

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING  
November 3, 2010  
Richland, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and introductions ..... 1  
DOE’s “Collaboration Zone” ..... 2  
Open Government Plan “Part 2” ..... 4  
State of the Site Meetings ..... 6  
Debrief of the Ice Cream Social Event and Survey ..... 9  
Debrief the Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Ground Public Workshops (joint topic with RAP) ..... 10  
Presentation from University of Washington Masters of Public Health Students and Potential Advice Points ..... 11  
Committee Business ..... 14  
*Action Items / Commitments* ..... 14  
Handouts ..... 15  
Attendees ..... 16

*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 October meeting summary.

Steve said the Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) received U.S. Department of Energy’s response to Advice #235 concerning openness of the DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) Subcommittee meetings. The response was fairly straightforward; DOE believes that holding closed subcommittee meetings is permissible under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and that they will continue to do so. Steve felt that PIC does not need to address the response at this time, but will continue to track this issue on behalf of the HAB.

Susan Leckband said she hand-delivered Advice #235 to Dr. Inés Triay, U.S. DOE-EM Assistant Secretary, and she and Dr. Triay spoke about it openly. Dr. Triay said the advice seems in concert with DOE’s efforts for openness and transparency; however, Dr. Triay did not provide additional reasoning for why the subcommittee meeting was closed. She only stated that they are not required to open them to the public. Susan asked other Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) if their meetings were open and it was a unanimous yes. The other SSABs agreed with the advice put forward by the HAB and said they would continue to discuss this issue with DOE Headquarters (HQ)

## **DOE's "Collaboration Zone"**

Steve said the discussion about a "Collaboration Zone" took place at the September 22 meeting. Ben Ellison, Chief Social Networking at DOE Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE\_ORP) provided a presentation on this topic in September. This is something the PIC and HAB are been interested in terms of trying to improve stakeholder access to information. During the September meeting Paula Call, DOE-RL, asked the PIC to identify specific topics that would be valuable to the public; a general for concept of a Collaboration Zone was developed using some of these suggestions.

Ben said the Collaboration Zone is a concept with loose boundaries. It is essentially a way to get information from inside the agencies, out to the public, i.e. data sets, agendas, summaries, etc. Most of this data is already available; however, it is sometimes very difficult for people to find. The Collaboration Zone will not be another network but more of a collaborative SharePoint site.

Currently DOE is developing a pilot site with assistance from Mission Support Alliance (MSA). This work is not yet in MSA's scope but Ben and DOE are working to get it into their contract and find funding for it. There is a push to get the pilot done and the website up and running. Doug Shoop (DOE-RL), Matt McCormick (DOE-RL) and Dave Brockman (DOE-ORP) are all on board with this.

DOE is currently working to find an 'anchor tenant, which is a well known group, organization or entity that that will serve as the initial/lead user of the new site in hopes of drawing in other users. Ben said there is a lot of interest in the Collaboration Zone so DOE is trying to involve all interested parties in this process.

For the first part of the pilot site, users will be required to have a username and password, also known as authenticated access. This is due to the fact that DOE would like control of what documents are placed on the site and what information is getting out there. Once this initial site is running successfully, more layers, with fewer restrictions and DOE control, will be added. This will make the site more collaborative in terms of networking, modifying documents, posting comments, integrating teams, etc. The software used to build the site will be very similar to Microsoft SharePoint but the exact software has not been determined yet. Ben said DOE will need to find more funding before progress on the Collaboration Zone can be made.

DOE hopes to have the first layer of the site up and running before April 2011. If MSA can accomplish this, DOE will see their work as a success. Once the pilot site is complete it can be expanded. There is a lot of information that should go on the site and it will take a while to have all of the information cleared by the appropriate parties. DOE is also hoping to have entire databases cleared and released for public viewing. Ben said information posted on the site cannot be classified or labeled as Official Use Only (OUO). This is a DOE site so information needs to be accurate.

Gerry Pollet raised concerns about documents possibly being held from the public, especially in regards to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Ben said it will be difficult to test the success of the site so it is important to start small by building the infrastructure first and then adding documents as the site progresses. Ben compared it to building the structure of a house first and then furnishing it once the structure is complete.

#### *Agency Perspective*

Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, said the end goal of the site is to have it open and accessible to the public and Ecology is on board with this.

Emy Laija, EPA, noted that EPA supports creation of the site as well.

#### *Committee Discussion*

Laura Hanses asked where funding is coming from and how much the site will cost. Ben said MSA expects to spend between \$275,000 - \$325,000. He said this estimate is based on technologies MSA is already familiar with, such as Read-only memory (ROM). Ben said he would like them to look into newer equipment like cloud storage but this project is difficult and will take a lot of time. Ben noted both forms of equipment are similar in cost.

Liz Mattson asked Ben to define some of the terminology he was using to explain the Collaboration Zone website:

**Anchor tenant** – Usually the first, and the leading, tenant in a shopping center whose prestige and name recognition (i.e. Wal-Mart or Target), attracts other tenants and hopefully shoppers. In terms of the Collaboration Zone, the anchor tenant would be a well known group, organization or entity that that will serve as the initial/lead user of the new site in hopes of drawing in other users.

