

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
November 1, 2006
Hood River, OR**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Tri-Party Agency Quarterly Update – Look Ahead, Look Back 1
Review of HAB Advice and Responses 5
Public Involvement and Communication Committee 2007 Work Plan..... 6
2007 Budget Meetings 8
Committee Business..... 10
Handouts 10
Attendees..... 10

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Helen Wheatley, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The June committee meeting summary was adopted.

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

Department of Energy-Office of River Protection

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, provided a status update on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). Mary Beth said work is currently focused on geologic data development in support of the groundwater model and associated boring log quality assurance (QA) issues. She said there were technical issues and QA took longer than anticipated. She noted DOE-ORP is also developing information in support of the Waste Management Alternatives for on- and off-site waste.

Mary Beth noted that Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) identified a Technical Review Group (TRG) in support of the groundwater model; a kick-off meeting and site tour was held in September, and open house invitations were extended to tribes and stakeholders.

The draft TC&WM EIS development schedule slipped due to issues related to QA work required for data efforts. The groundwater model will be ready for draft EIS use in July

2007, and DOE-HQ will review the draft in October 2007. The draft EIS release is scheduled for February 2008 and the final will be published in November 2008.

Mary Beth said the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB, or the Board) identified five members to help communicate, coordinate information, and identify workshop topic areas with the TRG, which was formed to provide technical assistance to the groundwater modeling component of the TC&WM EIS. The self-selected members are Ken Gaspar, Jerri Main, Dirk Dunning, Larry Lockrem, and Dick Smith, representing a range of technical and policy interests. The TRG will meet in December 2006, February 2007, and March 2007.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Madeleine Brown, Ecology, noted Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) 2+2 Permit modification is in a comment period from October 9 through November 27. There is a public hearing at the Richland Ecology office on November 9.

Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, presented a DOE-RL update. She noted DOE hopes to issue the final Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review draft this month; approximately 300 comments were submitted. Karen said 300 Area risk assessment workshops are ongoing and DOE wants to coordinate them with HAB activities. While there is not a formal comment period, DOE is seeking Board input on the groundwater management plan and will keep the Board informed as groundwater is on the Board's priority list. Karen also noted the draft Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Engineering Evaluation/Cost Assessment (EE/CA) will be available in the winter or spring.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry Pollet asked if additional HAB members could work with the EIS team; Mary Beth said it is possible, but envisioned a three to six member group to maintain manageability.
- Helen asked if the Board knew about this communication group. Cathy McCague said HAB members working with the TRG will communicate and coordinate with the committees, specifically the River and Plateau and Tank Waste Committees, and will report to the Board through them.
- Betty Tabbutt was concerned how information will be brought back to the entire Board; Cathy said it is a working group similar to issue managers, who go through the proper committee channels and to the Board. Mary Beth said the intent was not to exclude, but to identify particular people to take the lead and serve as liaisons.

