

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
January 13, 2011
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
State of the Site Meetings 2
Open Government Plan Advice 6
Committee of the Whole – Tank Closure 8
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit Public Meetings..... 8
Committee Business..... 9
Attendees..... 11
Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 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, participated by phone. He welcomed the committee, introductions were made, and the committee adopted the December meeting summary.

Gerry Pollet noted that it is difficult to find presentations on the Department of Energy (DOE) website. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, noted that they are working with the DOE webmaster to better organize presentations online.

Steve asked the committee to read the December meeting summary and the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting summary from yesterday, when it is available, as there are public involvement components.

Susan Hayman introduced Nicole Addington with EnviroIssues, who will take notes and develop summaries for committee meetings.

State of the Site Meetings

Steve provided an overview of PIC and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) input on the 2011 State of the Site meetings and provided a summary of input along with recommendations for next steps. Steve said there is a long history of the Board providing advice on State of the Site meetings. He noted that the handout identifies “common threads” in eight separate sections:

1. Usable quotes
2. Key documents
3. Supporting sources
4. Persistent core principles
5. Persistent core expectations
6. State of the Site mechanics
7. Questions that should be answered
8. A recommendation

Steve described how the document begins with a series of quotes talking about public and town hall meetings. Steve said he pulled out those specific quotes because they represent the tone and sense of Hanford public involvement efforts. Steve also included information on specific public involvement meetings in chronological order with advice from each. He said there is enthusiasm for public involvement, but the meetings are perhaps not as successful as they could be.

From this information, Steve said he developed a core set of principles that he recommended should be followed when planning State of the Site meetings. He said the principles are not surprising and are consistent with what has been said previously.

Steve described the section about the mechanical process of public meetings. He said that it is important to have an organizational structure that works to make the process successful. Steve was surprised to see that in general, people wanted to have more State of the Site meetings or to at least have the meetings at more locations. Steve said that section 7 of the document lays out questions that should have been answered, but have not been. He said that sometimes there is no easy answer, but in order for planning to be successful PIC needs to find the answers.

Steve discussed the Town Hall format as a possible way to hold State of the Site meetings. He said the Town Hall format has not been consistently successful, but he did not think it was because the idea itself was wrong. He said meeting set-up has not been consistent over the years. Steve suggested having State of the Site meetings twice a year (April and October), holding meetings in three different locations during each time. He suggested tying State of the Site meetings to other Board activities to reduce resource use. Steve said rotating the six meetings between different cities would reach a broader set of people.

Steve described the Town Hall format as consisting of a meet and greet at the beginning followed by an informational session on a focused topic of interest to a given community, and then a general question and answer (Q&A) period. He said this format might take more time than the usual State of the Site meetings. He also suggested that many people wanted printed material in advance to learn about topics that would be discussed at the meeting. Steve suggested using

updates that PIC received from the agencies. He said these updates could be printed and provided to the general public when they arrive at the meeting.

