

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3, 2008
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions..... 1
“Landscape” view of Hanford-related public involvement..... 2
Community Relations Plan..... 5
HAB White Paper..... 6
TPA Communications Strategic Plan..... 7
TC&WM EIS 7
RCRA Site-Wide Permit Scope and Public Rollout..... 11
Committee Business 17
Handouts..... 18
Attendees 18

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, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The September meeting summary was adopted.

Susan Leckband announced that the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) leadership decided to have a Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss the Hanford budget and baselines. The Committee of the Whole will meet on December 11.

Lori Gamache is the new federal coordinator to the HAB for the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP).

Steve reviewed the meeting/workshop goals:

- Identify the agency/organization goals for HAB public involvement and how the PIC mission fits in that framework.
- Identify how PIC contributes to HAB work plan accomplishment.
- Identify how PIC meets its responsibilities.
- Identify projects/activities that energize the PIC and meet agency needs.

Steve asked the committee to think about how it and the agencies can communicate more effectively with the public and provide opportunities for involvement. Other workshop objectives include:

- Providing concrete recommendations for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Communications Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan)

- Providing concrete recommendations for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Site-Wide Permit (Site-Wide Permit) and Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) rollout
- Discuss the HAB Public Involvement White Paper (White Paper) and TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP)
- Respond to TPA agencies request for prioritization of issues identified in the Strategic Plan

Steve said the topics are complex and the committee may not be able to discuss every nuance of each issue. Steve thought Board meetings should include an educational agenda item. He welcomed the committee to add issues to flipcharts around the room if they wanted to discuss a particular topic.

Susan asked the committee to remember that the agencies want the committee to comment on three particular topics: 1) public involvement process for the TC&WM EIS, 2) public involvement process for the Site-Wide Permit, and 3) public outreach to reach a more diverse audience.

Shelley Cimon noted that she brought resources from Oak Ridge about stewardship and educational resources.

Gerry Pollet wrote a memo in preparation for the workshop that was distributed to the committee. He said it considers goals, strategic plans, measures and definitions and issues surrounding public involvement. He said the Board has been concerned about the lack of an annual strategic plan for public involvement. Gerry thought advertisements for outreach events need substance and should identify public comment goals. He also thought the agencies should define a “diverse audience.” He thought the committee should be specific and say the Hanford audience should be “geographically diverse.”

“Landscape” view of Hanford-related public involvement

Ken Niles reviewed the results of the public involvement survey he conducted and synthesized it to develop a “landscape view” of the primary entities engaged in Hanford-related public involvement activities (including agencies and organizations). Ken distributed a compilation of unedited survey responses and a copy of his PowerPoint presentation. Organizations that responded to the survey are:

- Columbia Riverkeeper
- Hanford Watch
- Heart of America Northwest
- Oregon Department of Energy (Oregon DOE)
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)
- Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility
- U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Ken described survey questions and participant responses.

Why does your agency/organization conduct public involvement?

Ken thought this is the key question, and one that helps illustrate why there are disconnects in public involvement. All respondents said they want to inform and educate through public

involvement. Stakeholders said they want to influence cleanup decisions. Regulators said they want to reach sustainable decisions, and DOE said it wants to provide open, ongoing dialogue.

Why haven't we been more consistently effective?

- Public does not feel “heard” – in part because they rarely know the impact of their participation. Ken said he did not think formal responses are very useful or clear, and do not say how comments are used or not used. Ken said Jane Hedges, Ecology, was responsive at the State of the Site meetings by directly affirming what Ecology heard last year and explained what Ecology had done in response.
- Lack of agreement on goals and objectives: Ken said goals will always be somewhat different, but it is important for everyone to “get on the same page.”
- Lack of timely and effective notice.
- Public interest groups believe that the agencies rely on public interest groups to notify/inform the public.
- Short comment periods for complex and lengthy documents: Ken said even executive summaries can be daunting for the public. He said sometimes there is agreement on extended comment periods, sometimes not.
- Lack of early collaboration.

What public involvement activities have been the most effective (stakeholders)?

- Meeting turnout: stakeholders felt they have done a good job at turning people out for meetings
- Single topic meetings (e.g. Hanford Watch tank forums)
- Informational materials: Ken said there are many good quality materials available, but it is difficult and time-consuming to keep them updated. For example, Ken said, the Oregon DOE does not focus enough resources on its website – therefore its Hanford materials on the Internet do not come close to making full use of the technology.

What public involvement activities have you done that are fairly unique?

- Tank waste forums (Hanford Watch)
- E-list (Hanford Watch)
- Public involvement “Tool Kit” (Heart of America Northwest)
- Road shows: (Oregon DOE - Ken said these are effective but time-intensive)
- Activities targeting non-English speaking populations (Ecology)
- “Pie-chart” exercise – FY 2009 budget discussions (DOE)
- Transparent decision-making with 100 Area cleanup decisions (EPA and others)

Still effective?