- Mary Beth gave an example of how DOE envisioned the group functioning: At a groundwater vadose zone issue manager workshop, some people took the lead to set an agenda and organize the meeting. They communicated to other Board members about the workshop, its topics, and goals. The group helped identify what people wanted to learn and identified topic areas. She said these are not the only people following the TC&WM EIS, but they volunteered to help coordinate and act as a communication liaison through the process.
- Norma Jean Germond asked if there was a particular timeframe for getting back to the Board with issues. Mary Beth thought timeframes depended on topical area, such as HAB scoping advice. Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec/DOE-ORP, added the intent is to take information back to the Board on a regular basis, and not necessarily wait for the next Board meeting. She suggested sending information out electronically.
- Susan Leckband added that most of the five Board members attend both River and Plateau and Tank Waste Committee meetings, making it easier to diffuse information, get updates, and coordinate between committees.
- Betty thought the TC&WM EIS schedule showed a small opportunity for public involvement. Mary Beth said the schedule was not as tight as it appeared. The groundwater model will be ready for use in the draft EIS by July 2007. Mary Beth said writing the draft EIS will begin between July 2007 and October 2007, followed by a DOE-HQ review, and finally published in February.
- Greg deBruler said the SAIC does not have previous Hanford experience – is the analysis run by SAIC? Mary Beth said SAIC is running the model and TRG is advising SAIC on various technical issues. The TRG are not SAIC employees.
- Susan Leckband asked if the Board would have the opportunity to look at the draft TC&WM EIS prior to DOE-HQ submittal. Mary Beth believed DOE-HQ would review it first, as it has in the past.
- Helen asked if Ecology and DOE are developing or maintaining an issues resolution list. Mary Beth said an issue list is maintained on the Ecology website. Madeleine Brown, Ecology, said it is updated at a “big picture” level and is not very detailed. Helen Wheatley thought the concept of the list was to keep the public apprised of when Ecology is not in agreement with DOE.
- Helen asked how the WTP public hearing is being advertised; Madeleine said it is advertised on Tri-Cities radio and in a legal notice, distributed to the HAB, the listserv, and to Ecology’s mailing list. It was also announced in the Fall 2006 Hanford Update and to stakeholders in meetings starting in September. Madeleine also confirmed that HAB WTP advice will be included in the comment record.
- Susan Leckband asked if there was a draft groundwater management plan available; Karen will check and let the Board know when it is available.

- Gerry and Jerry Peltier attended the recent 100 and 300 Area river corridor baseline risk assessment workshop, and appreciated the welcome they received. Jerry thought the contractor seemed to expand the scope instead of narrow it, and there were more “unknowns.” Gerry disagreed, and felt the workshop was not what the Board and public expected it to be. He thought it was focused on a small portion of the river corridor, and said it is supposed to be a cumulative baseline risk assessment. Karen Lutz said she would look into it, and asked if that concern had been communicated to DOE. Gerry said the risk assessment advice (under development) is urgent because of differing risk assessment expectations.
- Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, announced upcoming public WTP status updates:
 - November 6: South Portland Rotary
 - November 8: Gresham Rotary
 - November 28: Milwaukee Rotary
- Erik estimated approximately 200 people total attended the Kennewick and Seattle State of the Site meetings. Nolan Curtis clarified that head counts, including agency employees, were taken at both meetings at 7:30 pm. The Tri-Cities meeting had 123 people in attendance, and the Seattle meeting had 83 people. In the Tri-Cities, workers compensation issues dominated, while cleanup issues dominated the Seattle meeting.
- Karen said a State of the Site interim overview summary is posted on the Hanford website. Gerry said there needs to be a detailed summary of the meetings, including comments and responses. Karen responded that it is not a comprehensive summary and they are still responding and collecting comments. She said if the agencies did not have an answer to a particular question at a State of the Site meeting, they collected that person’s contact information and made a commitment to find the answer and respond.
- Natalie Troyer presented a Heart of America Northwest meeting evaluation assessing the effectiveness of State of the Site meeting notice. Out of the twenty responses received, most people cited weekly newspapers such as the Stranger and Seattle Weekly as the best means of advertisement.
- Barb Wise heard State of the Site audience suggestions to not advertise in large Seattle newspapers like the Seattle PI, but to use the calendar section because it is more cost effective and is posted online.
- Nolan said Seattle State of the Site advertisement included KUOW 94.9 radio, UW Daily, the Stranger, and the Seattle Weekly. The Stranger and the Seattle Weekly included online announcements. Erik Olds confirmed a press release was issued announcing each meeting, and local public interest groups were utilized.

- Susan Leckband attended the Kennewick State of the Site meeting with the HAB display and spoke with many people about the HAB and the Hanford Site.