Agency Perspectives

- Paula Call, Department of Energy-Richland Office (DOE-RL), said she likes the idea of rotating between cities and going to individual cities every two years in conjunction with other work. She said that with their limited resources, senior management would probably not be able to attend six different State of the Site meetings. Paula said that senior management is committed to providing information to the public and that they are concerned the public is not informed enough about Hanford. Paula said DOE-RL was working on providing web access to meetings this year and like the idea of including an opportunity for the public to send in questions.
- Pamela McCann, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said DOE-ORP would like to have a specific agenda that covers what the community would like to hear. She said agendas help them coordinate their time and decide what to focus on. She asked if PIC could contribute to an agenda and provide input for agency talking points. She also recommended asking the public: What would they rather have their dollar spent on: Is it cleanup, or is it more important to have more enhanced public involvement? She said it is important to get a pulse from the public on where they want Hanford money to be spent.
- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said that EPA will be piloting an approach to conduct outreach a few weeks prior to State of the Site meetings in 2011. Emy said the meetings should offer opportunities for discussion rather than provide an introductory lecture to Hanford. She suggested holding open houses where the public could talk with agency representatives. Emy said she agreed with Steve's suggestion to hold budget meetings with public meetings to save resources. Emy said she was concerned that EPA would not have the resources or time to hold two rounds of State of the Site meetings since EPA is also conducting other types of public involvement. She noted that EPA would probably not be able to support two rounds of three State of the Site meetings each, given their support for other public involvement activities. Emy said EPA expects to participate in State of the Site meetings in the Tri-Cities, Seattle, and Portland with Hood River and Spokane as potential options. Emy said the Tri-Party agencies would be attempting to visit each location prior to the meetings.
- Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), asked if the committee thought it was redefining State of the Site meetings by suggesting this new two-series-of-meetings format. He said State of the Site meetings have usually been more general and covered several different topics so he would like to know a little bit more about what the meetings were expected to look like. Dieter said it was interesting to combine multiple meetings and thought grouping topics and meeting times/locations would be an efficient use of resources. Gerry Pollet said that Steve was suggesting an open house format for the start of the meeting, then a one hour presentation on a specific topic followed by an hour and half for Q&A that would address issues beyond the specific topic.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry said he liked the recommendation of having two rounds of three meetings because it would be much easier on schedules. He said Walla Walla should be added to the list of cities to rotate through. Gerry said a mailing should go out to people that includes issues from the previous year's State of the Site meeting with an update on what managers have been doing along with a 1 page summary of upcoming issues that they are expecting to discuss. He said he didn't think just handing out materials at the meeting would be very effective. Steve agreed and said his suggestions were only an interim solution to get away from continually relying on agencies to read through materials at meetings. Steve said it would be much better if people have the materials in their hands before the meeting.
- Laura Hanses asked whether the rotations described in the document were what Steve wanted (e.g. rotating between Hood River and Portland). Steve said they were – those cities were close together and would broaden the base of communities effectively touched by Hanford. He said that when the agencies or the Board reached out to communities prior to meetings, those communities would have the opportunity to shape the meeting agenda. Steve said they could rotate meeting locations between cities or find something in between.
- Liz Mattson said that she thought rotating meetings was a good idea because it would help deal with the constraints for the public involvement schedule. Liz said PIC needed to find better ways to distribute information that would prepare the public for State of the Site meetings in advance. She said these meetings should not be the only time for someone to get information and ask questions each year. Liz said she likes the idea of a brainstorming session that considers the issues from the previous year and what issues will be emerging in the current year. Liz suggested that PIC also consider different learning styles and the amount of work members of the public would be willing to undertake before a meeting. She noted that Eugene, OR and Vancouver, WA should be on the list of locations to hold State of the Site meetings as well.
- Steve said that another benefit of having two sets of meetings is that emerging topics can be addressed in the second set of meetings instead of waiting a full year.
- Liz recommended building efforts to involve high school students and young people in the Hanford cleanup, such as encouraging them to attend meetings in the Tri-Cities. Liz agreed that there should be a space for workers to discuss their health and safety concerns, but it might work better if that were held separately from State of the Site meetings, as that topic can tend to take over the meeting. Susan Leckband said she is concerned about Hanford employee issues and workers should have a space to voice their concerns, but the State of the Site meetings should allow a more enhanced discussion with the general public about the actual cleanup. Susan said when she spoke with people after the meetings, she commonly heard that the most meaningful part was hearing about accountability from the agencies.
- Steve said he thought if they were going to have a specific topic at a meeting, it should be kept short and compact. The presenters should think about how the topic affects the community rather than just what the technical issues are.
- Susan Leckband said they were all aware the budget was going to decrease starting in 2012 and remain that way for sometime after. She suggested using technology to ameliorate potential budget constraints, such as using GoToMeeting and having interactive websites,

although these tools would not replace talking directly to agency representatives. Susan said that technology is being underused and it has lots of possibility.

