

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
November 2, 2005
Seattle, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Upcoming Public Involvement Activities..... 1
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)
5-Year Review 4
2006 PIC Public Involvement Plan..... 6
Video Presentation 7
Review of Static Board Display..... 7
Committee Business..... 9
Action Items/Commitments 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

Norma Jean Germond, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The September meeting summary was adopted.

Upcoming Public Involvement Activities

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Karen Lutz, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) presented a list of prioritized upcoming Hanford Site public involvement activities. Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford (FH), explained that an informational piece entitled “Look Ahead, Look Back,” was originally developed to get feedback on the priorities of Hanford stakeholders. Currently, the TPA agencies are looking for feedback on public involvement priorities from the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) and the committee.

Committee Discussion

- Norma Jean said the TPA agencies’ list of prioritized public involvement activities is helpful information as the Board works to frame its public involvement strategy.

- *Karen asked the committee what the Board's public involvement priorities are?* The committee identified the DOE Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Process and DOE State of the Site (SOS) meetings as public involvement priorities.
- Karen indicated that the budget process begins in the spring. Although the SOS meetings are currently held throughout the year, they are designed to serve as a report card for DOE on the previous year's activities at Hanford and a look ahead to the planned activities for the coming year. Therefore, based on the budget calendar, she indicated it makes more sense to have SOS meetings in the fall, as opposed to throughout the year. *Karen asked how DOE could organize its budget meetings based on the Board's priorities? To make SOS meetings as effective as possible, she asked the committee when and where DOE should hold the meetings?*
- Greg deBruler commented that with the potential funding cuts to Hanford work activities, the 2008 Budget Process meetings should be of interest to the entire region. Therefore, the meetings should be held regionally in Portland, Hood River, Seattle, etc. He said key DOE managers and decision makers should attend the budget meetings. He believes that since they have come to past meetings, there is no reason they should not be able to attend the 2008 meetings.
- Susan Leckband agreed that key managers from Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) should attend the 2008 budget meetings.
- *Karen asked the committee how last year's budget meetings went?* Greg said past DOE budget meetings provided real financial numbers and line items that could be evaluated, which last year's meetings did not.
- Pam Larsen said the Board is mostly interested to know which work activities are above the line and which are below the line. Susan said that information was previously provided at past budget meetings.
- *Joe Voice, DOE-RL, clarified that committee members are suggesting DOE provide an integrated priority list?* Susan said it is clear there are going to be large budget cuts, so it would be important to see an integrated work priorities list at the 2008 budget meetings.
- Since new DOE managers and staff may not be familiar with the priorities list that used to be provided at budget meetings, Greg suggested the PIC supply a copy of an old priorities list to DOE as an example of what is expected. Barb Wise will provide a copy of a priorities list to DOE.
- There was general committee agreement that it would be good for DOE to provide a priorities list at its budget meetings.
- Rebecca Sayre, Heart of America Northwest (HOANW), said HOANW members want the opportunity to participate in the budget meetings, to better direct their lobbying efforts.
- *Norma Jean asked what is the timeframe for the 2008 budget meetings?* Greg emphasized his belief that they should be held in the early spring, perhaps early March.