Review of HAB Advice and Responses

Helen Wheatley discussed past advice and responses, including a brief review of the following:

- State of the Site (Advice #191)
- CERCLA Five Year Review (Advice #190)
- Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (Advice #184)
- Contract Management and Upcoming Major Contracts (Advice #182)

Committee Discussion

- Norma Jean Germond commented on the improvement in agency response over the last few years.
- Susan Leckband noted the responsibility of tracking and following up on advice and agency responses lies with the issue manager. Helen agreed – the issue manager is responsible for bringing the response to the committee and deciding if the response is adequate. If not, it should be discussed before the full Board.
- Betty asked if responses are only discussed at the Board when the committee deems the response inadequate; Cathy said that is usually the case.
- Betty asked if agencies can get clarification directly from the issue manager. Barb Wise said agencies do not often know who the issue manager is, but could call the committee chair, illustrating the importance of issue manager-committee communication.
- Cathy said agency representatives are welcome to attend committee meetings for clarification so they could respond appropriately to advice, like John Eschenburg, DOE-ORP, did. Sharon Braswell said he appreciated the opportunity and feels better equipped to respond to the advice.
- Susan Leckband thought an issue manager tracking system should be implemented to help committees determine if a response is adequate. She also thought an issue manager should be identified for each piece of advice.
- Jerry discussed quality of response versus implementation, such as determining if the State of the Site meetings were consistent with HAB advice – was the advice clear or was it simply not followed? Betty agreed, and said that after analyzing the response, the event or behavior should be analyzed to see if it followed the response and advice. Susan Hughs suggested adding implementation evaluation to the issue manager job description.

- Helen said it could make sense to have semi-permanent issue managers for repetitive events, such as the State of the Site meetings.

Public Involvement and Communication Committee 2007 Work Plan

The committee discussed and identified issues to include in the 2007 Work Plan:

Issue	Primary Issue Manager	Other Issue Manager(s)
Issue manager identification		
State of the Site	Norma Jean Germond	Helen Wheatley, Gerry Pollet
Budget meetings	Helen Wheatley	Gerry Pollet, Susan Leckband
Contract management	Gerry Pollet	Susan Hughs
Public involvement activities	Helen Wheatley	
TC&WM EIS	Susan Leckband	
CERCLA Five Year Review	Greg deBruler	
End state discussion/ stewardship	Jerry Peltier	
Evaluation of public involvement activities	Helen Wheatley	
River corridor baseline risk assessment	Gerry Pollet	Jerry Peltier
New budget baseline	Gerry Pollet	

Committee Discussion

- Helen suggested the committee review Executive Committee priorities. She also thought PIC committee and Board interaction should be analyzed, not just agency interaction.
- Susan Leckband discussed the role of the PIC committee and how it integrates with other committees. She suggested the committee focus on a few key issues and allow the other committees to focus on issues within their specialties. She thought there would be a natural flow to the PIC committee because of cross-committee membership.
- Susan Hughs noted the committee should be careful not to extract public involvement from other issues. *The committee should ensure public involvement is integrated into all processes and issues.* Susan Leckband agreed that all committees should think about public involvement when developing advice. She said sometimes DOE wants public involvement advice separately, and the committees need to think about how to meet the needs of the Board and the agencies.

- Helen read from the HAB Leadership Draft Priorities Memo. Priorities included improving communication with agencies; improve individual seat and Board effectiveness; improve dialogue with responses from agencies; communicate Board successes; and ensure the public involvement process is sound. Susan Leckband thought the committee did much of that currently and should document it.
- Betty warned that the public will not attend a multitude of public meetings and the committee should avoid such recommendations. Susan Hughs noted *public involvement does not necessarily mean public meetings – there are many tools to use.*
- Gerry said the committee should monitor budget re-baselining as it develops, and identify public involvement opportunities.
- Sharon Braswell commented that the five members interfacing with the Technical Review Group will be looking at public involvement and communication as well. Cathy suggested an update from that group at the next meeting.
- Nolan suggested the committee describe end goals and values for the agencies rather than implementation particulars. He also asked the committee to consider alternative methods of reaching the public and how to expand the audience. Helen said it would also be helpful for agencies to communicate particular questions or issues they would like the committee to specifically address.
- Susan Leckband thought the PIC committee needs to meet more frequently and not just the day before the Board meeting (depending on the Board budget). Norma Jean agreed it is difficult to develop advice the evening before the Board meeting.
- Gerry thought the PIC committee should continue meeting the Wednesday before the Board meeting, but suggested the committee chair request additional meetings as necessary.
- Susan Leckband noted the possibility of joint committee meetings, and Betty Tabbutt suggested utilizing conference calls.
- Susan Leckband noted the Board is asking for additional funding and more control over the Board budget. She said the Board and committees should identify how many meetings they anticipate needing to provide reason for additional funding.
- Jerry thought the committee has a good opportunity to actually measure success, such as a large turnout at a public meeting. Greg deBruler said the public needs a reason to attend meetings, which means having a format to increase dialogue. He said the public also has to be somewhat educated to foster interest to attend a meeting.