- Ken Niles said it requires a substantial effort to bring a new community “up to speed” about Hanford. He said if the meetings are held in new cities, the Board needs to commit to extra time beforehand to interact with community leaders and understand what is important for that community. Ken suggested that whenever meetings are held in a new community, to systematically develop coordinated efforts to best use the resources of everyone in that community.
- Ken noted that if we ask the public whether they want money spent on public involvement versus cleanup, the public should then get an opportunity to weigh in on all the cleanup tradeoffs. Maybe they would prefer money not be spent, for example, on tearing down relatively uncontaminated buildings in the 300 Area. Yet that is a priority for some stakeholders (and contractors).
- Laura said having six State of the Site meetings was a good idea. If the agencies used the State of the Site meetings to also provide annual budget information, it would not be a substantially larger or more costly public involvement effort. She said that with the amount of cleanup decisions that the agencies want the public to be engaged with, it is important not to limit face time between the public and agency representatives.
- Jean Vanni asked if there would be an opportunity for people to submit questions before the meeting (e.g. provide contact information on meeting notices).
- Pamela asked where she could find summaries of past State of the Site meetings. The committee thought Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance, would know where to find them.
- Regarding schedule, Paula said there is a window of two to three weeks when DOE will have enough budget information to host meaningful State of the Site meetings. DOE is looking to have enough budget information to hold State of the Site meetings on March 17, 24 and 31. Ken Niles said March 31 would work for the Portland meeting. Paula noted the Portland dates coincide with the April Board meeting.
- Gerry was very concerned about the proposed dates for the State of the Site meetings. He said that they would occur too late for University of Washington students who are studying Hanford issues this term to meaningfully participate in the meetings (their term ends prior to March 17). He said that the agencies were overemphasizing the amount of specific budget information required to get good public feedback, and expressed frustration that dates he previously submitted were not selected.
- Doug Mercer (participating by phone) suggested that students could choose to participate in the meetings even if they didn’t have a class directly related to the subject. He said there was value in taking a longer view towards developing the student’s interest in sustained participation in Hanford.
- The agencies said they would take this input regarding the meeting schedule back to their managers and discuss dates again during the PIC Committee call next week.
- Liz advocated resource efficiency in conducting meeting outreach. She noted that Board members in the various cities can help with outreach in those cities prior to State of the Site

meetings. Emy said she would like to know what the different groups (e.g. HAB, Columbia RiverKeeper) are doing so efforts are not duplicative.

- Paula said there needed to be at least one budget workshop and possibly more because of potential budget issues. Liz suggested using a cake or another edible item as a metaphor for a budget. Gerry said at early budget meetings dot exercises were effectively used to help prioritize budget decisions for cleanup.
- Liz asked how much information agencies needed for planning meetings. Emy said the agencies would be meeting in February about the State of the Site meetings and will identify groups to approach prior to State of the Site meetings. She said EPA was open to suggestions from the Board about groups with which Board members have established relationships. Emy requested contacts by the end of January. Paula said she would also like the information as soon as possible. Dieter thought reaching out to different groups two to three weeks prior to the State of the Site meeting would be good timing to ensure the topic is fresh in the public's minds.
- Emy said that the agencies were getting together the afternoon of January 26 to discuss State of the Site outreach, and would welcome any PIC Committee members who wished to participate by phone or in person. Paula said that a stakeholder call was being scheduled towards the end of January (after the agency meeting January 26) to collect a broader range of input on the topics, format and outreach for the State of the Site meetings.
- Liz and Steve reiterated that the dates for State of the Site meetings would be a discussion topic on the upcoming PIC committee call.

Open Government Plan Advice

The committee reviewed draft advice on DOE's Open Government Plan. The committee would like to reach consensus on this advice and bring it to the full Board at the February Board meeting. Susan Hayman edited the draft advice on-screen, and it was also visible to those on the phone linked to GoToMeeting.

- Liz asked for more information about how this particular version of the advice was generated. Gerry said he and Ken incorporated edits from Doug Mercer and others. This draft advice was emailed to the committee for review the week of January 3.
- Gerry said he wanted to have some background information on the Open Government Directive (OGD) with a possible white paper that includes additional background. He took feedback about the advice and the current version of the advice reflects that feedback.
- Liz thought the committee had previously decided to table the Collaboration Zone advice point until they get more information about it. Gerry noted Doug Mercer also had questions about that advice bullet. The committee decided to remove it from the advice but follow up with the agencies to obtain more information about it.

