

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
September 3, 2008
Seattle, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions..... 1
State of the Site Meeting Discussion Follow-Up 1
HAB White Paper – Public Involvement Evaluation 5
TPA Communications Strategic Plan 6
TPA Public Involvement Community Relations Plan 7
Planning for the Strategic Planning Workshop 8
Committee Business 11
Handouts..... 11
Attendees 12

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 and introductions were made. The April meeting summary was adopted.

Steve noted that the meeting would focus on the Strategic Planning Workshop that will be held in November.

State of the Site Meeting Discussion Follow-Up

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies’ State of the Site meetings are scheduled for fall 2008 (see draft schedule below). All meetings will consist of an open house from 6:30 to 7:00 p.m. followed by a public meeting from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Date	City	Location
Thursday, October 2	Kennewick	Red Lion Hotel 1101 N. Columbia Center Blvd.
Tuesday, October 7	Seattle	N. Seattle Community College 9600 College Way N.
Tuesday, October 21	Hood River	Best Western Hood River Inn 1108 E. Marina Way
Wednesday, October 22	Portland	Lloyd Center Doubletree 1000 NE Multnomah Street

Erik Olds, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said interested organizations are invited to display information materials.

Steve said the TPA agencies shared a print advertisement at the TPA Quarterly meeting that was held prior to the PIC meeting. He asked the committee to consider how successful such an ad may be; he noted that it targets the general public who are not typically involved in Hanford issues. Steve thought the ad captured that intent.

Steve said in the past, PIC has not provided sustained feedback on State of the Site meetings to the full Board or the agencies. He proposed that some volunteers from PIC attend State of the Site meetings as “observers” to gather information, note frequently asked questions and responses, and evaluate the meeting space and logistics. Observers would record and send their observations to Steve, who volunteered to synthesize the feedback and provide a report to PIC and the HAB. He emphasized that someone from PIC would have to attend each meeting. Steve thought it should be a regular activity in which PIC engages; it is a PIC responsibility.

Agency perspective

Erik thought it was an intriguing concept. State of the Site meetings could be another mechanism for the Board to get information out to the public as well as provide a way for the organizations on the Board to provide information. He said he was unclear on the analysis, or “digestion” of the observations. He said the agencies do their own analysis.

Kim Ballinger, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), asked if such staffing and observations would result in a PIC product. Steve said no; Helen thought it would be more of a report-back to the Board, an informal analysis. She thought such observations would help shape issues for the Board that would then trickle down to the agencies.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the Board and PIC are the “conscience” of the public. He said certain policy issues are discussed more in depth at different State of the Site meetings (e.g. groundwater milestones) and PIC could work to establish a tracking mechanism for the issues.

Nolan Curtis, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), agreed that the agencies have their own TPA evaluation of the State of the Site meetings. Nolan shared the TPA online survey evaluation. He also noted the agencies may have different objectives amongst themselves for the State of the Site meetings; for example, Ecology may have goals that differ from DOE.

Susan Leckband noted that agencies look at public meetings from a different perspective from the public. She hoped PIC would gather information from the public perspective, which would be helpful to provide to the agencies in a somewhat informal way.

Discussion

Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford, said State of the Site meetings are a good opportunity for the Board to share information about itself with the public, and that the Board typically sets up its traveling display. However, Barb noted that the display board was not staffed at three of the four State of the Site meetings in 2007.

Helen Wheatley volunteered a PIC member from Heart of America Northwest to staff the meeting in Seattle. Gerry Pollet thought they and PIC members from Columbia River Keeper could staff the Hood River meeting.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, asked if Steve wanted observers to provide a standard set of information. Steve said not necessarily; he could synthesize general observations.

Helen thought the observer proposal fits with the notion that PIC is the Board's "feelers," finding out from the public what issues the Board should consider. Steve agreed and thought that by gathering information, PIC will be able to make appropriate adjustments to how it operates and what it focuses on.

Deb Fine Richards, DOE-ORP, said blogs are an excellent tool to generate excitement and interest in Hanford issues. Helen thought the organizations that sit on the Board would be better suited to use blogs since the HAB website is pretty formal.

