

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 4, 2009  
Kennewick, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions..... 1  
Approve meeting summary ..... 1  
Updating, Revising and Editing the Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement  
Community Relations Plan..... 2  
Status of January Action Items..... 3  
Committee Business ..... 4  
Handouts..... 5  
Attendees ..... 5

*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, Chair, welcomed the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (the committee or PIC) to Kennewick. The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss draft advice on the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Community Relations Plan (CRP) that is expected to be brought forward at the April Board meeting. The meeting agenda also included:

- Identifying an issue manager to follow TPA changes and public involvement implications (Steve Hudson)
- Updating the TPA Agencies Communications Strategic Plan (Ken Niles, issue manager)
- Discussing the public involvement flowchart (Bob Parazin, issue manager)
- Discussing a catalogue of PIC materials (Helen Wheatley, issue manager)
- Discussing a synthesis of policy-level work/advice to date (Helen Wheatley, issue manager)
- Discussing RCRA site-wide permit public involvement (Norma Jean Germond and Gerry Pollet, issue managers)

**Approve meeting summary**

Steve commended the December workshop/meeting summary and asked the committee to read it and share it with other Board members. Steve said it captured the many ideas for public involvement that the committee developed at the December workshop. He asked committee members to review the potential actions captured in the summary and to think about which ones the committee should be a priority for the committee to pursue.

The summary was adopted.

## **Updating, Revising and Editing the Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Community Relations Plan**

Steve said he and Paige Knight worked on draft advice to the TPA agencies for updating the CRP. The advice is based on suggestions that came out of the December PIC workshop. Steve reminded the committee that Board process requires committee consensus before draft advice is considered by the full Board.

The draft advice asked the agencies to develop an editing calendar with sufficient time allotted for public and Board participation, and public and Board comments throughout the process. It advised having a 90-day comment period, and involving the Board in a substantive and meaningful way (e.g. addressing changes in audience, document purpose and content). It also advised that the Board be involved in a productive way from the very beginning of the editing process (e.g. format and organization)

### *Discussion*

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the agencies have committed to revising the CRP this year. While they have not agreed on a timeframe, Dennis said he intends to provide the committee with editorial-type comments in April, incorporate committee and Board comments, and put a revised CRP out for formal public comment in the fall. Dennis said he does not know if the CRP needs substantive changes and if formal public meetings will be needed (as they were when significant changes were made in the 1990s).

Dennis commented that he did not think there will be substantive changes warranting an extended comment period. He noted standard comment periods are 45-days.

Steve offered the committee's help and said he looked forward to early collaboration.

Ken said it seems like there is already good collaboration, and asked if the committee needs to issue advice. Dennis said advice is valuable to ensure follow-through on commitments. He said it may be more appropriate to issue advice in June if the agencies have not met their commitments.

Nolan asked what major issues PIC thinks should be resolved in the CRP. Steve said changes are needed to the CRP format, organization, and presentation, as well as revising outdated sections and ensuring all information is current and accurate. Steve also said the CRP should be tailored to match the needs of all audiences (e.g. the agencies and general public).

Nolan said he would like to know of any substantive changes the committee would like to see. Gerry noted that State of the Site meeting changes would qualify as substantive.

Ken said he would like to see public involvement objectives included in the CRP.

Gerry thought the site background section does not need to be as extensive. Dennis noted that he frequently uses the site history section, providing it to high school and college students as a concise background summary of Hanford cleanup. Ken agreed that it is helpful, but may take up too much of the document. Dennis said in the future, he would like to explore ways to provide simple information about Hanford.

Greg thought the agencies should make the CRP visionary and useful into the future. He commented that the CRP nicely states the problem and how the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), EPA and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) will engage the public in the process; it shows how the agencies “do business.”

Dennis will review the current CRP. Steve will compile PIC and Board member comments and provide them to Dennis and Paula Call, DOE – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL).

The advice was tabled and will be revisited in June if necessary.

### **Status of January Action Items**

The committee reviewed action items from December 2008.

#### *Identify an issue manager to follow TPA changes and public involvement implications*

Steve suggested discussing TPA changes at an informal lunch meeting on Friday, February 6 after the agencies roll-out the change package. He also suggested reviewing the draft fact sheet on Friday if it is available. Barb Wise, CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company, noted that the draft fact sheet is currently text-only.

