

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
September 5, 2007  
Seattle, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions ..... 1  
Tri-Party Agency Update – Look Ahead, Look Back ..... 1  
Debrief of Regional Budget Meetings ..... 4  
Committee Discussion on Environmental Impact Statements (EIS’s) ..... 4  
Hanford Public Tours..... 6  
Action Items / Commitments ..... 7  
Handouts ..... 7  
Attendees..... 8

*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**

Helen Wheatley, Public Involvement Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Helen asked the committee if there were any changes issued to the June meeting summary, no changes were announced and the committee adopted the meeting summary.

Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Chair, announced that Jim Rispoli, Department of Energy Environmental Management (DOE-EM), has issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the consolidation of plutonium at Savannah River Site. Gerry Pollet said he has received calls from the press and referred them to HAB advice regarding the budget for security costs for plutonium.

Cathy McCague conducted the leadership selection process for the committee. Helen was nominated for Chair and Steve Hudson was nominated for Vice Chair. No other nominations were made and the committee unanimously voted in the two individuals.

**Tri-Party Agency Update – Look Ahead, Look Back**

Erik Olds, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said the Tank Closure and Waste Management (TC&WM) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is due out in May 2008 as a draft and a comment period will follow. Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, will be on the phone later to talk in more detail about this topic.

Karen Lutz, DOE – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) said issue managers have been invited to participate in the Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment Workshop that is coming up. The River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) and the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Management Plan are both on the Board meeting agenda and DOE-RL is still accepting comments. Karen reviewed the details of the Supplemental Assessment (SA) to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and said the SA does not require a formal comment period. The River and Plateau (RAP) committee will have the opportunity review the SA to the CLUP in October for informal comments.

Karen said DOE HQ has tasked the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) at the request of Jim Rispoli to address tribal investment, public participation and risk assessment processes about the health and safety of the Columbia River. She said they do not have a schedule yet but the scope will be out next week. Karen encouraged committee members to talk with CRESP directly about HAB's involvement.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the 100 Area Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) is out for public comment. Dennis said they have met all guidelines for cleanup in this area except for the tritium contamination. They are looking at whether it makes sense to leave the tritium in place, but are evaluating what criteria must be met to protect public health in order to follow through with this.

Nolan Curtis, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said the comment period on the 400 Area opened this month and includes long-term storage of mixed waste. He said they do not have hearings proposed at this time; but if there is interest, he will consider scheduling some. Also, Nolan said the Site-Wide Dangerous Waste permit is about to be reviewed and there will be a sixty day comment period sometime after December 2007. He said the document contains ten years of changes and he was not sure that anyone could read it in sixty days. Nolan said they are working on ways to help people locate relevant information so they can engage in a meaningful review. The statement of basis is the germane part of the document where people can go to find the area they have a specific interest/issue with.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Bob Parazin agreed to be the issue manager for the CLUP work and to coordinate with RAP.
- Greg deBruler agreed to be the issue manager for CRESP and call Chuck Powers and follow up with the PIC. Betty Tabbutt suggested that the 100 Area tritium contamination and ESD would be a good case study for CRESP because it directly concerns a public health risk.
- *What are some ways Ecology is working to make the Site-Wide Dangerous Waste permit accessible to the public?* Nolan said there are two approaches they have examined (1) to make sure the permit is written and organized in a way so the people who are subject to the permit can read it, (2) to work on developing the statement of

basis which is the summary that precedes each section. Nolan thought they would probably get enough comments on this to warrant additional outreach such as public workshops and hearings.

- Gerry suggested the committee should collaborate on the development of a schedule for the Site-Wide permit. His concern is if you cannot read it in sixty days then Ecology will not receive informed feedback.
- *What effect will public comments have on the permit condition?* Nolan said he cannot promise that if someone makes a comment the permit will change. Typically, a member of the public will comment that they felt a certain constituent was not addressed and Ecology replies describing how they felt it was addressed.
- *What is the timeframe for the document release and how could this committee be involved with the review?* Nolan said the final draft would likely go out for public comment sometime in January. Currently, there is a requirement for public involvement for this permit that may or may not be acceptable to this committee. As a part of the permit itself, it might be necessary to involve the public in specific aspects of the document. Nolan said he would like to work with this committee to identify areas that they can work on this process together.
- Betty said she thinks the committee should work on developing a primer for the statement of interest to show where there have been substantial changes to the original permit. Nolan offered to have someone who worked on each section of the permit meet with the committee to discuss the contents.
- *Will this permit require changes in the TPA?* Nolan said he did not know but given the current negotiations, one might affect the other. For example, the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) permit was set so it would be operating by a specific date. They ended up not using IDF so the permit has been changed to reflect that it is on hiatus.
- *Helen asked Dennis when the committee should pursue the Site-Wide permit issue if they are interested.* Dennis said the committee should have the permit writers explain the permit conditions and then the committee could then discuss how to identify a value and write conditions into the permit. Susan asked committee members to work with RAP on this topic and suggested this could be an issue for the Committee of the Whole as well. Gerry Pollet agreed to be the issue manager for this work. Dennis said there are two issues involved in the Site-Wide Dangerous Waste permit: public involvement and permit conditions. Dennis provided a hypothetical example of the bulk vitrification plant conducting public involvement to treat waste that is not currently listed in the permit conditions. Dennis said this could be written in as a part of the permit.
- *Why is the schedule for Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) EIS not included in this discussion?* Karen said they have it on their list but do not have a schedule for the GNEP activities because it is managed out of DOE HQ. Karen said she understands concerns were raised at the GNEP public meetings regarding public notification of the meeting (specifically was the meeting notification mailed to Hanford stakeholders). She suggested because GNEP is a DOE HQ policy issue and