- State of the Site meetings: Ken said there were good and bad responses to State of the Site meetings. Some organizations raised issues about effectiveness – have they run their course, what changes could make them more effective, etc.
- Hanford Update newsletter

Agency perspective

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said Ecology’s efforts to target non-English speaking populations had a unique start that was not sustainable. He also noted that the agencies have to serve both individually and collectively as the TPA agencies, which can affect efficiency.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said a “sustainable decision” is one that is fully vetted with the public so the final decision will stand the test of time. He said at times, EPA uses the public to “kick-start” topics or issues. For example, Dennis said EPA put the Central Plateau cleanup strategy on the Board’s work plan several years ago.

Discussion

Norma Jean Germond said the committee should keep in mind the interconnectedness of all Hanford issues.

Steve asked if survey participants offered any solutions. Ken said not many, but respondents were not aware of the disconnects that were illuminated by the survey. He hoped DOE will expand its definition about why it conducts public involvement. Ken agreed with Dennis that public input can influence decisions, which is good if an agency is attempting to reach a sustainable decision. Ken said giving the public a chance to influence cleanup decisions takes more effort than simply conducting a dialogue (e.g. providing information in a way that the public can make informed comment).

Paige Knight said agency goals seem nebulous and give no sense of intentionality. She said it is not satisfying for the public to take the time to attend a meeting and “just talk.” Paige said the agencies should make their goals and intentions clear for public meetings.

Shelley asked why the agencies thought State of the Site meetings have run their course. She thought the meetings were good. Ken said the agencies’ responses did not indicate they wanted to end State of the Site meetings, but that a discussion on their usefulness would be helpful.

Helen Wheatley said agency decision-makers should be at State of the Site meetings. She said the agencies should be clear about what they want from the public and follow-through on their responses.

Norma Jean said Dave Brockman, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), gave a good tutorial at the Portland State of the Site meeting, but it was long and limited time at the end of the meeting. She said it is a common dilemma to provide enough information while allowing enough time for comments and questions.

Steve said education should precede meetings. He said Heart of America Northwest is a good example of an organization doing such education.

Paige said the agencies should have examples of how public input is used, and remind people at every meeting. She noted that reading handouts during a presentation is difficult. She asked if there was a way to provide one handout with clear background information and opinions from various agencies and organizations. She thought it would require early collaboration.

Dennis said EPA uses the Board to help find solutions. He said the agencies all view Hanford cleanup a little differently. He said the public does not often experience the deliberation between the agencies for big decisions. Shelley suggested the public could attend more Committee of the Whole meetings where agency deliberation is discussed.

Gerry said meeting notices should be more than the date and time of a meeting. For example, Gerry said the TC&WM EIS should describe potential impacts and risks in a manner that motivates people to get involved. Gerry said notice should be meaningful and use language to

which the public can relate. Gerry said Ecology refused to use a word such as “dump.” Nolan said there was a difference of opinion on using the word “dump” to describe a waste site in a Heart of America Northwest document funded by a broad public education grant from Ecology.

Gerry said if the agencies strive to have one viewpoint, the public is deprived of each agency’s values and perspective. He said the regulators should describe to the public how they differ from DOE to reassure the public that they are doing their job. Nolan agreed that it is difficult for the agencies to act individually and collectively.

Dennis said the agencies are expected to collaborate and come together. However, he thought it would be interesting to show the public the struggle and vet decisions through the public process. Dennis said notices do not typically explain the original proposal or how results came from immense amounts of work.

From the State of the Site meeting reports, Steve said he got the sense that people just wanted information.

Gerry said a key goal for the State of the Site meetings was to get public input on the TPA negotiations and delays, but the agencies did not present different views on the negotiations. He thought the regulators should insist on presenting those differences, and asked where in the TPA it says there has to be agreement on a common message to the public. Nolan said there were major legal constraints on what they could share with the public and Ecology was frustrated with those limitations.

Paige said it is necessary to teach different points of view if they want the public to be informed. She suggested using an educational model for public involvement strategy.

Helen said DOE is responsible for public involvement and developing and implementing the CRP; the regulators’ role is to review and approve. She did not think there would be much change until DOE shows active engagement and changes.

Lori said DOE provides the opportunity for the public to provide input on its budget priorities. She said it is important for DOE-ORP to listen, learn and clarify at State of the Site meetings, and Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP manager, does not want to limit discussion. Lori said State of the Site meetings are great opportunities for people to discuss whatever they want. Lori noted that Shirley was unable to attend the meeting in Portland, but received public feedback from her representative.

Shelley said the DOE website needs to be more informative. Barb Wise, Fluor, clarified that the Hanford Events Calendar shows all events. To see more information on a particular event, the user needs to click on the event link. Barb said she posts agendas and presentations when possible.

