

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
April 11, 2012
Kennewick, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Hanford Site-wide Permit 2
State of the Site – Potential Advice 4
River Corridor Public Involvement Plans (Joint topic with RAP) 5
Committee Business..... 6
Attachments 7
Attendees..... 8
Attachment 5 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes 9

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, Hanford Watch and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. Steve reviewed the agenda.

The committee adopted the February meeting summary.

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said that he, along with Ecology’s John Price, recently teamed with Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), to provide a joint presentation on the Hanford Site for public policy students at Oregon State University. Even though Corvallis isn’t a typical outreach community for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies, the 65 people in attendance were very interested in the environmental issues posed by Hanford. Ken Niles noted that Becky Rubenstrunk, Board member candidate, was responsible for a lot of leg work in Corvallis that resulted in high participation. The success of the presentation demonstrates the importance of community members in stimulating large turnouts and interest.

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), announced that the March 15 budget workshop went very well, and the notes will be finalized next week. DOE-RL released an early notification for the upcoming public comment period on modifications to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) Site-wide Permit. Details pertaining to the modifications schedule and comment period are provided in Attachment 2.

Hanford Site-wide Permit

Issue manager framing

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, provided an update on the Site-wide Permit, noting that the public comment period will begin on May 1, and a Board/public workshop will be held on May 3. Ecology has offered the meeting as a public workshop in order to save Committee-of-the-Whole funding for HAB. The River and Plateau Committee (RAP) has been helping to frame how the HAB will interact with the workshop and which topics will be of interest to the Board. RAP will be reviewing the draft workshop agenda during their meeting next week. Liz noted that previous versions of the agenda were too overwhelming, topic wise, and RAP will be advising Ecology on how to best use participants' time. A joint effort between RAP, PIC, and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) will be undertaken to draft advice on the Site-wide Permit between May and September, with the goal to bring it to the September Board meeting.

Madeleine Brown, Ecology, said the May 3 workshop will be held at the Ecology offices, and refreshments will be provided. There is a new Ecology webpage for the Site-wide Permit that already features multiple chapters from the document. Steve noted that he has heard the website is very easily navigable and is interesting to the public. Madeleine said information on the Site-wide Permit public meetings has been issued to those on the "highly-interested" postal list; copies of the notice will be provided at the Board meeting.

Madeleine announced that the single shell tank (SST) unit of the Site-wide Permit will have a delayed release from the rest of the permit. Due to the complexity of the SSTs, that draft unit is expected to be released for public comment on July 1 for a 90-day comment period, to time its ending date with the date of the rest of the permit issued on May 1. Madeleine noted that the SST document will only be 80 pages, and that it is complicated because the SSTs are closing units with operating conditions to be addressed, which is a hybrid of other units on site. Ecology will host separate public meetings on the SST unit, preferably via webinar. Madeleine asked for PIC's feedback about when to hold the webinar, noting that the TWC will be advising on the webinar's content.

Committee Discussion

The PIC discussed the timing and methods for the SST unit webinar. The key points of the discussion include (see Attachment 1 for the transcribed flip chart notes)

- An informational webinar should be hosted prior to, or during, August Committee Week in order for the Board to prepare for the September Board meeting and potential advice.

- A follow-up webinar for comment collecting should be hosted following August Committee Week, and agency representatives should attend committee meetings to hear additional comments beyond those provided through the consensus advice process.
- Some committee members objected to hosting meetings on the SST unit via webinar, but acknowledged that funding for Board member travel is limited.
- Meetings for individual units of the Site-wide Permit may not be effective for the public, as their main interest lies with the big picture of tank closure, not the individual units. A webinar specifically for the SST unit should include some time to explain how all of the tank components fit together. The May 3 workshop may still address all tank components, but Ecology will not be able to accept comments on the SST unit during the workshop because the document will not yet be released.
- One PIC member said that Ecology is required to release the Site-wide Permit as one comprehensive document. If the delayed release is necessary, she suggested that Ecology extend the end of the public comment period for both documents into November to provide more time for review without having to adjust the schedule for public meetings that have already been arranged. Dieter said he will take that recommendation back to Ecology, but he noted that the comment period for the Site-wide Permit is already 153 days, three times longer than what is required. The PIC agreed that the recommendation of comment period extension is tentative at this point, pending conversations with TWC concerning the effort needed for writing advice.
- The PIC discussed what will be required for review of the Site-wide Permit, as well as the SST unit, noting that it may not be necessary to address the documents at such a depth as they do with other documents. If a deeper review is required, the Board's ability to provide advice on both components during the September Board meeting may be compromised. Ecology will provide TWC with a review of the content of the SST unit, at which point the level of effort required, as well as the appropriate timeline for meetings, can be determined.