- Gerry thought it was important for the agencies to understand that the Collaboration Zone should provide high-level data to the public, not just another way to find information already available online.
- Susan Leckband reminded the committee that it is important that the background does not include actual advice; all advice points should be in the advice section. She also noted that repeating statements in advice sometimes strengthens, but sometimes dilutes advice.
- Ken said the advice should be more specific about how the administrative record should be more accessible. The committee agreed and adjusted the language.
- Susan Leckband asked whether the Open Government Directive statements are paraphrased or quoted. Ken said they are paraphrased, but the language is very close to the directive.
- Pamela said she was concerned that the current draft read as though the agencies weren't doing any of the recommended advice points. She said the agencies already have many of the same goals that are identified in the advice and they are already carrying out many of the identified activities. She is concerned that the flavor of the draft advice doesn't capture the fact that they are working on reaching these goals, and this advice would be a way to improve on those goals. Liz showed Pamela where the advice references current efforts.
- Pamela said she knows this is a developing plan, but she said agency management would wonder whether the field office has the same values and may ask "aren't they working toward that?" Gerry said he doesn't think the advice reads like there's nothing being done to address the directive.
- Jean said the advice is directed toward the specific goal of asking for DOE Environmental Management (EM) to develop its own Open Government Plan. The advice is to focus on a plan specifically for Hanford.
- Pamela acknowledged that there is a sentence that states DOE would benefit from following the advice, but it doesn't say how or why DOE would benefit. Pamela recommended stating how DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) would benefit from DOE-EM developing its own Open Government Plan. The suggested changes to the wording were noted in the draft advice.
- Liz recommended giving credit to the work being doing at Hanford while identifying how other DOE-EM sites would benefit from an Open Government Plan.
- Pamela said there is a difference between open government and engaging the public. She said the committee should keep in mind that EM is receiving this advice without the benefit of hearing the committee's comprehensive discussions about this topic.
- Jean said that the OGD requires all federal agencies to adopt an Open Government Plan; the benefit to Hanford DOE would be that the agency is in compliance with the directive's requirements.
- Emy commented that EPA may not be able to support every point in the advice, but the advice is written clearly enough for EPA to respond directly.
- Laura Hanses commented that many committee members were not present at the meeting to see the advice; does that affect the consensus process? The committee reminded itself that the draft advice had been previously discussed in committee and revised versions circulated

through emails; it is each member's responsibility to engage during advice development. Consensus on draft advice is reached at the committee level by participating members at that meeting. Changes to the draft advice will not be discussed or accepted until the advice is presented at the Board meeting in February.

The committee reached consensus on the draft advice. It will be brought forward to the full Board in February. The committee discussed whether or not a presentation for the Board was necessary to provide in depth background about the advice. It decided a full presentation was not needed; the usual 5-10 minute issue manager introduction would suffice. Copies of the Open Government Directive will be provided as a handout at the back table during the February Board meeting.

Committee of the Whole – Tank Closure

The purpose of this agenda item was to debrief the recent Tank Closure Plan Committee of the Whole (COTW) workshop and issue manager meetings on strategic public engagement regarding tank closure, and discuss next steps for the committee. The committee decided to table this agenda item and discuss it on the committee conference call due to time constraints.

Liz briefly mentioned that a few Board members met with agency representative following the COTW to discuss a pilot project for stakeholder engagement related to the closure plan. More information (and work) will be forthcoming.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permit Public Meetings

The committee received an update from Ecology regarding public meetings for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Permit.

Madeline Brown, Ecology, said Ecology is considering the input the Board provided regarding RCRA Permit public involvement. Madeline would welcome further input. Ecology is still planning on four meetings, one in Richland, Seattle, Vancouver and Spokane. There will be a 120 day comment period.

Madeline said the latest information she had was that the permit is 90% complete so the comment period is expected to start before July and will probably begin in June. She said they have time to shape the message and priorities for public meetings to connect what the agency needs with what the public needs.