Community Relations Plan

Steve said the CRP was last updated in 2002 and requires about a year to update. He said it needs mechanical editing and audience identification – is it the public? The agencies?

Barb said contractors and DOE managers are also targeted audiences. She said the CPR governs Hanford public involvement.

Dennis said the CRP is required under the Comprehensive Environmental Recovery, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and under RCRA. He said the primary intent is to inform the public about cleanup in their community. The HAB was formed since the development of the CRP in the late 1980s. Major changes were made to the CRP in 1993, and EPA and the other agencies agree that it needs revision and a process for that revision. He wants to hear the committee's ideas on how the CRP should be revised.

Steve offered PIC's help. Susan suggested that PIC develop advice identifying the CRP as valuable and offering PIC's help with its revision. She thought advice makes it a concrete and prioritized request. Steve thought the committee should modify its work plan, too, and should review the CRP regularly.

Nolan said Ecology agrees it is time to update the CRP and thought it is important to identify in the advice how PIC wants to help with the revision process. Lori said DOE-ORP thinks it is time to revisit the CRP.

Ken asked what opportunities there are for PIC to participate in updating the CRP. He would like to have face-to-face opportunities, not just submit written comments. Nolan said he wants to have a clear understanding of roles in the process.

Barb said PIC issued advice and played an active role in the last CRP revision process.

Gerry thought the revision process could serve as a model for public involvement. Maynard Plahuta said the purpose of the CRP and public involvement should be identified and different approaches defined. He thought it will need heavy issue manager work. Shelley thought the CRP should contain templates for public involvement.

Paige thought the CRP should include examples of good products and processes, such as advertisements for public meetings. She said examples are important as new people come through the agencies.

Maynard hoped the agencies would engage early on with the committee and the Board with drafts and revision development, and not just bring PIC their product. Maynard said collaboration early and throughout will be valuable.

Dennis said Hanford's CRP is better than other sites, but can be better. He said his goal is to make it sustainable and able to address the future work at Hanford.

The committee will prepare draft advice on the CRP revision for the February Board meeting. Paige and Steve are the issue managers.

HAB White Paper

PIC developed the HAB White Paper in June 2002. Steve said it is an excellent document with clear goals and expectations for public involvement. He said it raised many questions that have not been answered, and thought PIC should evaluate and identify priorities found in it.

Dennis thought principles from the White Paper can be discussed and used concretely when evaluating the CRP. He thought there should be a context for the principles. Steve agreed and thought the principles apply directly to the TC&WM EIS and Site-Wide Permit.

Paige thought they should use an evaluative tool such as a rubric.

Susan will bring copies of the CRP, White Paper and Strategic Plan to the Board meeting. She thought PIC could overlay the White Paper on the CRP and develop a flowchart for identifying an issue, outreach needed, techniques, and what kind of input is desired. She thought it could be similar to the HAB Groundwater Flowchart.

Ken said the committee and Board should not redo work that has already been done. PIC should look for other good quality products to bring forward and re-endorse.

The committee identified a few existing resources:

- Oak Ridge stewardship kit
- Hanford Communities television spots on specific topics
- Community college courses on TV
- Oregon DOE videos

TPA Communications Strategic Plan

The TPA agencies asked PIC to respond to specific current issues. Steve asked the committee to address the TC&WM EIS and Site-Wide Permit. Dennis said they want it to be a “living plan” to continue every year.

Steve said the committee should help the agencies identify policy implications for each issue.

Shelley thought they could develop flowcharts for specific issues and/or meetings. She added that they should consider DOE-HQ priorities, too, and how they may differ from public priorities.

Ken thought there were disagreements on defining public policy issues. Regarding the TC&WM EIS, Ken said the level of cleanup is a huge public policy issue for tank closure. He said when the Record of Decision (ROD) is issued, Hanford is open for business for taking waste from other sites; this is another major public policy issue.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement

Norma Jean introduced the discussion on the TC&WM EIS and how to roll it out to the public. Norma Jean said the executive summary is 300 pages and DOE currently plans to have a 60-day comment period. She noted the difficulty is sharing this with the public in a manageable and meaningful way. She suggested a plan for discussing the TC&WM EIS at a public meeting. She suggested small groups of about eight people with a knowledgeable person to serve as a group leader. She said the agencies could provide a tutorial handout about a particular topic. The group leader, most likely someone from one of the agencies, could explain alternatives, risks, and benefits, and lead an open discussion. She suggested that each group focus on one topic, like tank closure, and have a wrap-up session with all groups at the end of the meeting. Norma Jean said this was one of the few ways she could think of to really tackle the issues in a meaningful and informative way.

Discussion

Nolan wanted to be clear that the TC&WM EIS is DOE's document, and Ecology will have an opinion about its adequacy and is interested in the public's opinion. He thought discussing broader issues does not really get to the EIS.

