

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**

*September 14, 2016
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1
Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Quarterly Planning Meeting 1
100 D/H Proposed Plan Draft Advice..... 4
HAB Report 5
State of the Site Meetings 6
Next Steps 8
Attachments 9
Attendees 10

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

Opening

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. The committee adopted the June 2016 PIC meeting summary.

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Quarterly Planning Meeting

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP), opened the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement Planning meeting. Dieter provided attendees with a copy of the [TPA Public Involvement Calendar](#) updated for September 2016¹. Using the information highlighted on the calendar as a guide, Dieter provided Board members with an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities, planned advisory board meetings, and informational resources.

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (September 2016)

Dieter provided additional detail on ongoing and anticipated public comment opportunities noted on the Public Involvement Calendar, including:

- An ongoing comment period regarding a proposed Class 3 permit modification to close tanks TK-P4 and TK-40 at the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Plant. The current 60-day comment period will end on September 16, 2016, and Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) will hold an additional 45-day comment period on the Closure Plan in the future.
- An ongoing, extended comment period regarding the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan. The extension to the original 30-day comment period will end on September 16, 2016).
- An upcoming introductory public meeting, hosted by ORP and Ecology, regarding ORP's Notice of Intent (NOI) to construct the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS) facility. The meeting is planned for November 14, 2016 at the Richland Public Library, and it will be the first in a series of at least three public involvement opportunities regarding the LAWPS facility.
- A potential State of the Site meeting in calendar year 2017.
- A planned public comment period on the 100 N Area Proposed Plan in calendar year 2017.

Randy Bradbury, Ecology, encouraged PIC members to contact him and other TPA agency Public Information Officers with thoughts as to how the TPA Public Involvement Calendar could be made more accessible on Ecology's website. He cited concerns with Ecology's website supporting .pdf files in the future, and was hopeful that committee members could potentially provide feedback on alternative strategies for formatting and accessing the Public Involvement Calendar in the future.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. The public meeting regarding ORP's NOI to construct the LAWPS facility is scheduled for November 14 — a time when HAB members will not be in the Tri-Cities area for Board or committee meetings. Why was the meeting not scheduled during a more accessible time? There is a lot of volunteer energy on the Board and a lot of interest in LAWPS, and it is important that TPA agencies schedule public meetings during times that Board members are in the area.

R. [ORP] The TPA agencies prefer to host public meetings at the Richland Public Library because there is no cost and the location is convenient. Evening availability of the facility is limited in November 2016. ORP and Ecology could work with HAB members to potentially look into alternative facilities for the meeting and/or ORP could provide a presentation to the HAB's Tank Waste Committee in November 2016.

Q. A public comment period for the proposed Closure Plan for the 324 Building recently ended. However, the 324 Building Closure Plan is currently not in alignment with new TPA milestones. How will the TPA agencies manage this discrepancy?

R. [EPA] The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will receive a briefing from DOE-RL soon regarding the schedule that was included within the proposed Closure Plan. At the moment, EPA has no intention of pushing back the TPA milestones.

Q. Is EPA the lead regulator on the 324 Building Closure Plan?

R. [EPA] No, EPA is not the lead regulator on the Closure Plan, which is regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). However, EPA is the lead regulator for cleanup regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Since CERCLA governs the areas around and underneath the 324 Building, those milestones are driving aspects of the 324 Closure Plan. TPA agencies will coordinate on the schedule and cleanup of the 324 Building to ensure that cleanup is effectively phased (e.g. the 324 Building will need to be left in place to act as a shield while soils underneath the building are remediated).

Q. What are the differences between CERCLA and RCRA permits, modifications, and public comment opportunities?

R. [EPA] EPA is the lead regulator on CERCLA activities. There is an EPA office in Seattle that oversees the state RCRA program, but the local EPA Hanford Project Office is not as directly involved.

R. [ORP] Ecology is the lead regulator on RCRA permits. Modifications to these state-managed permits are classified as Class 1, Class 2, or Class 3. Class 1 modifications are minor, administrative changes that do not require a public comment period. Class 2 and Class 3 modifications are more substantial changes, and Class 3 changes require a 60-day public comment period and a public meeting. Class 3 modifications also require that Ecology hold an additional, 45-day comment period.

C. The Board will see many upcoming permit modifications in the coming years. It would be beneficial to continue this discussion during future PIC and Board meetings to ensure that members have enough context to effectively provide feedback on complex permitting issues. Potentially, TPA agencies and the Board could work together to create a permit "cheat sheet."

Q. What is the current status of submitted comments on the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan?

R. [RL] RL received 84 comments so far, and the general consensus is that the public would like to see the Areas remediated to the highest possible degree.

C. The Board has been working on advice for the 100 D/H Proposed Plan for several months, and members are anticipated to adopt it at the September 2016 Board meeting. RL should consider the advice as the agency authors Proposed Plans for additional River Corridor areas, such as 100 N.

Attendees thanked TPA representatives for the information, and agency representatives closed the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Planning meeting.