Dennis asked the committee to look at the draft fact sheet when it is available and provide comments to him and Paula before the next committee call (February 19).

#### *Update the TPA Agencies Communications Strategic Plan (CSP) (Ken Niles, issue manager)*

Ken said the revision to the CSP provided by the agencies incorporates many of the additional public policy issues and ideas based on the discussions at the December workshop. He provided a few additional ideas to the TPA agencies and believed the committee’s work on the issue to be complete.

#### *Draft advice regarding the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) public comment period*

Ken said the advice is ready for the February Board meeting. The draft incorporates changes from Gerry and Paige. Ken said instead of a one-day workshop soon after the release of the draft TC&WM EIS, Jeff Luke suggested a two-day workshop (targeting people typically interested in and familiar with Hanford issues).

#### *Create/discuss the public involvement flowchart (Bob Parazin, issue manager)*

Bob said he will have more of an update on the public involvement flowchart in March.

#### *Create/discuss a catalogue of PIC materials and a synthesis of policy-level work/advice to date (Helen Wheatley, issue manager)*

Steve said Helen Wheatley is working on these issues.

#### *Discussing RCRA site-wide permit public involvement (Norma Jean Germond and Gerry Pollet, issue managers)*

Norma Jean said she was supposed to meet with Gerry and Madeleine Brown, Ecology, prior to the PIC meeting, but they were unable to connect. Gerry said they are working on understanding and planning public involvement activities for the site-wide permit, and how to get the HAB involved in the permit and its roll-out in a substantive manner.

Norma Jean noted that many of the site-wide permit activities should be similar to the activities described in the draft TC&WM EIS public involvement advice.

Gerry said the committee and public needs adequate information to understand the alternatives and proposals. He said the public needs to know background information and how the TC&WM EIS will or will not inform the site-wide permit.

Steve noted that in the past, Gerry had commented on the relationship between the TC&WM EIS and the site-wide permit, and the timing of their development and release. Gerry said there has to be enough information for the public to comment on the site-wide permit without having seen the analyses contained in the TC&WM EIS.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said DOE will have to submit a plan for any issues that are unresolved in the site-wide permit prior to action.

Gerry said he has not been allowed access to drafts of the permit. Nolan said Ecology is consulting with their attorney general about providing access to drafts. Bob asked why Gerry thought there is a hesitation to share drafts; Gerry said he suspects the public will not like what is being proposed in the draft permit.

Dennis noted that since 9/11, careful consideration is given to what can and cannot be released to the public, particularly with sensitive information (e.g. building coordinates). Dennis also noted that this rendition of the permit contains placeholders for certain issues and decisions that will be made after the TC&WM EIS is finalized, following a public dialogue. Gerry wants to know the level of public involvement that will be done for any placeholder, and how it was decided what will be a placeholder and what will not.

### **Committee Business**

PIC will informally meet on Friday, February 25 at 12:00 to discuss the TPA change package, public involvement, and the draft fact sheet (if available).

The committee will have a conference call on February 19 and again in March. They will look at a full-day meeting in April.

#### *Action items*

- TPA change package
  - PIC (and Board) members will provide comments on the TPA change package draft fact sheet to Steve for compilation by February 11
    - Steve will provide comments to Paula and Dennis by February 13
  - Identify an issue manager for the TPA change package
- CRP
  - PIC identify substantive changes they would like to see (topic at April meeting)
  - Check on status of CRP revision in June
- Review December PIC meeting summary and prioritize identified issues/activities

#### *Future work*

Steve thought Ken should share the public involvement survey presentation from the December workshop at the April Board meeting. He thought it would be a good educational piece for the Board. Ken thought that was a good idea.

Dennis thought the committee should allot more times for meetings to better address public involvement issues. He would like to see more coordination between PIC and TPA public involvement update meetings (e.g. joint meeting concept).

**Handouts**

- Draft advice “Updating, Revising and Editing the Hanford Site TPA Community Relations Plan”

---

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg deBruler	Steve Hudson	Bob Parazin
Norma Jean Germond	Laura Mueller	Gerry Pollet
	Ken Niles	Steve White

**Others**

Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, CHPRC
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Peter Bengtson, WCH
	Emy Laija, EPA	Michelle Gerber, Fluor