Maynard thought separating out the issues in the TC&WM EIS would not provide a good analysis of the big picture. Paige agreed that a piecemeal approach would be difficult.

Shelley liked the idea of an all-day workshop. Paige suggested having it on a Saturday since most people work during the week.

Public comment period

Maynard said the comment period is insufficient; the public cannot provide meaningful comment in 60 days.

Ken agreed and said there is no realistic deadline that makes a 60-day comment period necessary. He said Oregon will oppose it. He did not have another idea, but felt breakout groups for State of the Site meetings presents problems, including dominating personalities, differing communication skills and unequal report-back (even with good facilitation).

Workshop/meeting format

Shelley suggested that Board members convey breakout group results to the larger group. She said DOE is looking at closing sites by zone and suggested structuring the meeting so people look at closures by zone, making it more comprehensive. She hoped the EIS will align with DOE's current perspective of closure. Shelley said another possible meeting structure would have DOE discuss the TC&WM EIS with the large group and not break into small groups.

Harold Heacock said he is concerned that the public will not be in a position to read all alternatives presented and/or access supporting information. He said organizations will bring many people to the TC&WM EIS meeting with one preset position that will prevent general public discourse on all the pros and cons. He said he could not see how to get a balanced measure of what the average person thinks.

Other strategies

Larry Lockrem said he had a similar question of how to reach a broad audience, and suggested that DOE utilize public television. He suggested a panel of DOE, regulators, HAB representatives and an overview of what the TC&WM EIS tries to accomplish and the issues it contains. It could be broadcast over a series of sessions, one dealing with each topic. Larry said DOE could show the sessions in Tri-Cities, Spokane, and other areas, and utilize YouTube and the Hanford website.

Norma Jean liked Larry's idea and noted that DOE and the regulators will have to select certain key issues they want input on. Larry said whatever DOE does, it has to present the TC&WM EIS as a whole – what it does and what it means.

Steve said the HAB and agencies have to set public involvement goals and then develop a strategy. Gerry said the Board should be able to provide input on an annual strategic public involvement plan.

Dennis asked the committee to define goals and what the public needs to know about the "big decisions" in the TC&WM EIS. He said Norma Jean's idea was more of a mechanism. Dennis

said people need to know what decisions the EIS makes and what it does not; for example, closure decisions are made through the permitting process, not the TC&WM EIS.

Ken recommended soon after DOE issues the draft TC&WM EIS, the Board should have a detailed workshop (e.g. Committee of the Whole) to ensure Board understanding about the decisions made in the document. He said individual organizations will need time to read and understand it, and produce background and informational materials. He said that cannot happen in 60 days.

Gerry said there are six to eight major decisions that will come from the TC&WM EIS. He thought it requires a full day workshop for the HAB, DOE and regulators to look at the decisions, define a goal for public involvement for the TC&WM EIS, and define a goal for each decision. Gerry said if DOE is trying to show how the public influences decision-making, it should be prepared to make changes based on public comment. Gerry said a measurable goal for public involvement is having 1,000 people attend the hearings. He thought there could be a Saturday hearing with an additional evening hearing. He hoped there would be workshops around the region that DOE could video and put online. Gerry emphasized that people need adequate information to make informed comments that can influence or change the TC&WM EIS.

What can we do before the draft TC&WM EIS release?

Paige asked what educational efforts PIC and individual organizations can do before the TC&WM EIS is released. Ken thought it depended on the level of effort people are willing to expend. He did not think PIC nor the Board currently know enough to share accurate information and doubted that the agencies will be able to be frank about the TC&WM EIS before it is released.

Paige asked if the various organizations could hold forums on their own about the TC&WM EIS. Ken thought that was a good idea, but he would not want to do that until he has the TC&WM EIS to ensure he is using accurate information.

Maynard thought organizations could put together a list of questions for the public to keep in mind when they read the TC&WM EIS. Gerry thought Mary Beth Burandt's, DOE-ORP, presentation from the September Board meeting provides good information about the EIS. Paige said Hanford Watch can keep updated information on its website about the EIS and hearings.

Gerry suggested learning more about the inadequacies of the Solid Waste EIS would help identify what key topics should be reviewed in the TC&WM EIS.

Nolan said PIC can help identify policy decisions that may or may not be affected by the TC&WM EIS. He said Ecology has a process for information distribution and formal comment, but wants the committee's help in identifying a mechanism for dialogue.

What does the TC&WM EIS do?

Nolan agreed that the TC&WM EIS is not a decision document. It does a comparative analysis from which decisions will be based. He said Ecology is looking at the process for Ecology's input and making sure it is substantial. He said Ecology's interest is primarily in making sure the EIS is adequate enough to make cleanup decisions.