100 D/H Proposed Plan Draft Advice

Liz Mattson provided committee members with an overview of the draft advice on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan² and highlighted the group's history with the advice. Particularly, Liz was hopeful that committee members could consider an advice point related to the public comment period that had been removed from the advice by the River and Plateau Committee (RAP). She was interested in learning if committee members felt that a public involvement advice point should be introduced at the September 2016 Board meeting for discussion and potential re-incorporation.

In addition, Liz noted that PIC members had worked with RL, EPA, and Ecology to create a 100 D/H question and answer document that applied specific focus to interim cleanup work conducted on waste sites within the Area. She stated that this question and answer document was used to create fact sheets for the 100 D/H public comment period.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The 100 D/H Proposed Plan advice, not incorporating the public involvement bullet, is a RAP product that moved out of the committee with member consensus. PIC members need to be mindful of this when proposing additional language to the advice—it needs to be introduced at the Board meeting during discussion of the advice.

C. [EPA] Once adopted, technical Board advice (such as that for the 100 D/H Proposed Plan) is forwarded to the relevant project technical team. This team then reviews advice through the lens of the preferred cleanup remedy—not the public involvement process. In many cases, the public involvement process has already been implemented once a comment period opens. Therefore, public involvement advice points may not be especially applicable in pieces of technical advice.

R. If public involvement advice points help to encourage technical project teams to consider the needs of the public for future projects, then they may still be useful. It may be useful just to get technical staff to consider approachable terminology.

Q. Should PIC members recommend reintroducing the public involvement advice point for discussion and potential inclusion within the advice at the upcoming Board meeting?

R. One of the reasons that RAP members removed the public involvement advice point from the advice is because they felt that the point's inclusion did not contribute to the clarity of the overall advice. Perhaps the public involvement advice could be reconceptualized as a letter and moved forward for review by Board members.

Attachment 2: Draft Advice (v.1 8/9/2016): Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units (Rev 0)

R. At past meetings, PIC members discussed the potential idea of authoring an overarching piece of public involvement advice that could better represent the Board's perspectives on best practices for engaging members of the public in Hanford cleanup decisions. This may be more useful for TPA agency staff and the project teams moving forward.

R. [EPA] There is adequate time for the PIC to author this overarching piece of public involvement. The next CERCLA process that could incorporate advice from the Board is the 100 N Proposed Plan, which is anticipated in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 or FY 2019.

C. There is a limited amount of time available to PIC members before the Board begins discussing the advice on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan. PIC members could retool the past advice point into something that is more succinct, and then incorporate a brief background segment on public involvement. This would allow all Board perspectives to be incorporated into the advice. If HAB members have strong objections to incorporating the advice point into the document, they may raise these concerns during Board discussion.

C. In the future, documents like the 100 D/H Proposed Plan question and answer document should be released to the public.

R. [EPA] TPA agencies will likely be unable to make that commitment, as any released information needs to pass through appropriate internal legal review. This would likely impact what the agencies can publish.

PIC members agreed on additional background language and an additional advice bullet to propose for Board discussion at the upcoming September Board meeting.

In addition, PIC members highlighted interest in continuing to explore the potential for authoring advice on general public involvement principles. Liz noted that upcoming committee calls would work to flesh out potential issue managers and next steps for this topic.

HAB Report

Cathy McCague, facilitator, requested the PIC members brainstorm potential topics³ and strategies for constructing future HAB reports. Cathy noted that the facilitation team has traditionally provided a report to the Board chair on an annual basis, but she recognized that in 2016 the facilitation team, in conjunction with the Executive Issues Committee, worked to retool the report into a shorter folio format to provide increased flexibility as to how frequently the report could be released. Cathy was hopeful that PIC members could begin brainstorming ideas that would target the frequency of future reports to the needs of the Board and the public.

PIC members provided the following preliminary ideas for upcoming report revisions:

Attachment 3: HAB: PIC September Meeting, List of Proposed HAB Report Topics (for committee discussion)

- Use numbers to tell the story of the Board's work (e.g. total volunteer hours contributed)
- Incorporate an enhanced contact list tying committee leadership and issue managers to topics of interest
- Spotlight core Board values (e.g. the safety of the Columbia River) and/or the Board Groundwater Cleanup Values flow chart
- Highlight recently adopted advice, white papers, and correspondence
- Track how Board advice influences cleanup decisions (e.g. the River Corridor)
- Quote agency leads and other cleanup decision-makers
- Highlight work that the Board accomplished in the recent past and preview work that the Board plans to do in the near future
- Focus content on the work of the Board as opposed to the contributions of individual members
- Produce four HAB reports per year beginning in calendar year 2017 (approximately one report per quarter, following each Board meeting)

State of the Site Meetings

Liz Mattson provided PIC members with a brief history of the State of the Site meetings. Liz noted that the meetings began in 2002 and continued annually until 2008, and that they often were regional, with sessions often being held in cities such as Hood River, Portland, Seattle, Tri-Cities, and Spokane. Liz said that the State of the Site meetings had been occurring less regularly since 2008, stating that the last State of the Site meetings occurred in spring 2014. She also recognized that regional public involvement groups worked with EPA and Ecology to hold regional public meetings on Hanford in Walla Walla, Spokane, and Vancouver in 2015.