**SharePoint** – A type of software or a large website that allows users, in this case the public, to download documents, calendars, photos, videos, etc. Wikipedia, Facebook and Google Docs are all examples of this type of site. Some sites are more public than others and this is where levels of security come into play.

**Authentication and Authorization** – These are types of access controls allowing users different levels of access to a website. Examples include passwords and login identification.

Jean Vanni asked why DOE is not adjusting their administrative record, which is available to the public, to function as the Collaboration Zone instead of investing money into something new that is very similar. She felt having two different sites is duplicative. Ben said he is not too familiar with administrative records but felt what he hopes to accomplish would be much more broad, interactive and robust than an administrative record.

Jean asked if this the Collaboration Zone will function like Hanford Local Area Network (HLAN) and Q Map. Ben said HLAN is legally bound to restrict access to the public and Q Map is only available inside of HLAN so it will not function like those programs because they are closed to the public.

The PIC asked Ben how he sees the Board and committees using the Collaboration Zone. Ben said it could enable the PIC to upload files and grant or deny certain users access ability, upload meeting minutes with some users granted permission to edit the document, approve advice pieces, etc. Ben felt the HAB lacks the type of tools that can effectively facilitate HAB activities and materials and suggested that this new site could better assist HAB collaborations.

Gerry said this sounds very similar to how Google Docs functions and noted that Google Docs is a free service for the public. Ben said DOE is looking for a higher level of integration than Google Docs.

Gerry also raised concerns about the HAB using the Collaboration Zone because it is a DOE website. He suggested having a neutral entity host the site, using EnviroIssues as an example.

Ben asked what functions and/or documents included in the Collaboration Zone site would be most important or useful to the PIC. Paula said it would be great if there was a place to upload documents and have people edit them or comment on them. The group agreed this could also be a good place for documents that are in public libraries that are only accessible during business hours.

Steve said the discussion provided a lot of material for future discussions. Steve said an issue manager needs to be identified who is familiar with the topic and knows the right questions to ask. Steve said DOE is asking for input and the PIC should take advantage of this opportunity.

## **Open Government Plan “Part 2”**

Gerry introduced the draft advice on the US DOE’s Open Government Plan. He said this advice is meant for the agencies but will also inform the public about what Open Government Plans are and why the agencies are creating them. Gerry said he envisions this advice aiding in the creation of a sub plan for US DOE-EM and each of the DOE field offices under US DOE’s larger Open Government Plan.

Gerry said Betty Tabutt assisted in organizing the advice. The advice focuses on three main principles that are outlined in the President’s Directive - transparency, participation and collaboration.

Gerry said 40% of the US DOE’s budget is committed to DOE-EM so it is important for DOE-EM to have more of a presence in the US DOE’s plan.

Gerry provided an overview of the advice. There are nine recommendation included in the advice that the PIC believes should be taken into consideration in order for US DOE’s Open Government Plan to meet requirements set by the President’s Open Government Directive including:

1. US DOE’s EM program should commit to a “flagship initiative” to update and improve EM site Public Involvement Plans in 2011.
2. The EM program should collaborate with its advisory boards, stakeholders and regulators.
3. EM and EPA should develop a list of high value data and provide it to site stakeholders.
4. EM should commit to having all EM advisory committee meetings open to the public, including subcommittee meetings.
5. US DOE should commit to and comply with all FOIA guidelines.
6. The US DOE and EPA Open Government Plans should commit to improving transparency and providing effective notices.
7. High value data sets should be made available online.

8. EM should commit to expanding participation and develop a mechanism for evaluating the success of that participation.
9. EM should commit to numeric goals concerning notice lists, attendance and participation in comment periods.

Gerry said some of the advice pieces tie into EPA's goals concerning environmental justice issues and getting public health risk information out to all those who might be affected.

Gerry said he included footnotes at the end of the advice so people have a frame of reference or have the ability to track down documents referenced in the advice.

Susan H. said this advice could come forward for February's Board meeting so the PIC still has time to continue working on it.

### *Agency Perspective*

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, said the advice is well thought out and valuable to the agencies. She said there is an opportunity leading up to the next HAB meeting for the agencies to look at elements of the Open Government Plan the HAB is looking to advise on.

Dieter said the advice is more focused on DOE than Ecology but realizes the advice is also targeting Ecology. Dieter said there is a lot to digest and consider with the advice but Ecology supports a lot of the elements.

Emy echoed Pamela and Dieter. EPA likes the principles defined in the advice. She said there are not any immediate concerns with the advice. There has also been positive feedback on EPA Region 10 having its own Open Government Plan and Emy noted Gerry planned to get feedback on the advice now and then send it through the EPA Region 10 development process to get a plan developed for Hanford. Emy said this could be applicable to all Superfund sites in the region.

Pamela said there are a lot of different agencies included in the advice and a lot of different elements so she encouraged Gerry and the PIC to be sensitive to different policies and procedures.

Ben agreed with the rest of the agency representatives; he likes the elements of the advice but thought it could be scaled back a little.

### *Committee Discussion*

The group thanked Gerry for the time he invested into drafting this advice.