Dennis said for some activities, the TC&WM EIS will be the decision document for DOE, like disposition of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF); it is not the decision document for closing tanks. He said those distinctions are important to make to the public. Nolan added that the

TC&WM EIS gives the basis for the decision, but the ROD is the decision document. Ken said the ROD will follow the TC&WM EIS.

Dennis said the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) started out as an EIS. EPA did not want DOE to issue a National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) ROD on “how clean is clean.” EPA believed that to be a CERCLA decision, which is how it became the CLUP. He said DOE can issue a ROD but that does not mean Ecology will abide by it because of RCRA.

Gerry said that should be part of the public discussion. He said the original reasons for doing the TC&WM EIS have evaporated with the initial push to close tanks by 2010. He said that is why supplemental treatment decisions are so important. He said under the law, Ecology will be required to do a supplemental EIS every five years.

Larry noted that technologies change, and those evaluated in the TC&WM EIS are already almost outdated.

The committee commented that they do not know enough about decisions that may be affected by the TC&WM EIS. Dennis suggested looking at the four needs for the EIS shared in Mary Beth’s presentation at the September Board meeting:

- The TC&WM EIS will enable DOE to:
 - Close the tank farms
 - Evaluate the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and supplemental treatment technologies
 - Implement onsite disposal of mixed wastes and low-level radioactive waste from the tank farms and other Hanford operations, and offsite locations
 - Evaluate disposition of FFTF

Dennis said the agencies have to provide information and define the issues, like what does it mean to “close tank farms.” He said once PIC has that information, it can help plan for public involvement.

Larry asked if the TC&WM EIS addresses timelines and funding. Nolan said no; it looks at different alternatives and risks. It provides data that DOE can use to make decisions. He said regulators may interpret data differently and come to different conclusions, but the data has to be adequate.

Ken asked if DOE has a preferred alternative. Lori said she would take that question back.

Dennis said preparing advice on the public comment period for the February Board meeting would be timely.

The committee identified questions relevant to every decision in the TC&WM EIS:

1. Does the EIS make or inform the decision?
2. What are the assumptions?

The committee identified public policy issues for tank closure:

- Quality and level of cleanup
- Waste streams
- How much waste is left?
- Pipelines

- How will leaked tank waste be dealt with?
- Are barriers proposed?
- What kind of barriers?
- Adequate characterization
- What are the assumptions? (e.g. Does DOE assume Yucca Mountain will open in 2018?)

The committee discussed one of the needs for a TC&WM EIS:

- Evaluate WTP and supplemental treatment technologies:
 - What supplemental technologies will be used?
 - What is the length of treatment?
 - What are the impacts until WTP is completed?
 - Capacity: WTP melter and capacity choices
 - Melter configurations
 - What are the waste streams?
 - How does it consider secondary waste streams?
 - Will it evaluate early Low Activity Waste (LAW)?
 - Are there any “show stoppers?”
 - Technology needs
 - Disposition pathways

Lori said she will take back the public policy questions for DOE-ORP to consider and the request for a longer public comment period. The decision about the comment period will come after DOE-HQ reviews the EIS. She will work with PIC to frame a workshop and thought the baseline workshop is a good model. Lori apologized that Mary Beth could not attend today; she has been in an EIS review for three weeks.

The committee decided to draft advice for the February Board meeting that identifies goals, a “big picture” plan for the TC&WM EIS, and a request for extending the public comment period beyond 60 days. Shelley and Ken will draft the advice.

The committee decided it is important to have an all-day workshop (potentially a Committee of the Whole workshop) right after the TC&WM EIS is issued and before public outreach activities. Norma Jean will continue to be the issue manager for TC&WM EIS public involvement.

RCRA Site-Wide Permit Scope and Public Rollout

Ron Skinnerland, Ecology, and Madeleine Brown, Ecology, have been working on public involvement strategies and plans for the Site-Wide Permit. A Frequently Asked Question (FAQs) handout and “Public Involvement for the Site-Wide Permit” was distributed to PIC. Madeleine said they are draft and open for PIC input.

Permit scope

Ron discussed the scope of the Site-Wide Permit and public involvement for the permit. The goal of the permit is to protect human health and the environment. The permit is required under Washington State’s Hazardous Waste Management Act. It covers dangerous waste treatment (e.g. WTP), storage (e.g. tanks), and disposal sites at Hanford. The permit is enforceable and regulates the actions of DOE and its contractors. Ron said it was originally issued in 1994 and expired after 10 years, in 2004. The new permit will be good for another 10 years. Ron noted that it does not cover a couple facilities that Ecology plans to add to the permit in a few years.

Ron said standard conditions and duties for all treatment, storage and disposal are found in Part 1, including reporting requirements, severability and emergency response. These conditions are similar to any other Ecology permit. Ron said Part 2 contains general conditions specific to Hanford, such as the role of the TPA, training, and facility record-keeping.