The committee determined to recommend SST meeting dates after TWC learns more about the document content. Dieter suggested debriefing the May 3 workshop during May Committee Week. Timing for the SST meetings will be determined by June.

Susan Leckband, HAB chair and Washington League of Women Voters, suggested that the committees that take on writing the advice work collaboratively in drafting advice points rather than asking one or two people to draft the advice on their own. She suggested taking time during committee meetings to capture high level bullet points and concepts to be agreed to by the whole committee for inclusion in the advice.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland and RAP chair, announced that the Hanford Communities has produced a TV program about the Site-wide Permit that will be airing in the Tri-Cities prior to the May 3 workshop. The TPA agencies will be providing backup images for the program before it is completed. Pam asked that PIC members who represent different regions work to provide the program in different communities, specifically Portland and Seattle.

State of the Site – Potential Advice

Issue manager framing

Steve said PIC is in agreement on the importance of State of the Site (SOS) meetings for the Hanford communities. It is a public activity that helps decision makers identify what they should really care about. PIC members agree on the meeting format, locations, and predictability, yet there is still no schedule for when the meetings will take place. Steve suggested he could draft a letter of recommendation on the SOS meeting calendar. He reviewed the content outline for a potential SOS letter (Attachment 3) and noted potential key points for the letter:

- SOS meetings should be held throughout the calendar year, with a minimum of three meetings and a maximum of six (six if meetings are collocated).
- Meetings must have local support, therefore, communities who would like a SOS meeting must request one and commit to providing outreach for advertising and public turnout.
- Meetings must be scheduled far enough in advance in order to provide adequate notification and outreach.

Agency response

Dennis Faulk, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said the schedule makes sense conceptually, but would be difficult logistically given that it is hard enough to schedule agency leadership to attend SOS meetings that occur concurrently. It would be much more difficult (potentially impossible) to get commitment three times a year. Dennis said January and February tend to be the better months for agency availability, and the fall is difficult due to budget concerns. Clustering the meetings all at once may be a large effort, but it works better for agency representative schedules. Dennis said SOS meetings are not being held this year because the agencies prefer to focus the public's involvement and effort on the Site-wide Permit. Dennis asked the committee to consider whether agency leadership participation is still a core component of the SOS meeting purpose.

Dieter said he is supportive of the concept of a shared agency and community responsibility for the meetings, but that the topic still needs a lot of discussion.

Committee discussion

The committee discussed the need for and content of a potential letter of recommendation concerning the SOS meetings and noted the following key points:

- SOS meetings could be thought of as conversations about cleanup, rather than updates on the state of the site. The purpose of SOS meetings is to provide a venue not based on single-topic technical information and documents.

- Meetings could be wide-ranging in topic or be more focused on the interests of the communities that are hosting them. Agencies could still speak to their recent accomplishments, but presentations need to be limited to facilitate more conversation.
- The agencies can easily support meetings where they only need to send a representative that can speak to issues the communities are interested in (e.g. past meetings at University of Washington and Portland State University). Meetings that do not require the agencies to arrange logistics are easily supportable. Agencies could support both broader SOS meetings and smaller community meetings.
- The original intent of SOS meetings was for the public to interact with chief agency decision-makers. One committee member suggested that the time at the SOS meetings be devoted to agency presentations and interaction, rather than additional interaction with interest groups.
- January and February meetings are subject to bad weather which could affect public turnout.
- The committee acknowledged the potential for public burnout if there are too many meetings in one year, but feels that SOS meetings are important for introducing people who are new to Hanford to the broader topics. It would be unfortunate for people to feel they don't want to participate in Hanford public involvement because the only meetings available to them are technical in nature.