Liz encouraged TPA agency representatives to provide additional context for the State of the Site meetings, as well as share plans for a potential meeting in early 2017.

Regulator Perspective

Emy Laija, EPA, clarified that the original intention of the State of the Site meetings were to host opportunities for regional public dialogue during times when other opportunities to inform the public on Hanford cleanup were not occurring. For this reason, Emy noted that State of the Site meetings do not necessarily occur on an annual basis.

Looking ahead, Emy noted that TPA agencies want to ensure that potential upcoming State of the Site meetings are productive opportunities to inform diverse regional interests. Emy said that the agencies were considering adopting an evening webinar strategy for a tentatively planned meeting in early 2017, which has received approval from TPA agency upper management. Emy highlighted the potential benefits

of adopting a webinar strategy, citing its potential to reach a wider, more diverse audience of regional citizens. She was hopeful that PIC members could provide TPA agency representatives with initial perspectives on best practices for scheduling and formatting this potential upcoming meeting.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Is the conceptualized upcoming State of the Site meeting going to be a single day, single webinar?

R. [EPA] If PIC members think that multiple webinars would be beneficial, then the TPA agencies can look into this potential. A single webinar would provide communities with the opportunity to share their perspectives and values with a wider, regional audience. This is an opportunity that is currently lost by holding regional meetings.

R. [ORP] In addition, if the format would prove to be effective, State of the Site webinars could be done with greater frequency.

Q. Why do TPA agencies feel that past in-person State of the Site meetings were not helpful?

R. [EPA] TPA agency representatives considered the cost versus the benefit of past meetings by looking at the number of people who attended the meetings and the quality of conversation that the meetings provide a venue for.

C. Number of attendees is not always the strongest metric to gauge the effectiveness of public outreach.

C. The webinar strategy sounds promising if it were only a part of a larger effort (e.g. incorporating it alongside town hall-style meetings). The public may perceive standalone webinars as a slight, as the format limits the public's ability to effectively participate in a dialogue. Webinars are less effective at facilitating a back-and-forth dialogue.

C. There is a benefit to getting people together in a shared space that is lost by using a webinar format. TPA agencies should consider this moving forward. Perhaps regional meetings could be broadcast to the wider community to allow for the enhanced sharing of local community values.

C. Hanford cleanup issues are very complex, and incorporating visual elements (e.g. live diagramming) into agency updates may help to facilitate a greater public understanding of technical cleanup issues.

Q. How do TPA liaisons anticipate a spring 2017 State of the Site meeting fitting into other, ongoing public involvement efforts?

R. [EPA] TPA agencies would prefer that the 2017 State of the Site meeting occur as a standalone. There is still ample time to plan other public involvement efforts around the State of the Site meeting. There are no anticipated CERCLA Proposed Plans due for release in early 2017 that could impact the meeting.

C. It is important to set the audience up with enough context before the meeting begins. This allows for efficient discussion of ideas and understanding during the limited meeting time.

C. The TPA agencies will have to consider how these webinars will be moderated, and how agency managers will accept questions. Some strategies are likely to be more effective than others.

R. [EPA] The webinar format would need strong planning and facilitation. Also, a State of the Site meeting webinar would not incorporate lengthy agency reports; the goal would be more engagement than that.

C. The PIC could begin to draft advice on the State of the Site meetings and bring it forward to the Board in December 2016. The advice should request that State of the Site meetings incorporate in-person time.

Liz thanked PIC members for their thoughts and discussions. She noted that she would explore potential advice on upcoming State of the Site practices with an issue manager group to be brought forward at the December 2016 Board meeting.

Next Steps

PIC members planned to hold a call in September 2016 to discuss potential upcoming advice on overall public involvement principles and upcoming State of the Site meetings as well as to plan for upcoming committee meetings. Issue managers for specific topics may request additional calls as needed.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016
(September 2016)

Attachment 2: Draft Advice (v.1 8/9/2016): Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2,
100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units (Rev 0)

Attachment 3: HAB: PIC September Meeting, List of Proposed HAB Report Topics (for committee
discussion)

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Don Bouchey	Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband
Jan Catrell	Gary Garnant	Phillip Lemley
Shelley Cimon	Rebecca Holland	Liz Mattson
Alissa Cordner	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles
Shannon Cram	Emmitt Jackson	Helen Wheatley

Others:

Dawn MacDonald, DOE-ORP	Emy Laija, EPA	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC
Richard Buel, DOE-RL	Randy Bradbury, Ecology	Patrick Mills, CTUIR
Kris Holmes, DOR-RL	Earl Fordham, WDOH	Patrick Conrad, MSA
Kyle Rankin, DOE-RL	Kate Lynch, WDOH	Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind/DOE-ORP
	Tom Rogers, WDOH	Shintaro Ito, PNNL
		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Brett Watson, EnviroIssues