Steve stated on behalf of Susan L. that the document would serve well as a white paper instead of a piece of advice. Steve agreed with Susan's comment because of the large volume of topics being dealt with in the advice and the length of the document. Susan reminded the PIC to keep in mind that the Board provides advice to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies, not the public or the media. Susan L. said she would like to see the advice points more compact and concise.

The group agreed that there was too much text and tutorial included. They also felt that too much focus was on the President's Directive. The group decided that the concepts are good but they wanted to see the document reduced to three pages or less.

Gerry asked members to submit suggestions for how to improve the advice, whether that be through adding or removing certain elements.

Liz and Ken suggested having a discussion in a future committee meeting about how FOIA fits into this advice, rather than including references to FOIA in this particular advice.

Liz said at the last PIC meeting the group decided that after developing a high level piece of advice on the Open Government Plan, a lower level piece of advice can be drafted. However, this advice incorporates both high and low level elements. Liz like that the advice is comprehensive but thought it could be broken down so it is more readable and the advice points distilled.

Liz thought the PIC should consider how Ben's pilot project and the Collaboration Zone might fit in with the flagship initiative. The Collaboration Zone could be used as an example or a reference to how governments should be open and transparent. Ben agreed but cautioned the group that the Collaboration Zone would only serve as a component of DOE's Open Government Plan and would not solve all of their transparency issues.

Jean suggested including language about the need for consistent funding to make sure the Collaboration Zone continues after it is established.

Jean also suggested including information about changes in operable units per the new RCRA permit. Gerry agreed that it would be great if changes in operable units could be tracked in one place that consists of indexes and links to regulatory documents.

Steve asked if chairs from TWC and RAP should be consulted about what they consider to be high value data sets. The group agreed that yes, the more technical committees should be solicited for input. Ben offered to place a post on Hanford.gov or Facebook asking for suggestions on high value data request. The group agreed this was a good idea but raised concerns that the phrase "high value data sets" does not relate well with the public. Often times the public does not know what type of data they are looking for so it is important to assign data with simple, easily referenced terminology.

Emy raised concerns about merging Open Government Plans with the CRP because they have different sets of rules and regulations. Pamela agreed that although some elements of the CRP and Open Government Plans are interchangeable, such as transparency and public access to information, they have different purposes and are governed by different orders. In addition, the CRP is a static document but strategic public engagement plans are fluid and will change over time. The group agreed to have further discussions on this issue.

Liz "volunteered" Ken to work with Gerry to re-tool the advice. She will check with Ken about this.

### **State of the Site Meetings**

#### *Agency Update*

Emy said no further planning for the State of the Site (SOS) meetings has been done since they will not be held until April. Emy suggested that because the meetings are now going to be held next year it might be a good idea to combine the SOS and public budget meetings.

Emy said the agencies agreed that three SOS meetings would be possible – Seattle, Portland and Richland. As far as additional meetings, Emy said the agencies would need to hear from stakeholders in that region expressing interest in a meeting. Locations and times of the meetings have not been set and are still being discussed. The meetings will likely be held in the evening so people can attend after work.

Emy said there is a lot of public involvement activity in March and April. EPA might hold other activities including possible Community Relations Plan (CRP) meetings. Emy said it is important for the agencies and HAB to be aware of how much they are asking of the public because they do not want to overwhelm them with too many activities and events.

Paula reminded the group that the SOS meetings were postponed because the PIC did not think these meetings should be held at the same time as the solid waste burial grounds meetings that occurred in October.

Paula said the budget process will occur at the end of March. If the process is delayed, then the agencies might not want to combine SOS and budget topics into one meeting. Paula said if the meetings are combined into one night they will need to be structured to fit everyone's needs.

Paula said DOE-EM faces a 5% budget cut for fiscal year (FY) 2012. This budget reduction reiterates the need to identify and address the implications of such cuts.

#### *Committee Discussion*

The group agreed with the agencies' idea to combine the SOS and public budget meeting. Gerry felt this is a feasible option and might be the desirable option as well. Gerry said depending on the results of the current election, ensuring adequate funding and support for cleanup will be a topic of interest.

Susan L. also felt that combining the SOS and budget meetings would be a way to get priorities from a budget standpoint. Susan felt the public needs to be aware that in FY 2012 ARRA funding will be gone and DOE faces a 5% loss in funding.

Susan L. suggested that the HAB have a deep, full day discussion to make conscious choices about what the priorities will be during the SOS/budget meetings. Susan L. said the SOS meetings should be framed around budget concerns with a portion of the meeting dedicated to capturing public comments.

Dieter said the format of the meetings is still being discussed. A format that works in the Tri-Cities may be different than what works in larger cities. Dieter said the agencies will be flexible with this.

The group suggested holding a worker meeting prior to the Richland SOS/budget meeting, similar to the worker meeting held last year. The committee reiterated that this will enable the workers to get their concerns addressed outside of the SOS meetings, and enables the SOS meetings to focus on the issues at hand.

The committee agreed that specific needs from the agencies tend to trump general education about Hanford. Liz wants the PIC to think about when general Hanford opportunities are being provided and how the PIC can be creative with different learning opportunities so they are not

always TPA led. Liz said she would like to see a general Hanford opportunity held now so that in April people will already have learned the basics about Hanford.