not managed at the local level that the Board raise the topic to the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB) at a national level in an effort to address the issue nationally. There is no institutional process for sharing this information.

- Gerry felt that while it is nice to address it at a national level it is also necessary to figure out a strategy locally. Erik and Karen agreed that this needs to happen and said they have raised the issue with DOE HQ. Helen said her concern is that if she were a member of the public she would not know where to go to get an answer about the GNEP draft EIS schedule. Cathy suggested having Erik and Karen follow up with the committee on who to contact for more information.

### **Debrief of Regional Budget Meetings**

Karen said DOE developed a postcard to send out to all Budget meeting attendees to close the feedback loop. She said they are in the process of informing the public/budget meeting attendees that their comments are posted on the website (Hanford.gov) along with the final budget submittal.

Karen said they would like to work with PIC on how to further refine the Budget meeting activities this fall including refining the cleanup exercise. Erik said they have discussed creating a lessons learned document in order to move forward. Karen said comments on the proposed DOE FY09 budget should have been submitted by August 31, but she had not received anything else.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis suggested forming focus groups with representatives from PIC and Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) to develop the lessons learned document that Erik suggested. He said involving people who did and did not attend the meetings would be useful as well.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Norma Jean Germond asked if the Heart of America survey was submitted to DOE Headquarters (HQ) as well as the comments. Karen said she was not sure, but everything that was submitted is on the website. Karen said she would make sure the survey was sent to DOE-HQ if it had not been already.

### **Committee Discussion on Environmental Impact Statements (EIS's)**

Mary Beth said on September 17, 2007 DOE is having a workshop on EIS alternatives. She said a discussion of how the EIS relates to other projects will be addressed as well and will be an opportunity for participants to talk about Greater than Class C (GTCC)

EIS. Mary Beth said they are preparing the draft EIS for DOE-HQ in February afterwards it will go through a review process. She said they are working to have a draft out to the public in May 2008.

Susan debriefed the committee on the GTCC Scoping meetings and the pre-meeting with Christine Gelles, DOE-EM. Susan said that Christine was surprised about the depth and breadth of questions from the public. Susan felt she handled the aggressiveness of the people asking questions well. Christine said she heard a lot of people say they do not want to see GTCC waste coming to Hanford even though it is premature. Christine said out of all the places she had visited, there was only one site that was welcoming: Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Susan felt that Christine was incredibly knowledgeable and that they are well served by her. Shelley Cimon is at a national conference about waste distribution that is the first of its kind and will report back to the HAB on that next month.

### *Committee Discussion*

- *Gerry asked if HAB will be notified of the workshop.* Cathy said an email was sent out already and the workshop agenda is posted on the website (Hanford.gov). Gerry asked if Board members can get travel reimbursement. Erik confirmed that they could.
- Greg said at the GTCC meeting he heard that only 200 notices were sent out nation wide. Greg asked if they talked about distributing the notice to the list of people who previously commented on the Solid Waste EIS. Mary Beth said she was not sure the Solid Waste EIS list was used but other lists were provided. Mary Beth will find out how many names they provided. Gerry felt that the people who had previously commented on the Solid Waste EIS are expecting to see the revision and that DOE should automatically include those folks on the mailing list for this EIS.
- *What is the process for getting out preliminary information on this?* Mary Beth said the Notice of Availability will appear in the Federal Register in May. She said anyone that is already on their listserv will receive an email asking if they want the information about the EIS. She said that will be followed by a postcard to ask those on the mailing list if they want to receive the summary or the CD of the EIS. Mary Beth said they would like PIC to review the postcard again. She also offered to provide an overview for Board members in March or April to learn how to navigate through the document to specific areas of interest.
- *Helen asked if informational brochures would be available to explain the differences between the old and new EIS.* Mary Beth said there is a section in Chapter 1 that talks about what the concerns were during scoping and it will include the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) and the Waste Management Tank Closure. Mary Beth also said the CD will be searchable.
- *Gerry asked if Ecology will continue to be a cooperative agency if they are not happy with the new EIS.* Nolan explained the cooperative agreement is part of the legal settlement for the EIS. DOE drives the EIS work and Ecology can accept or reject the final EIS. He said this is the hold back of being the cooperative agency and not the

co-author. What the State of Washington wants is an adequate and useful EIS, without it they cannot make a lot of decisions that need to be made at Hanford.