Parts 3-6 have specific conditions for Hanford waste sites and facilities. Ecology split the 40 RODs covered in the permit into three categories. Part 3 addresses operating facilities, including double-shell tanks, waste encapsulation and storage facility, WTP, the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), and 11 others.

Ron said Part 4 is dedicated to corrective action areas. It is also known as “solid waste management units” and addresses spill sites. Ron said Ecology will use RCRA to clean up these sites. He said most of them will be dug up; if they cannot be dug up, Ecology will require groundwater monitoring.

Part 5 addresses units undergoing closure, including cribs, ponds, ditches, and single-shell tanks (19 total closure sites). Ron said about 12 of the closure sites are in the Central Plateau and Ecology plans on using an integrated approach to ensure cleanup is protective. He said single-shell tanks were added because they will hold waste for a long time and need operating requirements. They cannot be made compliant, so Ecology’s goal is to empty them as soon as possible. Ron said C Tank Farm will be closed around 2015.

Part 6 covers post-closure sites, or sites that have been closed already but still need groundwater monitoring (e.g. 183-H Solar Evaporating Basins and 300 Area process trenches). Ron said not everything can be cleaned up at Hanford, which is why they will continue to have groundwater monitoring and pump and treat systems. Ongoing monitoring will make sure work is protective and safe.

Discussion

Shelley asked how the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) is permitted. Ron said it operates under a CERCLA ROD.

Larry asked if transuranic (TRU) waste will go to IDF. Ron said they are storing post-1970 TRU in burial grounds. He said those drums are being retrieved and characterized; TRU waste goes to WIPP and other drums are repackaged and sent to T Plant. Ron said that program was stopped because of budget problems. Ron said TRU waste will be shipped to WIPP as money is available.

Dennis said Part 4 is important because it identifies that Ecology has corrective action authority of chemical releases. The language identifies the intersection of cleanup programs and requirements. Dennis recommended that PIC and the Board read that language because it is a model that will most likely be used in the future. Ron said requirements will be satisfied whether it is a RCRA permit or a CERCLA investigation – the same level of protection will be reached.

Dennis asked if the C Tank Farm permit will have a schedule for closure. Ron said yes, a schedule will be included in the draft permit. Ecology will do supplemental work on the permit when additional information is available this spring.

Maynard noted the FAQs were contradictory when referring to regulating imported mixed waste – on page 4 it says Ecology will regulate only dangerous mixed waste, but it says on page 2 that

Ecology will regulate both if they are mixed. Ron said Ecology regulates the dangerous waste component, but there is no practical way to separate the radioactive component from mixed waste. He says Ecology “regulates the whole drum” but legally just regulates the dangerous waste component.

Shelley said Christine Gelles, DOE-Environmental Management, said Hanford will not ship waste directly to WIPP, but will go first to Idaho for processing and shipping. She asked how much waste is sitting at Hanford ready for shipment. Ron said DOE saw an optimization opportunity while WIPP is shut down. They had the trucks to ship 1,000 drums to Idaho and process them while WIPP is shut down. Ron said there may be labor questions about shipping Hanford processing work to Idaho. Ron said they need to determine if drum retrieval is still a priority since there will potentially be no shipments from Hanford to WIPP for five years, leaving Hanford with the issue of storing waste.

Paige asked what severability means. Ron said it is a legal clause allowing the removal of a certain feature without negating the rest of the permit or having to redo the entire thing.

Larry asked if EPA penalizes Ecology for the expired permit. Ron said the EPA Region 10 manager reviews and provides comments on the permit; EPA could also say Ecology is not doing its job by letting the permit expire and issue their own permit. Dennis said realistically, EPA does not want to take RCRA authority away from the State of Washington.

Permit public involvement

Madeleine described the goals for public involvement:

- Follow requirements in Dangerous Waste Regulations [Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-303-840]
- Follow public involvement requirements from the TPA and CRP
- Make permit accessible and understandable
- Define role of permit in Hanford’s cleanup

Ecology identified some public involvement issues with the permit, including general knowledge (e.g. why is it needed?), document size and readability, stakeholder expectations, agency expectations and the delay in the permit’s release.

Madeleine said the permit will be released in the same general timeframe as other documents, including the WTP appealed permit conditions (October 20 – December 8, 2008) and the TC&WM EIS. She also thought the public will need an explanation of how Ecology fulfills State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) requirements.

Madeleine said the current proposed communications strategy includes a 90-day public comment period and four hearings, one each in Richland, Spokane, Seattle and Vancouver. She noted the required comment period is only 45 days. She said Ecology is considering a workshop in Richland at the beginning of the comment period and providing a message phone line for questions about the permit. Madeleine said they would like to staff it 40 hours a week, but do not have the resources. People can leave a message and expect a call back.