The group raised concerns about the public getting burned out if they are asked to attend too many meetings. Liz said she thinks burnout happens when meetings are always convened by the same organization and the same format is used. Liz suggested hosting a public comment meeting followed by a movie night or a brainstorming session because this format is less susceptible to burnout.

Susan L. said she did not think college students are interested or engaged in Hanford because they want to be but are because they are required to be by their curriculum. Susan reminded the group that a student signing up to take a course about Hanford is much different than the average person. Susan L. said the burnout effect is different for students and non-students and the PIC should recognize this.

Liz said it is a lot of responsibility on the TPA to plan and host all of these meetings so the PIC should think about ways to leverage where there is enthusiasm.

Gerry said the agencies need to host an SOS meeting in Spokane, as well, because they have not held an SOS meeting there for a long time. Gerry also said there is a lot of interest in Hanford in Eugene. Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) is having an information night coming up in Eugene and Gerry thought it would be helpful if people had an SOS meeting in April as a follow up. Gerry also noted that Hood River has expressed interest having a meeting as well. Laura suggested the agencies also host a meeting in Moses Lake because it is a central location.

The committee wanted to know how the agencies planned to handle this issue and how additional meetings might be added.

Shelley agreed that it has been a long time since a meeting was held in Spokane. Shelley said the agencies need to build a backing in a city. They cannot expect to simply drop into a city and expect a large turnout. However, if the agencies come back each year around the same time a rapport can be built.

Shelley said Liz's ice cream social was a fun and creative idea and felt that the agencies should provide money to the interest groups and let them work on ways of getting people the information they need so they will continue to attend meetings.

Sam suggested it might be good for the PIC to be thinking 5 years ahead and developing a public involvement strategy that identifies future opportunities and what is needed to support this effort.

Laura suggested giving attendees at the SOS/budget meetings the option to either attend a 30-minute budget workshop session in one room or learn about the waste treatment plant (WTP) in another. Then the groups could reconvene for an open forum at the end of the night.

Sam said if the HAB and the agencies do the same thing year after year it will all get stale. Sam said the PIC needs to bring more creativity to the table. Susan L. said the agencies have identified some funding for creative activities. Gerry said he is on the Board that allocates funding for this creative effort and that \$1 million are available.



Susan H. suggested the PIC issue managers synthesize their feedback about the SOS meetings and put together a package of recommendations concerning the SOS meetings to present to the agencies. Liz offered to pull together the PIC's ideas and recommendations.

The committee agreed that the agencies need confirm soon whether or not a meeting will be held in a certain city or not because in order to work with university classes in the spring and get them to attend the April meeting, the PIC needs to work with professors now.

The committee asked if the agencies can decide on exact dates now. Paula said the agencies will try to accommodate timeframe recommendations but they cannot confirm dates yet because they are still trying to consider a number of variables, including manager availability.

Overall, the committee agreed on the preference of combining the two discussion topics into one meeting but raised concerns about the need for the public to have other general education opportunities prior to the April meetings.

### **Debrief of the Ice Cream Social Event and Survey**

Liz said Hanford Challenge held an ice cream social on July 27 to talk about the future SOS meetings and find out from the public what they thought the meetings should be about. The event was held from 4-7 pm at Seward Park in Seattle. Attendees were provided free ice cream in exchange for completing a brief survey. Games that were built around information about Hanford were also provided so this event was very educational. 60 people attended the family friendly event out of the approximately 250 that were invited via email. Overall Liz felt this event was a success and noted that it took minimal time and effort to plan.

The survey given at the event was drafted by Hanford Challenge but included input from the PIC, Ecology and DOE. Liz had the survey approved by Ecology through a public involvement grant process.

Liz said the event was fun but it also provided useful information and feedback to Hanford Challenge. A lot of people came to the event who Hanford Challenge has not been in contact with before. A few agency people attended as well. Some attendees asked for an overview of Hanford and after completing the survey most people wanted to know more.

Erika Holmes, Ecology, said she also participated in this event. She said it was a fun, stress free atmosphere and people were really enjoying themselves. This is where Erika met Holly Barker, the professor from the University of Washington (UW) that has been working closely with the PIC.

Pamela added that the event was family oriented, the flyers and notification were good, the location was great and the goals of the event were met. Liz agreed that Seward Park was a great location but was a little difficult for people to find.

The committee asked how Liz developed the survey questions. She said she designed the survey around finding out what people wanted to learn at the SOS meetings and then Ecology and several PIC members weighed in on the initial drafts.

Liz provided members with a first draft of the survey results but noted that they still need to be formalized. Once finalized, Liz will provide copies to PIC members.

Erika reviewed the draft survey results. From the event they discovered that protecting the Columbia River and finding a high level waste repository were two of the most important topics to attendees.

Liz said she plans to hold a similar event next summer.

### **Debrief the Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Ground Public Workshops (joint topic with RAP)**

Gerry said three regional workshops concerning Hanford's solid waste burial grounds were held in Hood River, Portland and Seattle in September and October. The turnout was very good in Seattle, approximately 98 people attended. Hood River had approximately 12 people and Portland had approximately 15 people in attendance. The group agreed that President Obama's rally taking place across the street in Portland is likely to blame for the smaller attendance in that area.