Meeting format

Charlie Weems asked about the structure of State of the Site meetings. Nolan said the agencies received positive feedback on the 2007 format, so the format will stay the same in 2008. A facilitated public meeting will follow the open house with time for the agencies to speak and time for a robust question and answer period. Whether or not the agencies should ask the public to comment on a specific issue, Nolan said Ecology sees the meetings as one of the few where the public can come and ask questions or comment on any issue they want. The Tri-Cities meetings tend to be more worker-focused.

Bob Parks asked if the State of the Site meetings are videotaped; if not, should they be videotaped? He thought it would be helpful. Barb said the meeting in Richland is sometimes recorded.

Meeting issues, topics and goals

Betty Tabbutt asked if the agencies wanted the State of the Site meetings to focus on one specific issue.

Norma Jean Germond thought the agencies shared a good amount of information and allowed enough time for questions and answers in Portland in 2007. She thought it was a good and balanced format that allowed for people to raise their concerns; she did not remember how well they were addressed.

Gerry Pollet asked what goals the agencies have for the 2008 State of the Site meetings. Last year, PIC heard that the agencies wanted to get public input on TPA negotiations. Gerry said a major piece of feedback was that the agencies did not give meaningful information about the negotiations. Gerry said it was his presentation that provided information about tank waste delays. He asked the agencies how that issue would be addressed this year. He thinks the public expects to hear something about TPA negotiations.

Gerry said Heart of America Northwest did its own evaluation. He said the evaluation showed that people did not get information on the status of TPA negotiations, which was the core issue of the meeting. He said people felt there was not enough information for them to make informed comments and there was a wide range of views about the responsiveness of the facilitator. Gerry said the agencies should evaluate if the public's needs were met in relation to the goal of the meeting. State of the Site meeting goals must be identified in order to evaluate if goals were met.

Nolan agreed that was a critical issue. He said he did not know if there was consensus among the agencies about whether that was *the* issue or not. He said Ecology had a display about the TPA negotiations, and noted that the agencies heard they did not want "talking heads" taking up too

much of the meeting time. He believed there was a wide range of views about how open the negotiation discussion should be.

Greg DeBruler said the agencies always say they want to hear from the public about their issues. He said last year, no agency was willing to speak about the risk, cost or rationale for cleanup delays. Greg said it is good the agencies try to work together collaboratively, but he said he does not want the State of Washington or EPA to think like DOE. He said delays will sacrifice the use of the Columbia River and drive cleanup costs up. He would like the agencies to think independently and ask the public to comment on the serious issues they are facing. Greg said he believed that only by speaking outside the comfortable zone of collaboration would the agencies get clear public involvement and dialogue.

Steve suggested there might be a need for other types of meetings based on the interest heard at State of the Site meetings. Charlie disagreed and said most people have a sense of the problems at Hanford and need a structured meeting to provide informative comment. Charlie thought people need to hear the problem background, progress, current schedule, and future plans.

Dennis said EPA's goal is to ultimately hear the concerns of the public. He thought the frustration with TPA negotiations is legitimate, but noted that it is difficult to present information on the negotiations given the sensitive and confidential nature. He asked the committee for suggestions on how to have a productive discussion given the situation.

Greg thought the agencies could talk about differences using the draft change package. He thought that would satisfy the concern from 2007. In addition to the negotiations, Greg said the public wants to hear about the actual state of things at Hanford – what is going on, where the problems are and what the public needs to know about.

Betty asked if the agencies were comfortable with each agency identifying the issue they want public input on rather than agreeing to one overarching issue. She said they may reach a roadblock if the major issue is the negotiations.

Susan Leckband said the Board has always struggled with how to get people to attend meetings. She suggested the agencies should identify what they heard from the public in 2007 and what they (agencies) have done about it – respond to the people who took the time to provide comments.

Helen said they should be clear about what meetings are purely informational and what meetings are specific requests for public input. In the legal sense, Helen said State of the Site meetings are not public input meetings. She thought the agencies should emphasize dialogue.

Gerry said the State of the Site meeting should present proposed TPA changes and the rationale, and that the agencies should share how they used and responded to public input provided at the 2007 State of the Site meetings. He also thought the facilitator should allow additional issues to be raised. Gerry said such information should be included in the ad or public notice. He also thought PIC should share its suggestions at the Board meeting.