Committee Discussion

- Susan Leckband suggested switching the Vancouver meeting to a meeting in Oregon. Earl Fordham said that since it is a Washington State permit, it is important to have the meetings in Washington. Ken Niles agreed the meeting should be held in Vancouver.

- Gerry asked if Ecology would attend or participate in a meeting hosted by a different organization. He asked if Ecology could give the same presentation as they would at the public meeting, possibly somewhere like Hood River, OR. He said his organization could take comments from attendees and submit formal comments to the agencies in writing. Ecology indicated it would be willing to consider this.
- Jean asked if any portions of the permit were available for review now, such as Part 1 or Part 2. Madeline said they were nearly ready and would be available online before the public meeting.
- Laura asked when Ecology would like input from the committee regarding public meeting structure. Dieter said there is time for that discussion and Ecology would appreciate the committee's suggestions.
- Liz suggested that the RCRA Permit issue managers meet before the February board meeting. She said this would allow them to develop a focus for the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting the following week. She said they should also be thinking about meeting structure and asked when they want to start getting input on meeting structure and related information.
- Susan Hayman noted that the committee has discussed this issue several times. She suggested that the issue managers identify what has already been discussed, work from there, and then bring it forward to the committee.
- Dieter noted that the committee should distinguish between what the general public may prefer for involvement versus what the Board prefers. He reiterated that Ecology is interested in Board input. Dieter said he suspected they will have a two hour evening meeting, but said Ecology has not delved into the details of how those would look. Susan Leckband said she has gone to several meetings where they have talked about how to structure public meetings. She agreed that the issue managers should look at those topics and then bring them to the committee.
- Liz said since the public comment period will not occur until June, RAP could focus on understanding the permit and then PIC could help develop public involvement planning based on that information.

Committee Business

The committee confirmed the follow-up items from this meeting:

- Barb will look for the 2008 State of the Site summaries.
- Develop a "pilot" coordinated outreach strategy for Portland; discuss this at the January 26 agency State of the Site planning meeting.

A committee call will be held on January 20. Topics include:

- State of the Site meeting dates
- Debrief the COTW and strategic public engagement efforts

- TPA Quarterly meeting dates

A committee call will also be held in February. Topics include:

- Six month workplan
- Six month accomplishments review

The committee decided to not meet in February. February action items include:

- Participate in the issue manager meeting on February 9 to discuss strategic public engagement for the Tank Closure Plan.
- Participate in the issue manager meeting on February 9 to discuss the RCRA Site-Wide Permit, specifically Part 2 conditions.
- Participate in the issue manager meeting on February 15 to discuss the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA).

Gerry expressed concern about delaying the RCBRA human health assessment discussion and potential advice. The agencies are requesting informal feedback by February 17. Susan Leckband thought they could develop very simple advice requesting a formal comment period. Liz and Shelley Cimon noted that the human health assessment is only one part of RCBRA; the ecological assessment and others are yet to come and will help inform the final Record of Decision. Gerry agreed.

Susan Hayman encouraged the committee to look closely at its Six Month Workplan. She noted many issues are binned, but are not scheduled on the calendar.

Susan Hayman announced formal nominations for committee leadership will be accepted in February. New leadership will be selected in March.

Six Month Work-Plan

The committee updated the month of February in the Six Month Workplan. They agreed to hold a half day RCRA Site-wide Permit issue manager meeting on February 9, and tentatively agreed to hold half day issue manager meeting on strategic public engagement for the Tank Closure Plan that same day. During February committee week they will hold a three hour RCBRA issue manager meeting to discuss potential public involvement, in addition to the technical RCBRA issues. PIC will review committee accomplishments and more fully update the work plan during the February committee call.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Laura Hanses	Steve Hudson (phone)
Susan Leckband	Liz Mattson	Ken Niles (phone)
Gerry Pollet	Doug Mercer (phone)	Earl Fordham (phone)

Others

Paula Call, DOE-ORP	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Barry C.K. Moravek
Pamela McCann, DOE-RL	Madeline Brown, Ecology	Bill Dana, Dana Engineering
	Emy Laija, EPA	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, MSA
		Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation (phone)