The committee determined to continue to think about the key points for the potential letter of recommendation or draft advice to present to the Board in June. They will discuss it further on the April 26 conference call (if a call is held).

River Corridor Public Involvement Plans (Joint topic with RAP)

Emy Laija, EPA, provided committee members with copies of the updated TPA Public Involvement Calendar and reviewed upcoming dates of importance. She said the 300 Area and K Area Proposed Plans are due for public release and comment in mid-July, but specific dates have not yet been set. Dennis noted that the documents will be out by July 15, as that is the last possible day to begin public comment in order to comply with congressional commitments. Emy said the regulators will receive copies of all of the draft decision documents for the River Corridor by the end of the calendar year, followed by public comment periods towards the end of 2012 and into 2013. The 300 Area and K Area Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) will be approved in the June 2013 timeframe. Emy noted that the only enforceable deadline is for the draft documents to be to the regulators by the end of the year; other dates associated with the documents are only target dates.

Dennis said Draft B of the 100 K Area documents will be provided to the regulators within a few weeks to ensure the necessary changes have been made. He recommended that DOE provide copies to the HAB as well, though he doesn't know if the HAB's review would be necessary at this point. Revision 0 will be released to the public.

Emy reviewed the handout Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and TPA Requirements for Hanford Public Involvement (Attachment 4), a table depicting the CERCLA documents, required actions and notifications, and optional activities for high-interest topics. Emy asked the PIC members to provide feedback on whether the table is useful.

Emy asked PIC members to provide input on information sessions for the River Corridor decision documents. The purpose of the meetings would be for a general overview of all of the River Corridor documents while simultaneously identifying communities' needs for additional meetings on the topic during the public comment period. The committee agreed to the importance of the meeting and provided ideas for format, where, when, focus topics, and which local entities could help provide support for the meetings. Ideas include:

- **Format:** early evening meeting during the week, limited opening remarks, use of common language (rather than technical jargon), breakout stations to focus on individual topics of interest such as land use, cleanup values, and units. Each station will be led by a subject matter expert and will address “why you should care” about each topic.
- **Focus topics:** challenges, why the public should care, what “cleanup” means and how it is applied across decisions, what will the site look like after final cleanup, institutional controls, groundwater.
- **Where:** Seattle, Portland/Vancouver, Hood River, Tri-Cities.
- **When:** evenings or weekends (potential to ask communities which time would work best for them), mid to late June – potentially during June Committee Week.
- **Local Support:**
 - Seattle: Hanford Challenge, Heart of America Northwest
 - Portland/Vancouver: Hanford Watch, Oregon DOE, Oregon-Hanford Cleanup Board
 - Hood River: Columbia Riverkeeper, Oregon DOE
 - Tri-Cities: Hanford Communities, Hanford Workforce

Emy noted that the agencies have also discussed producing short videos on each area in the River Corridor so the public can learn about the areas outside of a formal meeting or comment period. The committee will continue to deliberate station topics and focus.

The flip charts outlining the committee's ideas will be posted during the Board meeting to solicit more feedback from the entire Board.

Committee Business

Committee Leadership Selection

Susan Hayman said the current nominations are for Liz Mattson for PIC chair and Ken Niles for vice-chair. There were no other leadership nominees from the floor.

Susan excused Liz and Ken for the selection and asked committee members if they agree to the nominations. The committee agreed.

Liz and Ken will begin their roles as chair and vice-chair on the April committee call. The committee thanked Steve for his years of hard work as committee chair.

Review Mid-Year Committee Accomplishments

Susan Hayman provided an overview of the Board and committee priorities and accomplishments document, noting that she prefilled the items related to PIC based on what she thought they had accomplished in the past six months.

The committee reviewed their six month accomplishments, identified areas for future action or review, and evaluated whether previously identified PIC topics are still a priority.

The updated document will be reviewed during Thursday's Board meeting. It will be further discussed by HAB and agency leadership during the HAB leadership workshop in April. Items that have not yet been acted upon will be evaluated for whether they are still priorities for 2012.