Helen said she would like assurance that the facilitator will read PIC meeting summaries and be aware of PIC input on State of the Site meetings. Nolan agreed make the facilitator aware of this request.

The committee agreed to ensure PIC members serve as observers at each State of the Site meeting. Observers will record things like topics discussed, frequently asked questions, and potential public policy issues. Observers will submit their observations to Steve for synthesis. Susan Hayman noted that it sounds like staffing the HAB display will be a separate responsibility.

The committee will share its discussion and recommendations with the Board.

HAB White Paper – Public Involvement Evaluation

The committee reviewed key findings and recommendations contained in the Public Involvement Evaluation white paper (2002) as foundational information for the upcoming PIC Strategic Planning Workshop.

Betty said every PIC meeting is an evaluation of public involvement. If the public provides advice or input, there should be a mechanism to go back to the public and show how their comments were used so they know being involved with Hanford issues is a worthwhile use of their time. Betty said it should not be about “checking public involvement boxes.”

Betty said the white paper was created by PIC as an evaluation tool. It identifies ten markers for evaluating public involvement and public involvement goals. The white paper was accepted at the February 2002 Board meeting and sent to the agencies to use as a guideline for future public involvement work. Betty said the Board discussion was very good, but nobody tracked the use of the white paper or followed up with the agencies. She said there was a suggestion to formalize the white paper as advice.

Steve noted that the purpose of reviewing the white paper was to provide the foundation for how to plan and conduct the November Strategic Planning Workshop.

Agency perspective

Dennis said agency representatives come and go but the public remains; there has to be continuity over time. He said public values have not changed and agencies need to continually check that they are on course to maintain validity. He believes self-evaluation is constant and agencies make course corrections as they move forward. Dennis thought the white paper is still valid; he asked how to put esoteric concepts into practice. He thought the Strategic Planning Workshop should use the key principles and thoughts outlined in the white paper as the committee and agencies put together substantive outreach efforts for 2009.

Erik said he would like to see philosophical ideas and discussions grounded and implemented.

Nolan said each of the agencies has a unique take, focus and ability to conduct sound public involvement. He said Ecology always considers public input but is not always able to agree or implement ideas. Nolan said Ecology could be better about getting back to the public and explaining why or why not his or her suggestions were implemented.

Discussion

Betty said she felt strongly that most issues could be boiled down to values statements and technical language could be translated for the public to understand and react.

Helen said all the issues about PIC in the white paper still apply; at the Strategic Planning Workshop, PIC needs to more clearly define its role and how it operates. Helen said the Board and PIC should serve the public.

Dennis observed that the Board has never been good at talking about public involvement; he said it seems like an uncomfortable topic and is a dynamic of the Board's structure. He said public involvement tends to get kicked back to PIC.

Steve commented that PIC should find a way to set and follow through on priorities; he thought there are so many things PIC needs to do that it does not do anything.

Dennis said PIC meetings are not set up to be successful because there is not enough time. He thought a full day workshop would allow the committee to accomplish more.

Norma Jean noted that PIC used to have tutorials on the Thursday night of a Board meeting where the public, agencies and Board members could come together and hash out issues. Norma Jean thought the "Thursday Night Tutorials" were very valuable.

Betty wondered if there was some division within the Board about public involvement because each seat sees the Board's role differently: some think the Board *is* a public involvement activity and some see its role as advising the agencies about how they involve the public.

Susan Leckband thought the Board is at an advantage by being composed of interests rather than individuals. However, she said, that means there are different expectations for public involvement and the Board tends to leave it to seats to reach out to their groups and the greater public, and then bring public comments and issues to the Board. Susan thought the Thursday Night Tutorials may be good educational sessions.

Bob Parks said everyone wants Hanford cleaned up safely and on schedule. He thought it was important to avoid getting wrapped up in minute issues and lose track of the bigger picture. Bob asked how the agencies could show how they hear and respond to public comments.