The goals of the workshops were to provide education and discussion on the burial grounds and solicit input from the public on investigation of the burial grounds. In an effort to establish long-term commitment on this issue, the agencies made a commitment to return to the public before making any decisions.

A lot of "lessons learned" were taken away from the workshops. Surveys were given at the Seattle meeting in an effort to get different perspectives on how the workshops went and how they could be improved. Gerry suggested the PIC review the surveys, debrief and then discuss potential advice.

Emy reviewed the surveys from Seattle. There were 20 questions in total. Some of the complaints the agencies received were that overall notification was inadequate and too selective, the workshops were too technical and complex for the general public, and attendees felt that their comments would not be considered by the agencies or have any effect on the outcome of the burial grounds cleanup. However, the surveys did show that the room and venue were good, the poster session was informative and engaging and the agencies and staff were available to talk and answer questions. Approximately 50% of those who attended the Seattle workshop were satisfied with their experience and would likely participate in another event in the future.

Sam asked if the survey results are biased because of the large student population. Emy said yes but noted that the student's feedback adds flavor to the results and are still valuable to the agencies.

Gerry asked the UW Masters of Public Health students on the phone, Cassalyn David, Katie Hess, Jordana Pickman and Sara Jaye Sanford, to give their opinion of the workshops. The students thanked the PIC for this opportunity. They said they were not informed at any point during the meeting that notes were being taken or that their feedback was being recorded. This led to the students feeling like the agencies were only hosting the meetings because they were required to by regulations, not because they were genuinely interested in feedback. They also wanted to see more context to the discussion. They said that John Price, Ecology, provided students with an excellent presentation during a class held prior to the workshop that showed one kilogram of plutonium and explained how many bombs that amount of plutonium could make. Students were hoping to get similar context at the meetings but it was much more complex than they expected. In addition, the students agreed that the information provided was of very high

quality but a reasonably intelligent and informed person could be easily confused by the way the information was presented.

The students suggested ways to improve the workshops including – providing a summary to attendees and providing more context to the discussion through visuals or more simplified explanations. Paula said that there was a notetaker present at the meeting and the notes are available on the web. Unfortunately, the agencies failed to communicate to the audience that notes were being taken.

Gerry said Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, made a commitment in Seattle to come back in a year. Matt could not confirm whether or not DOE would be able to come back before a decision was made but Gerry said waiting until 2016 for public comment was not the message the PIC was seeking.

Doug Mercer asked if names and contact information were provided on the surveys. Emy said they were anonymous.

Paula said when these meetings were planned, the agencies had a detailed conversation with the PIC about what the target audience of these workshops should be. It was decided that a small, informed group of people should be invited. Based on this decision, the agencies built their materials and format around this suggestion. However, when the audience changed to large numbers of students previously unfamiliar with Hanford, the agencies tried to accommodate that but the context of the meeting simply ended up being too complex.

The agencies received strong feedback about the lack of notification to the general public. Only those who had attended a previous meeting were extended invitations and the agencies as well as other interest groups involved in the meetings received backlash from this. The group agreed that in the future additional notices should go out to the public. Paula said a lesson learned was that it is not in DOE's best interest to try and do a highly educated stakeholder meeting because audiences tend to shift and this can come off looking like a focus group meeting.

Paula added that in the future, meetings should start with a brief Hanford 101 instead of jumping right in with the assumption that those attending are already familiar with the topics of discussion.

Ken said DOE came through with a lot of the items the PIC had asked for and they were very willing to take the PIC's advice and try something different. Ken said it is important for members to admit that some decisions were the wrong ones and learn from those.

Liz said the structure of the meeting with presentations and poster session with Q and A helped break up the meeting and kept the energy up. Public Health students' presentations were also incorporated into the meeting, which were a positive addition.

### **Presentation from University of Washington Masters of Public Health Students and Potential Advice Points**

Gerry introduced the four UW Master of Public Health students that wrote papers concerning Hanford's solid waste burial grounds. The students were given only a week to complete this assignment. Gerry said the two papers provide an excellent basis for the development of advice and the PIC might be able to benefit from the students' work.

Pam Larsen encouraged PIC members to read the papers because they read like HAB documents. Pam reviewed the first essay, *Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Ground Position Paper*.

She said the papers highlight similar values as the HAB's which are important to be reminded of. The values listed are as follows:

- Protect human health and the environment
- Conduct an effective and cost-efficient cleanup
- Ensure worker safety
- Guarantee public participation and transparency

Pam said many of the points included in the paper are consistent with what the HAB has been saying about the solid waste burial grounds. Dale Engstrom stated that he liked what the students had done with their papers and concurred with Pam and Gerry about possible advice resulting from these papers.

Jordanna Pickman introduced her paper entitled *Protecting Health: Criteria for the Hanford Burial Grounds*. The paper focused on several key issues to be addressed through burial ground remediation policies but drove home the need for improved monitoring of the burial grounds. Jordanna said an issue her and her fellow students came across was that data information is in a patchwork, which made it challenging to compare multiple datasets. She felt that if it was difficult for graduate students then it would probably be even more difficult for the general public.