2007 Budget Meetings

Helen asked the committee to review and discuss past HAB Advice #169 on budget workshops, and how they can provide input on meeting dates, locations, announcements, and outreach opportunities for next year's budget meetings. Helen said there is a trend of issuing advice, it not being followed, and the committee issuing the same type of advice again.

Helen developed a tentative budget meeting proposal, which includes informational regional outreach meetings and separate formal budget workshops. She thought having general budget outreach prior to the budget release would help educate people, raise interest and increase public comment. She thought there is usually not enough time to comment on the budget.

Committee Discussion

- Committee members were frustrated with the lack of detail at budget meetings and the time shortage for meaningful public input.
- Helen thought there should be public input on both the proposed budget and the final budget. She said the public is not given a good opportunity to comment on proposed budgets.
- Betty thought the public does not understand that *policy is budget and budget is policy*. She said the Board identifies policy values and hopes they are translated into a budget. She thought holding an early priorities and policy meeting would be useful.
- The committee agreed that budget public meetings should identify public values and goals.
- Gerry agreed, and thought budget meetings could be called long-term cleanup priority meetings. He also noted the Board's repeated request for a new budget baseline, and the budget meetings should discuss that.
- Nolan said DOE is supposed to prove they requested enough money to meet TPA milestones. Often, he said, DOE held budget briefings with Ecology within a day of the budget's release. He agreed timing is problematic, and DOE is faced with the difficulty of receiving a budget and deciding how to use it, rather than the other way around. Nolan asked the committee to consider how the process can be more effective, and how to resolve the timing issue.
- Gerry agreed that timing is an issue, and suggested public review take place in March or April to allow time for meaningful comment. In reference to DOE's budget briefings with Ecology, Gerry suggested inviting HAB members as they did in the past.

- Karen Lutz asked the committee to consider values and principles when looking at the budget. She said it would be helpful to have a “trade-off” list identifying priority shifts if a budget is insufficient.
- Susan Leckband liked the idea of two separate meetings, and thought an educational process would enable the public to provide meaningful input. Gerry also liked the educational proposal, but thought the public would not attend a multitude of meetings. Helen suggested a panel format for the budget meetings. Three identified areas of interest are: 1) Long-term impact, 2) presidential budget, and 3) two year output. The committee also agreed on the need to hear multiple voices.
- The committee identified Helen, Gerry, and Susan Leckband as budget workshop issue managers. Cathy noted issue managers can meet separately to help flesh out ideas for advice and next steps.

Committee Business

- Next steps:
 - 2007 Work Plan
 - Budget workshop
 - Continuing public involvement and the HAB
 - Evaluation of the Community Relations Plan
 - US Ecology site and MTCA
 - Public involvement tools
- The committee will have a conference call in November.
- Helen suggested a conference call in January in addition to November.
- Gerry suggested the PIC committee attend the joint Tank Waste and Budgets and Contracts Committee meeting on December 5.

Handouts

- Budget Meetings Proposal – Helen Wheatley
- Seattle State of the Site Meeting Evaluation Findings – Natalie Troyer, Heart of America Northwest
- Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS Update – Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Susan Coburn Hughs	Betty Tabbutt	
Greg deBruler	Natalie Troyer	
Norma Jean Germond	Helen Wheatley	
Susan Leckband		
Jerry Peltier		
Gerry Pollet		

Others

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP (phone)	Dennis Faulk, EPA (phone)	Barb Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Innovations