Gerry suggested bringing forward the white paper as advice so PIC and the Board does not lose track of it. Susan Leckband said PIC could develop a letter for the November Board meeting that could serve as advice and use the white paper as an attachment. Dennis suggested tying it to something substantive with which the agencies are grappling; he said it would be better received.

The committee briefly discussed agency advice response tracking. Susan Leckband said it is the responsibility of issue managers to track agency responses; she committed to making sure PIC follows up on agency responses.

TPA Communications Strategic Plan

Dennis discussed the TPA Fiscal Year (FY) 2007/2008 Communications/Public Involvement Strategic Plan. He said some activities will be pushed to FY 2009. The Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) will require a big public involvement effort over the next year. Dennis discussed a few of the activities on the strategic plan:

- Central Plateau Waste Site Cleanup 200 PW-1,3,6 Proposed Plan: Dennis said portions of the Central Plateau waste sites are cleaned up and the agencies hosted a public workshop.

DOE and contractors are revising the Feasibility Study based on public comment; it is due for release in the February timeframe.

- Groundwater 200 ZP-1 Proposed Plan: Dennis said, overall, comments were supportive of taking the action. Dennis said no one pushed back on the two public policy questions (should natural attenuation be used in the decision process, and what is an acceptable timeframe for groundwater cleanup). The agencies are moving forward with the Record of Decision (ROD) for the proposed 150 years of natural attenuation. The proposal is to remove 95% of the contamination and allow a small portion to attenuate naturally. Dennis noted that usually the timeframe is shorter, but 150 years was selected due the plume size and complexity.
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Site-Wide Permit: Dennis said the agencies need time to discuss public policy questions related to the permit and how it affects site cleanup. The draft permit is not finished.

Dennis said he wants to discuss specific public involvement goals at the Strategic Planning Workshop in November.

Dennis said the strategic plan is a living document and will be updated.

Discussion

Betty asked why the issues are called “public policy issues” instead of just issues. Dennis thought that was a good point, but “public policy” attracts more attention. Betty thought that could apply to a technical issue as well.

Susan Hayman asked procedurally, is there a threshold when an issue becomes a public policy issue. Betty said not really, but some Board seats think the Board gets too technical; opinions differ on issues in which the HAB should be involved. Dennis said no; the agencies put forth their biggest projects and issues to the Board and the public for input.

Helen asked when the draft site-wide permit will be issued for comment. Nolan said Ecology has targets for internal processes and is still pushing for a draft in October but January is more likely. Nolan said he would like to know PIC’s needs for public policy issues for the site-wide permit. Helen said PIC should address it at the November workshop.

Greg asked when the draft TC&WM EIS would be ready; Erik expects the draft will be ready in 2009 and noted that Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, will update the Board on Friday during the Board meeting.

Sharon Braswell, Ecology, said Ecology wants to work with PIC about how best to roll out the site-wide permit and explain it to the public. She wants to avoid releasing it at the same time as the TC&WM EIS. Greg anticipated that the presidential election would cause delays.

TPA Public Involvement Community Relations Plan

Dennis said the TPA agencies are supposed to review the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP) every few years. He brought copies of past revisions. He said the first two plans were “cookie-cutter” and major changes in public involvement happened between 1993 and 1997: the Board was formed in 1993; quarterly public meetings were utilized and discarded when they lost their usefulness; and the consideration of alternative viewpoints and/or local voices was added. Dennis

said the plan did not substantively change from 1997 to the current revision (2002). He said the Board's charter is attached to the current revision and needs to be updated, as well as some practices that are not used. Dennis said the agencies are committed to revising the CRP this year.

Dennis said he receives many requests for information on Hanford, especially from students. He said it is hard to find current and succinct information, and he frequently uses information from the CRP. He would like to update Hanford background information more frequently.

Discussion

Steve asked how PIC could help. Dennis said it would be helpful for issue managers to read the CRP and bring comments to the November workshop.

Barb asked what the impetus was for revising the CRP; Dennis said they review it every two years. Helen asked if any past revisions were related to the white paper. Dennis said no, the white paper came after the last revision. He said it can take three to nine months to publish the CRP.

Helen, Steve and Susan Leckband volunteered to be issue managers for the revision of the CRP.