Jordanna also referenced data that was based on a "Reference Man," a "hypothetical 20 to 30 year old Caucasian male" weighing 154 pounds. She said the data is not valuable because women are more sensitive to radiation than men.

The paper proposed four criteria that must be met for any alternatives chosen for remediation of the burial grounds. The four criteria stated that comprehensive data for contents and characteristics of what is buried must be included in the remediation plan, hazardous contaminant must be cleaned up to levels that will not lead to adverse health effects, monitoring must extend for as long as the contaminants are harmful to people, and the process for both remediation and continued monitoring must be open and transparent.

Jordanna thanked the agencies and PIC members for allowing her and her fellow students to get involved and learn more about this issue. Liz offered to send Jordanna conference call and GoToMeeting information if she or any of the other students in her program would like to continue to be involved in future discussions.

#### *Agency Perspective*

Deborah Singleton, Ecology, thanked the students for doing such a great job. She said she attended the Seattle burial ground workshop and assured the students that the agencies were actively listening and will take their input into account when the agencies discuss approaches and best characterization methods that will be included in the work plan, due out December 2011.

Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL, said they heard loud and clear about the need for improved ground water monitoring. DOE also recognizes that more information concerning deep vadose zone and Pre-1970 Transuranic waste (Pre-70 TRU) are also needed.

Doug H. said in terms of showing how and where public comments were considered, some text taken verbatim from the workshop summaries will be included throughout the work plan.

### *Committee Discussion*

Jean said the students did an excellent job presenting the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) side but suggested they also look at the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) side. Cleanup of the burial grounds falls under RCRA guidelines, which are more stringent than CERCLA. Jordanna said they chose to organize their papers around CERCLA guidelines because they are the guidelines for cleanup of Superfund sites.

Doug M. asked how the students envisioned the burial grounds once remediation was complete. The students answered that future land use plans were not referenced in these papers.

Doug M. asked if the students suggested cleanup be done through a collection of cleanup tasks or one single cleanup method. The students said they did not come up with specific cleanup approaches, but provided a general framework of values they hope the agencies will consider.

Gerry felt that the concept of transparency and potential health risks from contaminants should be incorporated into burial ground advice. Gerry also said monitoring is insufficient and the need for soil column and early release monitoring should also be included in the advice.

Gerry said there will be an investigation work plan one year from now so the PIC and HAB should be thinking about other advice pieces that might need to be included in terms of the workshops, meetings, public input, etc.

Gerry said the criteria the students developed should apply to all landfills and burial grounds on the Central Plateau, not just the SW-2 burial grounds. There is also a major concern about a cleanup plan not being finished until 2017. The deadline for cleaning up TPA tank farm units is 2024 but it will be difficult to meet this deadline if the work plan is not finished until 2017.

DOE estimates that about 30% of the waste trenches have not been studied and DOE knows little to nothing about. The committee agreed that DOE needs to get started on digging in those trenches to characterize what is inside of them.

Susan L. said that if waste that is dug out of the trenches ends of being TRU waste, according to Frank Marcinowski, DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM), it will be able to go to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

Liz said it is important for the agencies not to rely solely on predictions that were derived from old records and data, but instead are made from actual data gathered through recent excavations. This will enable DOE to cross reference old data with new data to ensure their predictions are in fact accurate.

Jean said there needs to be an item in the advice that speaks to the RCRA permit and modifications that need to be made to the permit. This will ensure some areas are not left uncharacterized.

Shelley Cimon said there are old ponds underneath the trenches that she would like the agencies to be clear on how much processing waste went into these ponds. She would also like to know how deep the ponds are and if they are dry or not. These answers are needed to be able to exhume all contaminants under the trenches.

Gerry said dose limits should be applied to an exposure scenario including women and children, not just “Reference Man.” Jean agreed that there is a need to consider range of exposure and the risk of exposure with barriers or caps.

Doug M. added that the advice should also identify transparency goals as they relate to the burial ground issue.

The committee agreed that this advice piece would include both technical and public involvement advice. The group also agreed that this should be a joint discussion with RAP.

Shelley said when DOE puts out their report it will be good to see what the public said and how DOE responded to their comments.

Jean reminded the committee that the RCRA permit will come out in February so this advice should come out prior to that. The group agreed that there might need to be two pieces of advice that are done in tandem; one pertaining to the RCRA permit and one focused on burial grounds. The group also suggested having the advice come from the COTW, not an individual committee.

Susan L. said the path forward for advice on the solid waste burial grounds is to first identify an issue manager, identify advice points and build the framework, and determine the potential for bringing this advice forward in February. Advice on the burial grounds will be the initial piece of advice followed by an overarching RCRA piece of advice.

### **Committee Business**

The PIC will have a committee call on November 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss the COTW tank closure plan agenda scheduled for December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### **Public Involvement Strategic Planning Advice**

Liz introduced the advice that was schedule to be brought to the Board for approval the following day. Liz said the goal of the public involvement strategic planning advice is to share the process the PIC used to conduct successful public involvement over the last year in an effort to get the agencies to incorporate some of the PIC’s strategies into the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP). The PIC and the HAB feel that meaningful public involvement is key to successful cleanup of Hanford and recommends the agencies adopt their public involvement strategies that will lead to a robust and successful approach to cleanup and make interaction with the public more effective.