Notifications of the permit and its public comment period include:

- Listserv notices
- Information repositories

- Facility mail list
- Radio
- Newspaper (legal notice and display ads)
- Website
- Meetings

Madeleine noted some notifications are required and some are not. Ecology plans to have meetings with the following stakeholders:

- HAB [PIC, River and Plateau Committee (RAP), Tank Waste Committee (TWC)]
- Staff-to-staff meetings with tribal nations
- Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board
- Hanford Public Interest Network (January 2009)
- Hanford Communities
- Others upon request (if travel is approved)

Madeleine noted the following publications will be used:

- Public notices
- Focus sheet with FAQ
 - The focus sheet provides information about the permit, comment period, how to comment, public hearing, what the permit covers, SEPA, hearing schedule, and how to find the permit
 - The FAQs provide answers to questions Ecology receives about the permit, information on how to submit questions; the electronic version will hyperlink to regulations and permit parts; hard copies available on request
- Reader's guide
 - It is not required, but Ecology thinks it is a good idea
 - Approximately 30 pages (designed to help direct people to specific sections of the permit from which they want more information)
 - Will include information from public notice and FAQs
 - Includes details on units and arranges units into logical groups
 - Identifies areas where comments will have greatest benefit
 - Electronic versions will hyperlink to parts of the permit
- Statement of basis (required; defines the basis for permit conditions)
- Hanford Update articles
- Press release

Madeleine said public notice will meet the WAC requirements [173-303-840 (4)] and provide information on how to comment. The permit will be available:

- Online
- On disk (CD, DVD) by request
- At Hanford Information Repositories
- At Nuclear Waste Program office
- At Ecology's Yakima office
- At White Salmon, WA public library

Madeleine said the draft should be available in spring 2009.

Discussion

Larry asked when the permit will be enforceable. Ron said it will be enforceable 30 days after it is finalized.

Ken liked how the FAQ uses examples. He said examples clarify issues well and should be used whenever possible. He thought there should also be a “why should I care” question.

Shelley thought the FAQs were good.

Gerry thought the headline should be “Who should care about this permit and why?” He thought “permit” does not catch people’s interest. Maynard agreed that Ecology would reach the “silent majority” better by improving the headline.

Gerry said the permit has major implications to public cleanup values. He said it is the decision document for tank closure and listed public values questions that should be answered:

- What is clean enough to be called closed?
- What is the basis behind saying a tank farm will be closed in 2015?
- What key decisions will be made based on the permit?
- Will this be the decision on how much offsite waste comes to Hanford?
- How much waste will be left in the soil at Hanford?

Gerry listed some overall goals for public involvement:

- Communicate and obtain input on the impacts of the permit on major public policy decisions
- Use a permit that will last ten years and reflect public values and Washington State hazardous waste regulations
- Ensure that public input and values will be a part of future decision-making under the permit; use this process to build a base of long-term public involvement for the next ten years

Shelley noted that PIC does not know the scope of what can be added to the permit. Gerry said by building a base of knowledge now, people will know and understand the permit when Ecology needs to amend it in the future. Gerry suggested keeping a separate contact list for the permit to ensure people are kept informed.

Site-Wide Permit scope and relationship to the TC&WM EIS

Gerry said another key question is the scoping of the permit. He said some people think the document is not scoped as it should be, and think some facilities are left out. He said the public is concerned about the permit conditions for a risk budget, how much waste can be disposed and left in the soil, and will be the basis for deciding if waste can be accepted from offsite.

Gerry said the TC&WM EIS is supposed to lay out all of those questions, including the alternatives considered and their impacts. He used a cap as an example: how big is a cap? Should DOE cap at all? Gerry said a key question for the Board is to ask if the permit can be done without the TC&WM EIS at all. Gerry said the permit was originally planned to come out a couple years after the TC&WM EIS. How does Ecology do a permit with an EIS?

Maynard asked if Gerry wanted Ecology to do nothing with the permit until the TC&WM EIS is done. The permit is already four years overdue. Gerry said they should identify those issues for the public – what decisions are being driven? Can Ecology wait for an adequate EIS? Maynard said he was also frustrated that the permit is coming before the TC&WM EIS, but they do not

know when the TC&WM EIS will be finished. He thought the permit could have a provision to review it when the TC&WM EIS is complete. Gerry thought there could be provisions that Ecology cannot issue conditions for closing tanks until the TC&WM EIS is done.

Ron said those questions are good for PIC to ask because the public may have similar questions and Ecology wants to be prepared with good explanations.

Helen asked if Ecology is interested in public input on the scope of the permit. Madeleine said the scope was heavily informed by state regulations and Ecology wants the public to comment on the draft product.

Gerry said the public should also know why the U.S. Ecology site is not in the permit.

Norma Jean asked if the TC&WM EIS will determine what choice DOE will make for tank closure. Gerry said Ecology will make the tank closure decision.