- Norma Jean suggested that PIC begin discussions right away about what would be useful to help the public understand this document and what kinds of comments will be most useful. Susan suggested it might be beneficial to look at what historically has been done for an EIS and to evaluate what has been effective in terms of fact sheets and other outreach material.
- Bob Parazin said an EIS will be done on where to put GTCC waste. It is not a large amount of waste, but Bob felt that it should be put in a deep repository somewhere and not in near-term storage where it will have to be moved again some day.
- Gerry suggested that after the problems at the Troutdale hearing on GTCC there should be a protocol developed for how national conferences hold local hearings. Gerry felt the ad for the meeting was very poor. The presentations by the Energy Department went through the two repository options, and the other generic site options but it was not clear that the repository sites would require changes to the size and acceptance material. After the presentations, DOE took questions in the back of the room. This troubled participants who wanted to publicly ask their questions and have them on record.
- Helen asked where PIC should go from here on the GTCC topic. Gerry suggested developing a protocol for local notice for hearings. Erik agreed that the committee could develop a model to be applied across the complex. Helen suggested the committee agree to pursue this topic and work out the details at another meeting.

### **Hanford Public Tours**

Helen said since DOE has resumed tours of Hanford, PIC might want to start looking at the quality and quantity of the tours again.

Gerry suggested that it would be good for this committee to look at the script and agenda for the tours. Gerry said Natalie Troyer from Heart of America Northwest (HOANW) has requested the agenda and script but has not received a response from DOE. Gerry felt that PIC should look at this as a major public involvement effort by the Department and insure that the quality of information used on the tours is adequate.

Karen said she has been on vacation and has not had the time to respond to the request for the script and agenda. She indicated that DOE would provide the script and will also post the script to the Hanford website. She said the tours provide an opportunity to share information about Hanford historically but they do not view the tours as a public involvement opportunity. They have many ways to involve people in the cleanup through various public meetings and forums. Karen said the number of tours this year was increased due to demand, and eighteen additional tours were offered this year. Karen reviewed the statistics about what kinds of people participate in the Hanford tours and their overall ratings on the tours.

There was also a discussion on the PICs previous committee work on reviewing the Hanford public tour script in 2000/2001.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Gerry said after the Budget meetings there were people interested in taking a tour to better understand cleanup issues. Natalie asked for a tour focused on cleanup and the answer from DOE was no. The public tours do not serve the same purpose and this seems to be a significant unmet niche.
- Norma Jean suggested there should be additional tours offered so those types of people who really want to go on a tour are able to go.
- Betty said it is the quality of the tour that she is interested in pursuing. The message that is given to the public on the cleanup will determine what funding will be and could determine the cleanup level in years to come. The script should be evaluated to see if it encourages people to write their senators.
- Karen reminded the group that as a member of the Board they can request a tour. Gerry felt that it would go against HAB's mission to not allow the public along on a HAB tour if there is room. Erik said that security issues since 9/11 will continue to play a role about who is allowed on-site. Karen said they are currently working on a virtual tour for the website.

### **Action Items / Commitments**

- CLUP – Issue Manager Bob Parazin
- CRESP- Issue Manager Greg deBrueler
- State Wide Permit – Issue Managers Gerry Pollet & Steve Hudson
- GNEP EIS - Karen and Erik will provide information to PIC
- TW&WM EIS update
- Protocol for announcing national meetings at local settings
- Lessons Learned document for budgets workshops
- Site Tours – continue discussion

The committee will have a conference call on October 18<sup>th</sup> to plan for next PIC meeting. Helen asked for more committee members to join the calls.

Susan announced that she has not received any comments on the *Politics of Cleanup* and would like to provide examples of HAB products to take to the SSAB meeting.

### **Handouts**

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

- Heart of America Northwest's Hanford Clean-Up Budget Priority Survey / Questionnaire Findings, Spring 2007.
- Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities August 31, 2007

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg deBruler	Bob Parks	Helen Wheatley
Norma Jean Germond	Gerry Pollet	
Steve Hudson	Bob Suyama	
Rick Jansons	Betty Tabbutt	
Susan Leckband	Jim Trombold	
Bob Parazin	Charles Weems	

**Others**

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Karen Caddey, CH2M Hill
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Laura Mueller, CH2M Hill
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
		Gina Barteletti, HOANW
		Rebecca Holland, HAMTC
		Natalie Troyer, HOANW
		Kris Hudson, public
		Fred Tabbutt, public