Members thought the advice was well written and thanked Liz for all of her hard work.

### **December meeting topics (conference call):**

- RCRA Site-wide Permit Workshop – design and locations (joint with RAP)
- Open Government Plan advice
- Solid Waste Burial Grounds advice (joint with RAP)
- Possible discussion on Collaboration Zone

### **Action Items / Commitments**

1. Follow up on DOE response to Advice #235
  - a. Susan L. to continue to informally network this topic with EM

- b. PIC will take further follow up action as appropriate
2. Discussion on Collaboration Zone (Liz/Doug)
  - a. Determine what records suitable for Collaboration Zone posting
  - b. Determine how the PIC wants to move forward with the Collaboration Zone
  - c. Let HAB EIC know about interest in High Value Data (needs to be defined)
    - i. Not specific documents, just broad categories
  - d. DOE may post request to identify high data value set on Facebook, Twitter, etc.
  - e. Get comments on how people want to search for this information (dictionary, terminology)
3. Further discussion on relationship between CRP and Open Government Plan
4. Gerry to follow up with Ken on helping to revise draft advice, v.2
5. Reformat/clarify information from Ice Cream Social survey and provide to PIC (Liz/Erika)
6. How to better involve Spokane and other interested communities in Hanford public events
7. Synthesize SOS input from PIC meetings → determine areas of agreement on recommendations to agencies (advice?) – queue it up (Steve)
8. Workplan
  - a. How to better involve Spokane and other interested communities in Hanford public events
  - b. Discuss how to accomplish public involvement goals w/o all of the responsibility on the agencies/interest groups
  - c. Develop overall strategy of public involvement over the next 5 years
9. Coordinate with RAP with key discussion/advice points. Issue Managers draft first (Doug, Jean, Shelley, Dale)

## **Handouts**

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

- Draft HAB advice on Openness Incorporating Public Involvement Strategy Planning into the Community Relations Plan, Liz Mattson.
- Draft HAB advice on Open Government Plan, Gerry Pollet
- *Protecting Health: Criteria for the Hanford Burial Grounds*, Jordanna Pickman, UW Masters of Public Health
- *Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Ground Position Paper*, Sara Jaye Sanford, UW Masters of Public Health
- Hanford Ping Pong Geography Scoring Guide, Liz Mattson.
- Hanford Challenge – Hanford Public Participation Survey, Liz Mattson.
- Draft survey results of the Ice Cream Social – Hanford Public Participation Survey, Liz Mattson.
- Comments and Responses on Proposed TPA Changes to Central Plateau Cleanup
- Hanford Challenge – *Hanford's Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds* fact sheet, Liz Mattson
- TPA – Hanford Public Involvement Activity Feedback – Participation Survey, Emy Laija
- Survey results of the Radioactive Burial Grounds Public Meetings – Seattle Workshop Surveys, Emy Laija

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

|               |                   |                 |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Sam Dechter   | Susan Leckband    | Maynard Plahuta |
| Dale Engstrom | Doug Mercer       | Gerry Pollet    |
| Laura Hanses  | Liz Mattson       | Bob Suyama      |
| Steve Hudson  | Ken Niles (phone) | Jean Vanni      |
| Pam Larsen    |                   |                 |
|               |                   |                 |
|               |                   |                 |

**Others**

|                               |                            |   |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Paula Call, DOE-RL            | Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology   | Paul _____, CHPRC                                     |
| Michael Collins, DOE-RL       | Madeleine Brown, Ecology   | Sonya Johnson, CHPRC                                  |
| R. Douglas Hildebrand, DOE-RL | Elis Eberlein, Ecology     | Dale McKenney, CHPRC                                  |
|                               | Erika Holmes, Ecology      | Dee Millikin, CHPRC                                   |
| Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP        | Deborah Singleton, Ecology | Paul Seeley, CHPRC                                    |
|                               | Dennis Faulk, EPA          |   |
| Ben Ellison, DOE-RL/ORP       | Emy Laija, EPA             | Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues                            |
|                               |                            | Chelsey Funis, EnviroIssues                           |
|                               |                            |   |
|                               |                            | Sharon Braswell, MSA                                  |
|                               |                            | Barb Wise, MSA  |
|                               |                            |   |
|                               |                            | Shannon Smith, Heart of America Northwest             |
|                               |                            |   |
|                               |                            | Cassalyn David, UW School of Public Health (phone)    |
|                               |                            | Katie Hess, UW School of Public Health (phone)        |
|                               |                            | Jordana Pickman, UW School of Public Health (phone)   |
|                               |                            | Sara Jaye Sanford, UW School of Public Health (phone) |



*November PIC Committee Meeting - Transcribed Flip Chart Notes*

---

**DOE's Pilot Options**

1. "Anchor Functionality"
  - a. Any "tenant" can post a document and solicit comments and/or edit
2. What kind of functions would most help the HAB?
  - a. Advice drafting
  - b. Public document collaboration