- Greg commented that it might be a good idea for the EPA and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) to look at potential pitfalls in DOE's list of priorities. Dennis explained that one difficulty in EPA's ability to review DOE's priorities list is that EPA, like the Board, is not sure what the Fiscal Year 2006 budget will be.
- Joe clarified that the budget workshop required by the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) in the spring is meant to discuss the budget formulation for 2008. At the 2008 budget meeting, Pam emphasized DOE should first inform the public about the FY06 and FY07 budgets and then discuss formulation of the 2008 budget.
- *Karen asked the committee how the Board defines SOS meetings?* She indicated the Board's perspective would help DOE in its SOS meeting development process. Susan said the annual budget meetings should be connected with SOS meetings. A fall meeting could discuss planned and completed activities for the previous year, while the spring meeting could focus on budget formulation for the upcoming year. Several committee members indicated that connecting the budget meetings and SOS meetings provides the full context for Hanford activities. Dennis added that coupling the meetings would provide an early indication of the public's priorities going into the budget formulation process, which is a more proactive approach.
- *Norma Jean asked whether the November SOS meeting would be any different than the September SOS meeting in Portland?* Tim Hill, Ecology, said the meetings are similar, except for the public discussion portion. The November SOS meeting will start with 20 minutes for public discussion. The areas of Hanford funding, off-site waste, groundwater cleanup, tank waste treatment, and waste Vitrification will frame the discussion.
- Dennis said there would be an evaluation of the SOS meeting available at the meeting, and asked committee members planning to attend to provide feedback to the TPA agencies to help improve future meetings.
- Norma Jean encouraged committee members to look at the TPA agencies' public involvement priorities list to see if they agree with the prioritized activities on the list.
- Susan commented that the Tank Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be a critical activity for the list of prioritized activities. *She asked if it was appropriate to presume a June timeframe for the Tank Waste EIS?* Eric Olds, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said a June timeframe could not be presumed since additional modeling needs to be done. The timeframe could be presumed to be sometime in late 2006 (calendar year).
- Norma Jean said she hopes to have a longer discussion of the Board's public involvement priorities at the February Board meeting. Barb said there is an effort by the TPA agencies to update the Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities document on a quarterly basis for discussion at the TPA Quarterly public involvement meetings. The document available by accessing the DOE-Hanford homepage (www.hanford.gov/). Susan added that she believes a link to the list should be on the websites for the Board and the TPA agencies. She emphasized this document should be changed as it is updated. Tim said he would put it on Ecology's website, and that

a discussion of public involvement priorities would be part of the TPA Quarterly meeting.

- The committee agreed there is a need for regional SOS meetings.
- For Budget meetings, the committee agreed a March timeframe is best, DOE should provide an integrated priority list, regional meetings should be held, a list of activities that were not funded in previous year should be provided, and DOE-HQ representatives should attend the meetings.
- Dennis encouraged the committee to think about public involvement issues regarding B/C Cribs, since the official dispute between EPA and DOE has been resolved and a draft Proposed Plan will be issued for public review sometime in the future.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) 5-Year Review

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, provided an overview of the CERCLA 5-year review planning process. Cliff Clark, DOE-RL, was available via phone to answer the committee's specific questions about the 5-year review. Karen explained that DOE representatives have been discussing the 5-year review with interested members of both the PIC and RAP committees. Those discussions instigated DOE to develop a public involvement plan to assist DOE in meeting its 5-year review requirements based on public input. She provided a draft plan of what has been done to date, including potential input points going forward. The draft plan indicates when various pieces of the review can be expected to be available. She said she would like to talk more generally about input points, as well as to define the next proposed issue manager workshop.

Greg deBruler provided a review of the issue manager workshop and subsequent conference calls. The workshop involved interested committee members, any other interested parties, and TPA agencies discussing the scope and depth of the 5-year review. He explained that the scope of the 5-year review is set by existing requirements, but issues concerning the depth of the review were open for discussion. One of the main questions discussed at the workshop was how to assess whether remediation activities are protective? The workshop and conference calls laid out several public involvement input points captured in the draft public involvement plan:

- November or December: Conduct stakeholder workshop sponsored by DOE
- End of December: DOE will respond to comments made during DOE workshop
- January: A meeting or conference call will be arranged to discuss outstanding issues
- January/February: As draft sections of the plan are finished, DOE will distribute sections to issue managers and other interested parties
- February: Draft of plan provided to stakeholders
 - If the draft plan goes out before public workshops, and there are several questions and changes to be made, then there needs to be an input point for addressing those changes before the draft is issued for public

comment by the end of February.