Planning for the Strategic Planning Workshop

Steve said the committee has to determine its priorities for the Strategic Planning Workshop, what it wants to accomplish, what information it needs to make decisions, and what resources should be there. He said there has to be an effort to establish agreement among the participants. Steve said Ken Niles previously offered to conduct a pre-meeting survey on public involvement and use it as a basis for initial discussion.

Discussion

Barb asked if the committee set goals for the workshop. Steve said PIC wants to have projects to energize PIC and help meet its responsibilities to the Board and agencies. He said PIC needs to identify how to meet its responsibilities to the Board. Susan Leckband said PIC would do that by bringing projects up to the full Board.

Dennis said PIC activities should help the agencies with their tasked public involvement and cleanup activities.

Helen thought the committee should discuss budget meetings, State of the Site meetings and the RCRA site-wide permit at the Strategic Planning Workshop.

Susan Leckband said she would like to identify the need for Thursday Night Tutorials. They or other such tutorials could be the forum to discuss the site-wide permit, for example, or provide a "Hanford 101." Gerry thought tutorials are a tool for issues like the TC&WM EIS and site-wide permit. Tutorials are a tool or mechanism; the committee should discuss their structure and evaluation. Norma Jean thought the tutorials should deal with specific issues like tank waste instead of general topics (e.g. "Hanford 101"). Sharon thought the tutorials would include an overview and discussion. Norma Jean thought they do not always need a conclusion; tutorials can simply engage, educate and energize.

Susan Hayman said from a strategic planning standpoint, the committee should first think about how PIC is relevant to the public, how it connects with Board, what it needs to effectively operate, and other such considerations. She suggested that there is a “*how will we be*” and a “*what will we do,*” as a way to implement the strategic plan. She thought action lists were easy to generate, but the committee has to frame them if it wants to be strategic. She asked the committee if the workshop should be half strategic and half “nuts and bolts.”

Helen thought the CRP issue managers could present on the CRP, which may help frame the strategic portion of the workshop. Betty thought the committee should bring proposed changes to the CRP to the workshop. It could act as a backdrop to the strategic planning portion.

Gerry thought PIC should focus its role and how goals are set for public involvement.

Helen thought a good starting point would be to identify what the Board is working on in FY 2009 and how PIC makes public involvement meaningful. Then, she said, they could discuss how PIC goals align with Board public involvement goals and how PIC contributes to HAB work plan accomplishment.

Susan Hayman asked if the agencies need to agree to the workshop objectives.

Dennis thought it was appropriate to talk about PIC’s role and expectations, but he also wants to ensure PIC input on specific activities on which the agencies need PIC’s help. He hoped the committee will be able to select a couple topics and spend time laying out what the agencies should do in 2009. Dennis said he typically gets frustrated when there is a smorgasbord of things to do but none are really done well.

Helen asked what Dennis would like PIC to spend time on; Dennis said the TC&WM EIS is the biggest public involvement issue. He did not know if it would be timely in November. He would also like the committee to discuss tutorials and budget. He thought they could spend time on strategic planning, but he was not particularly interested in it.

Steve suggested spending the first half of the day on strategic planning and the second half on specific activities.

Ken Gaspar thought the committee should remember that it is not carrying out DOE’s public involvement responsibility; the committee’s work should be complimentary and supplementary.

RCRA site-wide permit

Dennis thought the RCRA Site-Wide Permit rollout is important, but thought the committee should discuss other activities first. Nolan said Ecology needs to identify what the permit is, what it does, what it does not do, and how to roll it out for the public. Nolan said Ecology is prepared to produce a summary or accompanying document to help describe the permit. Norma Jean asked if there would be an executive summary; Nolan said Ecology is looking at all the component parts. Public input will be important for the permit.

Gerry said there are major policy issues the permit will address, such as the closure of tanks containing waste or can a landfill be operated without a permit. Nolan said Ecology wants people to understand what is and is not in the permit.

Dennis said it is important to work with a technical committee on the site-wide permit. Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL, suggested looking at the technical committees' work plans and see how PIC fits in.

Issue managers and working with other committees

Betty said PIC has to put a stronger emphasis on issue manager work. Issue managers need to gather information and work with the technical committees to identify big issues for public involvement before coming back to PIC with background information and recommendations from the technical committees. Betty said PIC has to make its work more efficient.