Page 1

---

**PIC Feedback on Draft Open Government Plan Advice**

1. Reads like a white paper
2. HAB doesn't "advise" the public, media, etc. The advice has a wider audience than usual advice
3. Long, detailed advice points – needs to be more concise
4. "H Land" and "Q Map" → Collaboration Zone seems duplicative of these other tools (Resolve issues with "O.U.O." Has DOE already decided to do this?)
5. Like the direction the advice is going; it captures key points
  - a. Might be useful to have background attachment
  - b. "Should" is used a lot
  - c. A lot of advice points – do we need to narrow them now and follow up with others? Use specifics as examples.
6. Too much detail (e.g. citing Presidential directives)
7. Make time for committee to discuss FOIA issues before finalizing the advice
8. Stage advice → high level first, then specifics for local application as a next step
9. Ask for Hanford Plan and ask DOE to seek input → then give this information when asked
10. Reference Collaboration Zone in the advice as an Open Government Plan initiative
11. Add consistent funding for Open Government Plan implementation
12. Reference to Community Relations Plan – note future name change for this document
13. Concern with merging Community Relations Plan and Open Government elements – some are interchangeable, but some are governed by different policies

What is "High Value Data" and how do we get this from other committees?

- Link changes in TPA to specific units and related documents
- Indexing and links to regulatory documents

Any missing points?

- Easier to see once narrative material is separated out

Page 2

---

**Agency Update on State of the Site Meetings**

1. Committed to Tri-Cities, Seattle and Portland
  - a. Others considered – base on stakeholder interest
2. Dates and times are TBD
3. Spring timing – may be good to combine these meeting with meetings on the budget
4. Timing with other critical public involvement events

Page 3

**PIC Feedback on State of the Site Meetings**

1. Hold SOS meeting in Spokane, Eugene and Hood River
2. Provide additional assistance/funds to allow interest groups to build constituency in advance of SOS meetings
3. Option → identify other creative opportunities and forego some locations
4. Not all the same topics at all locations

Page 4

---

**Budget and State of Site Options**

1. HAB COTW/Budget meeting with evening SOS framed, in part, on budget
2. Concern that specific topic (budget) will trump general education opportunities
  - a. If focus is on budget, provide other general education opportunities (not necessarily hosted by TPA)
3. Have concurrent topic sessions (budget, WTP, etc.), then follow with general education sessions
4. Be creative – don't do the same things/same places every year

Page 5

---

**Key Discussion Points on Solid Waste Burial Grounds – Possible Advice Topics**  
**Investigation Work Plan**

1. Concept of transparency
  - a. Potential health effects of contaminants need to be disclosed and discussed
2. Monitoring
  - a. Water monitoring is insufficient (inadequate number wells/unit)
  - b. Need soil column/early release monitoring
3. Meetings about what the plan will be and how input is used (feedback loop)
4. Criteria students developed should apply to all burial grounds on the Central Plateau
  - a. “Recommendations” on page 9 of the *Hanford Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Ground Position Paper*, written by University of Washington students in the Master of Public Health Program
5. Need to start earlier than 2017 (E.g. characterize by excavation – especially trenches with no information available (30% of the trenches))
6. Shouldn't use an analogous characterization approach
7. What is a record? Don't just rely on process data. Need to use excavation to validate records/ are records actually accurate?
8. Need to speak to need to modify RCRA permit
  - a. To allow for trench characterization
  - b. Identify by “concept”
9. What is an acceptable level of hetero/homogeneity of final disposition of burial grounds (for remedial action phase)
10. Issue of past practices → what do we know about processing materials in ponds? Under trenches?
11. Dose limits should be applies to women and children – not just “reference man”
  - a. 15 mren is 3 times the CERCLA rick range → address this level
12. “Transparency Goals”
  - a. E.g. – contact/keep in contact with the interested public

- b. Other mechanisms to do this
- 13. Advice should be about Investigation Work Plan and RCRA permit as it pertains to the burial grounds (parallel with RCRA permit advice)

---

**Follow Up**

- 10. Follow up on DOE response to Advice #235
  - a. Susan L. to continue to informally network this topic with EM
  - b. PIC will take further follow up action as appropriate
- 11. Discussion on Collaboration Zone (Liz/Doug)
  - a. Determine what records suitable for Collaboration Zone posting
  - b. Determine how the PIC wants to move forward with the Collaboration Zone
  - c. Let HAB EIC know about interest in High Value Data (needs to be defined)
    - i. Not specific documents, just broad categories
  - d. DOE may post request to identify high data value set on Facebook, Twitter, etc.
  - e. Get comments on how people want to search for this information (dictionary, terminology)
- 12. Further discussion on relationship between CRP and Open Government Plan
- 13. Gerry to follow up with Ken on helping to revise draft advice, v.2
- 14. Reformat/clarify information from Ice Cream Social survey and provide to PIC (Liz/Erika)
- 15. How to better involve Spokane and other interested communities in Hanford public events
- 16. Synthesize SOS input from PIC meetings → determine areas of agreement on recommendations to agencies (advice?) – queue it up (Steve)
- 17. Workplan
  - a. How to better involve Spokane and other interested communities in Hanford public events
  - b. Discuss how to accomplish public involvement goals w/o all of the responsibility on the agencies/interest groups
  - c. Develop overall strategy of public involvement over the next 5 years
- 18. Coordinate with RAP with key discussion/advice points. Issue Managers draft first (Doug, Jean, Shelley, Dale)