold a call on Thursday, December 15 (Note: corrected to Thursday, December 1) to discuss the agency responses to Board Advice 239 and 240, public involvement planning, and debrief from the Hanford Public Involvement Plan public meetings to be held in November. There will be a committee call in January to plan for the February in-person meeting.

Attachments

Notes from HAB Issue Manager Meeting on Public Involvement for the Permit (Attachment 1).
 Public Involvement for the Site-wide Permit presentation (Attachment 2).
 Permit Hearing and Workshop Agenda (Attachment 3).
 Public Involvement Survey Results (Attachment 4).
 PIC 6 Month Work Plan (Attachment 5).

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Earl Fordham	Susan Leckband	Betty Tabbutt (phone)
Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson	Jean Vanni

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Mark Loper, Heart of America NW (phone)
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Becky Rubenstrunk, OSU
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Emy Laija, EPA	Barb Wise, MSA	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Advice Responses

1. Agencies would appreciate HAB review of agency responses.
 - a. Identify what did/didn't respond to.
 - b. Know that responses are not always addresses point by point.
2. Add Board agenda item to discuss responses and where HAB "landed."
3. Process for timely notification of agency responses (?).

Page 1

Advice Responses (continued)

4. Develop a Board process for agency responses to advice (committees to the Board).
 - a. Be mindful of need to "reacquaint" Board with advice.
 - b. "Issue tracker" versus "issue manager" – advantages/disadvantages to having tracker/manager same person.
 - c. Be inclusive and transparent in response.

Page 2

Advice Responses (continued)

5. Add links to agency responses on HAB Events at a Glance.
6. Track if agencies actually "did what they said they would" (close circle).
7. Have HAB be accountable for advances/success it contributed.

Page 3

Terms to define

1. MCTA
2. RCRA
3. Alternative requirements
4. CAD/ROD
5. Incorporated by reference
6. Right to Appeal

Page 4

Public Involvement Planning – November

1. PW 1/3/6

Page 5

Public Involvement Planning – December

1. Contaminants of concern (graded approach).

Page 6

Public Involvement Planning – January

1. How clean is clean?
2. Long-term stewardship/institutional controls – public access and use.
3. RCBRA – Human Health Assessment.
4. Characterization.

Page 7

Public Involvement Planning – February

1. K Area Proposed Plan.
2. Budget (out year).
3. State of the site meetings.
4. WTP and worker safety.
5. WTP technical issues and public confidence.

Page 8

Public Involvement Planning – March

1. TC&WM EIS.
2. Class C Waste EIS.
3. Site-wide Permit.
4. Tank closure.
5. Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment.

Page 9

Public Involvement Planning – April

1. Hanford Public Involvement Plan – once final.
2. Emergency Planning.
3. Other River Corridor Proposed Plans (may be early).

Page 10

Follow Up

4. PI Planning topics check-in on committee call.
5. TC&EM EIS monthly question.
6. Inform and involve public after remedies selected.

Page 11