Committee Discussion

- Greg said an effort is being made to make the 5-year review as complete and finished as possible before it is issued, to avoid having to resolve a lot of changes or additions. He believes there is a need for a feedback loop in the process, detailed in the public involvement plan schedule, to address changes made after the draft plan is distributed to interested parties for review and before the draft plan is issued for public review. Karen agreed a feedback loop is applicable, but there is still a need to figure out exactly what that feedback loop will be.
- Karen said DOE is committed to meeting the February timeframe for completing a draft of the 5-year review. Dennis agreed that he considers this a firm commitment as well.
- Greg said he believes the 5-year review is critical, and it is important to make sure it is as complete as possible. Dennis cautioned the committee not to try and do too much in the limited timeframe available; however, he said it is important to identify issues that can be resolved later by setting commitment deadlines for addressing missing information pieces.
- Helen Wheatley said the proposed dates for another workshop (November 29th, or December 5th, 7th, or 8th) are not far off. She emphasized the need for time to discuss workshop specifics, and to determine how it will fit into the general design of the 5-year review. *She asked what type of public involvement DOE is looking for from the workshop? Is there agreement between the type of public involvement the Board is interested in and what DOE is looking for?*
- The committee was reminded that DOE is sponsoring the workshop, and the role of Board members is to provide input. Dennis said Board member input is beneficial to the 5-year review development process, especially in determining inputs.
- Greg indicated that Gerry put together list of issues and objectives for discussion during the development of the 5-year review. Gerry's list provides specific examples of what needs to be incorporated in the 5-year review, how to go about assessing protectiveness, and what tools should be used in the assessment protectiveness. These issues can provide a foundation for the next 5-year review meeting.
- Helen said she looked at public comment from the previous CERCLA 5-year review done in 2000. She said an inadequate public comment process was the main issue of concern. She indicated there seemed to be a real disconnect between individuals making public comment to evaluate protectiveness and DOE's comment response in the document. She believes this is indicative of a communication failure. If a public workshop is conducted to address protectiveness, she said she would like to know how issues and comments from the workshop would be incorporated into the 5-year review.
- Dennis said the TPA agencies would consider action items from the last 5-year review to see if they have been accomplished, look at the status of the cleanup

process, and will go back to the remedial regulations to see what is required to achieve protectiveness. This will generate questions about the appropriateness of methods and tools being used in the review.

- *Gerry Pollet commented that the criteria for protectiveness has changed, and asked how this information will be considered in the development process for the 5-year review?* He expressed the need for a workshop and a process that demonstrates public participation is important and has an impact. He emphasized the need for comments and a response to comments on the scope of the review. Furthermore, Gerry believes a workshop and a public meeting are needed in the Tri-Cities, with a clear notice that Ecology address what decision announcements it will use.
- There was general committee agreement to hold the next workshop on December 7th. Several committee members volunteered to be involved in the workshop, including Gerry, Norma Jean, and Greg. A time would be arranged for a conference call to work out the workshop agenda.

2006 PIC Public Involvement Plan

The committee reviewed its public involvement priorities list from the 2006 Board Priorities List.

- The HAB static display board layout is being developed.
- Outreach to the University of Washington has been done to encourage people to attend the November SOS meeting.
- The committee discussed the suggestion to develop a process to actively seek opportunities for Board members to serve as speakers on various Hanford issues.
 - The committee recognizes the need for a process to identify speakers for speeches, films, etc.
 - Greg commented that the process would involve a “speakers bureau,” available on the Board and TPA agency websites to identify Board members who have an expertise in a specific Hanford issue area and who like to discuss these issues. He said establishing a group of available speakers increases the accessibility of the Board and enhances the Board’s outreach network.
 - Pam added that identifying speakers associated with various Hanford issues could also facilitate the referral of interested outside parties to the best available representatives associated with Hanford (e.g. DOE, Hanford contractors, TPA agencies, Board members, etc).
 - Susan expressed concern that Board member speakers would be perceived as speaking for the Board when they should not be. To avoid this issue, Greg said speakers could focus specifically on presenting the Board’s positions, or they could stick to broader educational issues.
 - Rebecca Sayre, HOANW, suggested including a disclaimer explaining that speakers do not represent the position of the Board.

- Norma Jean commented that the State of Oregon Department of Energy has a generic video that provides a broad overview, without getting into specific issues.
- Dennis said developing a list of speakers could be done, but determining whether a speaker is viewed as an individual or as speaking for the Board is tricky. He said if he speaks to the public about an issue, people perceive him as coming from the EPA perspective.
- Examining the Board's mission statement, Helen indicated the Hanford website can be used to help Board members communicate with their constituencies. Therefore, having Board member speakers could be construed as enhancing communication with their constituencies; however, she indicated it would be important for speakers to identify themselves and that their perspective is not reflective of the Board.
- In his experience, Gerry said most people want a general introduction to an issue or to have more information on a recent decision made about an issue. Gerry said Ecology has web links and descriptions of partner organizations on their website for a similar purpose. He suggested the committee consider wording for the Board's website that states speakers are available from various groups represented on the Board, and provide links to member organizations and/or contact names.
- The committee agreed individual Board members should not represent the Board when speaking publicly. Susan and Greg agreed to discuss this issue further and bring recommendations back to the committee and Board.