Comprehensively Update the 6-Month Work Plan

The committee updated their 6 Month Work Plan based on priority, timing, and work load. The updated work plan is provided as Attachment 5.

Review Follow Up Items

Susan Hayman reviewed follow up and action items.

1. Continue to consider SOS meetings recommendation letter or advice and discuss on the May committee call (if an April call is not held).

Liz encouraged everyone to participate in the Inheriting Hanford Project, which pairs mentors with young people to help encourage younger participation in issues at Hanford. She noted that getting to know fellow Board members is an important aspect of each person's responsibility to the Board, and she wants everyone to see themselves as resources for each other and future generations.

Attachments

PIC Meeting Transcribed Flip Chart Notes (Attachment 1).
DOE-RL Notice of Upcoming Public Comment Period (Attachment 2).
State of the Site Advice: Content Outline (Attachment 3).

CERCLA and TPA Requirements for Hanford Public Involvement (Attachment 4).
PIC 6-Month Work Plan (Attachment 5).

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles (phone)
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Betty Tabbutt (phone)
Norma Jean Germond	Susan Leckband	Jean Vanni
Laura Hanses	Liz Mattson	

Others

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Rachel Monto, Heart of America NW (phone)
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Allyson Ruppenthal, Ecology	Shannon Cram, public
Emy Laija, EPA	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Michelle Andrews, Ecology	Barb Wise, MSA	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC	

Attachment 1 – PIC Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Site-wide Permit

1. Between July 1 and September 30 – single shell tank webinar (provide agencies with input on *when*, TWC addressing content).
2. Education single shell tank webinar (or in-person?).
3. “Comment” webinar for single shell tanks (or in-person).
4. Could do “comment” meeting during August committee week (in-person) – perhaps more comprehensive to include all tanks.

Page 1

Site-wide Permit (continued)

5. Concern with parceling out single shell tanks from entire permit (proposed release in July 1, instead of May 1).
 - a. Recommend extend of permit comment period through November (to allow time to consider permit package as a whole).

Page 2

Site-wide Permit (continued)

- May 3 – HAB/public meeting/workshop.
- Debrief the workshop during the May committee week (tentative).
- May/June – public hearings without single shell tank unit.
- July 1 – single shell tank operating unit permit released
- Potential for educational and comment webinars/meetings between July 1 and September 30 (HAB to consider).
- September – HAB issues advice.
- Begin capturing high-level advice points beginning in May during committee week.

Page 3

State of the Site Calendar

1. Scattered throughout the year:
 - a. Three clusters and general locations (e.g. six total).
 - b. Wide-ranging, but community can influence topics.
2. Communities that wish to have an SOS meeting help provide venue, outreach, topic identification (i.e. through HAB members).
 - a. Agreement: shared commitment to put on SOS.
 - b. “Obligation.”
 - c. “Responsibility.”
3. “Conversations” about cleanup.
 - a. Reference “SOS” title.

b. General meetings.

Page 4

6-Month Work Plan

May:

- Potential SOS advice.
- River Corridor public information sessions updates.
- Site-wide Permit (all months).
- Status on TC&WM EIS (post decision technical).

Page 5

6-Month Work Plan

June (Board meeting month):

- Strategic planning.
- Debrief Site-wide Permit meeting.
- River Corridor information sessions update.
- HAB member interactions regarding Hanford cleanup.

Page 6

6-Month Work Plan

September (Board meeting month):

- Public understanding of cleanup levels - How clean is clean? (Tie to River Corridor and Site-wide Permit meetings/discussions).
- Post decision techniques/policy (PW 1/3/6 lessons learned).

Page 7

Follow-up

1. What is the level of detail that will be in the SST O.U. Permit? What will the substance be?
 - a. May be able to provide this info at April/May TWC meeting.
2. PIC talk with TWC and RAP about concept of delayed comment until November.
3. Find out HAB budget situation – are funds available for summer permit meeting? (Susan Leckband).
4. Pam Larsen to provide video to Liz, Steve, and others to distribute to local markets.
5. Bring up May committee week debrief of May 3 workshop.
6. Coordinate input on River Corridor decision public involvement process with RAP issue managers.

Page 8