Susan Hayman observed that it might make sense to assign issue managers now and do some work before the workshop. She also thought the committee should look at its work plan and discuss it during the strategic planning portion of the workshop.

Dennis thought adding concrete issues to the committee work plan could help get issue manager work going between now and November.

Betty said PIC has to work with and incorporate issues other committees think are important. For the budget meetings, PIC should work with the Budgets and Contracts Committee and see how it feels about public involvement, and come back to PIC with specific recommendations. Helen thought PIC should have that commitment and action prior to the workshop.

Dirk Dunning asked how big the site-wide permit would be compared to the first one. Nolan said it would be about 3,000 pages and that it is critical for Ecology to be able to describe the sections. Dirk said the first permit was about 15,000 pages and 25 hours of reading. He encouraged issue managers to think about what they are getting into.

The committee agreed to the following draft objectives and framework for the November workshop:

Objectives

1. Identify projects/activities that energize PIC and meet agency needs
2. Identify how PIC meets its responsibilities
3. Identify how agency goals are set for public involvement and how PIC fits in that framework
4. Identify how PIC contributes to HAB work plan accomplishment

Framework

1. Part I: Strategic planning
 - a. Discuss how PIC functions and relationship with HAB, public and TPA agencies
 - i. HAB public involvement and agency public involvement
 - ii. Three foundational documents help guide PIC strategic planning: TPA Community Relations Plan; HAB White Paper, Public Involvement Evaluation (version 7, revised June 23, 2002); TPA Communication Strategic Plan
 - b. Work plan development and integration with HAB and other committee work plans
2. Part II: Specific PIC contributions to HAB and TPA agencies public involvement
 - c. Budget meeting approach
 - d. Tank Waste and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement
 - e. "Thursday Night Tutorials" and other tools

- i. Structure
 - ii. Evaluation
 - iii. Specific topics
 - iv. "Hanford 101"
- f. RCRA site-wide permit public rollout

Other potential topics/activities for November public involvement workshop or at a future PIC meeting include State of the Site meeting recommendations. Gerry thought State of the Site meeting recommendations should be discussed at a regular PIC meeting, not at the workshop.

Outstanding questions include workshop attendance: should it be open to PIC, other committees and the agencies? Who from the agencies should attend?

The committee agreed that the workshop framework looks promising and will assign issue managers. It will have a conference call in September and identify issues the committee will focus on in November.

Steve thought the committee should get in touch with PIC members who are absent.

Committee Business

Committee work prior to November workshop

1. Read and propose updates to the CRP
2. Review and propose ways to implement PIC work plan and integrate with other committee work plans

The committee will have a conference call on September 18 to continue working on plans for the November Strategic Planning Workshop and hear issue manager reports.

Nolan distributed an Ecology Public Involvement Strategy Map (updated August 2008); he said it is a living document.

Helen noted that she does not like electronic HAB packets. Susan Hayman suggested discussing that at the Board meeting.

Handouts

- TPA Community Relations Plan (last updated January 2002)
- HAB White Paper, Public Involvement Evaluation (version 7, revised June 23, 2002)
- TPA FY 2007/2008 Communications/Public Involvement Strategic Plan
- Ecology Public Involvement Strategy Map (updated August 2008)
- "Hanford in context: public principles guide new mission" (Ecology; no date provided)
- Excerpt from February 2002 Board meeting summary (page 17)
- Excerpt from December 2001 Board meeting summary (pages 21 – 24)
- Draft TPA State of the Site meeting print advertisement
- Draft 2008 TPA State of the Site Meeting Evaluation

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Karen Bowman	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Greg deBruler	Susan Leckband	Bob Suyama
Dirk Dunning	Laura Mueller	Betty Tabbutt
Ken Gaspar	Bob Parks	Charlie Weems
		Helen Wheatley

Others

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Deb Fine Richards, DOE-ORP	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, FH
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP		Peter Bengtson, WCH
		Aubrey Bauman, Heart of America Northwest
		Sasha Cornellier, Heart of America Northwest
		Jenna Marx, Heart of America Northwest