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

State of the Site Comments

1. Cycle Walla Walla through the mtg location rotation
-Also Eugene
2. “Town Hall” can be successful depending on objectives
3. Would like to see mailing prior to SOS that provides Agency feedback on previous year’s input, and upcoming topics/issues that will be discussed at current meeting

Page 1

State of the Site MTGs (cont’d)

4. Work w/communities about what topics should be discussed at mtgs.
5. Makes sense to continue concept of spring SOS w/budget topic + fall with another pertinent topic
6. Prepping for mtgs – how to do this effectively
→ Preparing communities ahead of time → seeking input, too
7. Like identifying issues from previous year & think how to share this in advance

Page 2

State of the Site

8. Brainstorm ways to get info to/from communities
9. Strategy for mtgs in Tri-Cities
 - Worker concerns (own forum)
 - Offer topics (cleanup focused)
 - Young people/family outreach

Agencies

10. “Pilot” to meet in communities ahead of mtgs to give/receive info
11. Use open house for general learning to one-on-one w/agency folks
12. Budget combo this year
13. Don’t think 2 rotations can happen this year for SOS - \$\$/mgr time

Page 3

State of the Site

Agencies (cont'd)

14. Tri, Seattle, Portland, HR Spokane
15. Like the idea of using rotation to hit some of the locations every other year – for perhaps some other purposes/topics than SOS
16. Webcast opp for Nat'l audience → try this year
17. DOE has been “beefing up” Speakers Bureau to augment community outreach

Page 4

SOS (cont'd)

Agencies

18. Interested in hearing more about proposal to pair mtgs w/HAB events/activities
19. Ecology has made university outreach a priority
20. Would be helpful for PIC to provide specific input on agenda
21. Ask public about balance of spending \$\$ on public involv. vs cleanup

Page 5

SOS MTGs (cont'd)

22. Use technology to help mitigate budget issues
23. Topic – specific → maybe would help w/every mgr not needing to be at every mtg
24. Takes more work to introduce Hanford to a “new town” (e.g. Baker City, Walla Walla)
 - Systematically coord efforts among agencies, interest groups, etc.
(Oregon, Ecology, DOE, EPA, HoANW, HC, etc.)
25. Dangerous place to go... to ask tradeoff of public involv. vs cleanup (details)

Page 6

SOS Mtgs

27. Don't see 6 mtgs a stretch since combination budget w/other SOS topics
28. Is there a way for people to submit questions ahead of time?
- Email?
 - Other?
 - Mailing?

Dates

March 17 – Tri
P/S (week of 24) Concern w/universities schedule
S/P (week of 31)

Page 7

SOS Mtg

29. Use Portland as a “pilot” for “enveloping” coordinated community outreach efforts (Action item to develop strategy)
30. Use “edible” (cake, e.g.) for budget metaphor
31. “Dots” exercise for prioritizing cleanup/interactive for budget
32. Interest groups will want ability to weigh in that budget cuts are unacceptable → more funding needed

Page 8

Next Steps – SOS

1. TPA mtg at end of month (Jan 26 2-4pm) to identify outreach strategy
 - Input on groups to contact for community outreach
2. Prewrite end of Feb/first week in March – TPA
3. Provide to... Use PIC IM + community “reps” for each mtg community to discuss

Page 9

Open Gov't Presentation

Standard intro time (5-10)

- OGP for each agency
- No E.M. plan
- CRP → tie to an EM plan

Have copies of Open Gov directive – back table

Page 10

RCRA Next Steps

1. IM mtg day before Feb Board mtg (1/2 day) to discuss part 2 conditions
-Stratify focus sessions/frame up
2. IMs synthesize RCRA discussion to date re:public mtgs
PIC → RCRA public MTGs
RAP → RCRA COTW

Page 11

River Coordinator Baseline Risk Assessment

- Set up/History
- Scenarios
- Results

Page 12

Follow Up

1. Check on availability of 2008 SOS mtg summary (Barb)
2. Develop “pilot” coordinated outreach strategy for Portland – Jan 26
3. Talk about SOS dates – committee call

Page 13