Ron said the TC&WM EIS looks at alternatives to meet TPA requirements. For example, one alternative is leaving more waste in tanks, which is of concern to the public. The TC&WM EIS looks at the long-term cumulative risk of retrieving 90% of tank waste. The EIS does not make a decision about how much waste to retrieve. DOE selects a preferred alternative and Ecology can agree or not agree.

Ron agreed that Ecology needs to be clear about the scope of the permit, what decisions it makes, what the alternatives are, what the process is between the TPA and the permitter, and how it interacts with the TC&WM EIS. Ron said 90% of the permit can easily go forward without an EIS and Ecology needs to explain why.

Steve said those public policy questions will be integrated into the TPA Strategic Communications Plan.

Shelley asked if Ecology has discussed waiting on the permit until the TC&WM EIS is done; Madeleine said no, they have to move forward. Gerry questioned if Ecology can effectively regulate without an EIS.

Gerry said Ecology should think about decisions down the line and the cumulative impacts of adding waste in the future. Ron agreed and said they need to address offsite waste. Ron said Ecology needs to get on with many parts of the permit and the public will agree.

Gerry said Ecology should come back and discuss the decisions in more detail. He suggested a workshop identifying shared goals for public involvement and a set of major public policy questions that need to be addressed. He thought it could be a Committee of the Whole or a HAB agenda item. Maynard thought RAP and TWC should be involved.

Dennis thought the committee should use a Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss the permit, the EIS and their relationship. He said by reaching a level playing field with the informed public, they can prepare to reach out to the broader public.

Shelley said Hanford needs to know its current load and capacity or else it is set up for failure, especially with emerging issues like the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership and Greater than Class C.

Larry said there is no way DOE will ever be able to understand the capacity of Hanford to handle waste. He said he was struggling with the path forward and commented that the Board is often critical of the TPA agencies for not moving forward – is PIC now criticizing the agencies for moving forward? At what point do the agencies need to “get on with cleanup” and make modifications in the future? He noted that Ron already said most areas can go forward and some will need revision.

Helen asked if Ecology wants comments on whether or not the permit should go forward now. Ron said they want people to understand the risks. He said 90% of the permit does more good than harm and Ecology needs to be clear about how the permit fits with the TC&WM EIS and what decisions the permit makes. He said they want to keep their options open, but they have to get on with the cleanup. Ron said EPA oversight and Washington State regulations dictate the content of the permit.

Gerry asked if Ecology was open to adding to the permit scope now and/or later. Ron said yes. Paige asked Ecology to consider leaving some issues out of the permit that need to be better informed by the TC&WM EIS.

Committee Business

The committee decided to have a tutorial on the TC&WM EIS and permit at the February Board meeting.

Topics on the committee work plan include:

- Prepare advice for the February Board meeting about the TC&WM EIS comment period and public policy questions that should be addressed; Shelley and Ken will draft the advice
- Prepare advice for the February Board meeting to revise the CRP and provide recommendations on how PIC and the Board can help; Paige and Steve are the issue managers
- Help update the CRP
- Work on materials prior to the TC&WM EIS release to “jumpstart” the public
- Design a TC&WM EIS workshop to be held immediately after its release
- Design a public involvement flowchart
- Respond to Ecology’s request for input on how to make the Site-Wide Permit accessible and understandable
- Recommend topics that integrate into Board activities (e.g. tutorials at Board meetings)

Norma Jean will continue to be the issue manager for TC&WM EIS public involvement.

Larry thought it is very important to bring public involvement topics to the full Board to ensure greater awareness and input.

Dennis noted that the agencies want to work on the CRP, but will have to focus their energy on the TC&WM EIS and permit.

Gerry said the agencies should use the TC&WM EIS and permit process as examples in the CRP. He thought today’s workshop was a great starting point.

The committee did not set a committee call date or time.

Handouts

- TPA Community Relations Plan (last updated January 2002)
- HAB White Paper, Public Involvement Evaluation (version 7, revised June 23, 2002)
- TPA FY 2007/2008 Communications/Public Involvement Strategic Plan
- Public Involvement Strategic Planning: A guide for assisting in today's workshop (Gerry Pollet's memo)
- Hanford Public Involvement Survey – unedited responses (December 2008)
- Summary of the public involvement survey (Ken Niles)
- TC&WM EIS Board presentation (Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP; September 2008)
- Public Involvement for the Site-Wide (Ron Skinnarland, Ecology)
- Draft Frequently Asked Questions: Hanford's Site-Wide Permit (Madeleine Brown, Ecology)
- Draft State of the Site Strategy Map (Nolan Curtis, Ecology)

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Bob Parazin
Norma Jean Germond	Larry Lockrem	Maynard Plahuta
Harold Heacock	Laura Mueller	Gerry Pollet
Steve Hudson	Ken Niles	Helen Wheatley (phone)
Paige Knight		

Others

Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP	Annette Carlson, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Barb Wise, FH
	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Peter Bengtson, WCH
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	