Video Presentation

The committee viewed four videos, provided by Pam Larsen, to consider for use in future public presentations and public outreach opportunities. The topics covered by the four videos were: 1) Regional Closure of U Plant; 2) Federal Budget Process; 3) Tank Closure; and, 4) Groundwater. Pam said copies of the videos are available to interested individuals. She will also announce this at the Board meeting. She suggested providing the videos to people who are interested in a particular issue but cannot attend a meeting. Pam also remarked that these videos could be a potential tool for Board members when they are speaking about Hanford. The videos also enable those who live outside the Tri-Cities region to see what Hanford looks like.

Committee Discussion

There was general committee agreement that the videos would be a good tool to use in public presentations and outreach efforts on Hanford issues.

Review of Static Board Display

Susan Leckband presented the background and genesis of the Board static display board. She spoke to DOE and they agreed to fund the display board, and she indicated

production is already arranged. She said the display board is a good opportunity to use at various venues where the Board meets. The display board will provide public access to Board materials and information to learn about what the Board does.

Committee Discussion

- The committee reviewed the layout and content of the display board. Proposed changes and additions included:
 - Several committee members suggested including contact phone numbers for the TPA agencies. Tim Hill, Ecology, suggested using the Hanford Information number as the single number for contacting the Board. Susan said that number has not worked several times. The committee discussed the appropriate DOE number to include. Karen explained that it would be important to get the DOE communications office numbers on the display board.
 - The TPA agencies will provide the appropriate contact numbers to EnviroIssues and Susan for inclusion in the display board information.
 - The committee agreed to include the general TPA Public Involvement calendar, displaying the public involvement activities for all of the TPA agencies and the Board. The link to the calendar website should be included as well. Committee members preferred including a three-month rolling calendar.
 - Jeanie Sedgely said more color contrast should be used for the titles. The committee decided to use a black background with white letters for the title. Greg suggested changing the main title to something that describes the Board's work, such as "Citizens Advising Hanford Cleanup."
 - The committee discussed the size of the Hanford Site to include on the display board, and decided to use 586 square miles as the official size of the site.
 - The committee discussed which pictures should be used on the display board. Susan indicated she prefers a mixture of site photos, work activities, and the Board. She said publicly released aerial photographs of the site are available. Additionally, Susan suggested developing a background graphic of three offset pieces of advice. Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said it would be good to show the site, but the majority of pictures should reflect the Board's work.
 - Committee members said the Barrier Application Decision Criteria flow sheet is a particularly important piece of Board work to showcase.
 - Dennis said the display board increases awareness of the Board's activities. During Board meetings, it would enable people to stop and recognize the work being done by the Board. Although the information presented on the display board is just an overview of the Board, he believes it is nonetheless a very important public outreach tool. Tim added that it would also be important to invite people to attend the meeting when they read information on the display board.

- In addition to the information presented on the display board, Susan suggested additional “take away” information pieces could also be provided in front of the display (e.g. consensus advice, annual reports, etc.).
- Nolan said the display board could be developed into a tri-fold Board brochure.
- The committee agreed that the Board facilitator would be responsible for keeping the display board up to date, especially the public involvement calendar.
- EnviroIssues will make the changes agreed upon by the committee and send the next iteration to Susan for review before the November committee conference call.

Committee Business

- Norma Jean acknowledged all the work done by committee members to encourage attendance for the SOS meeting and November Board meeting.
 - Gerry outlined the panel of university researchers HOANW helped arrange for the November Board meeting. The panel will include:
 - Tim Takaro, Clinical Assistant Professor, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, Simon Frasier University;
 - Bill Rodgers, Stimson Bullitt Professor of Environmental Law, School of Law, University of Washington;
 - Tom Leschine, Director and Professor, School of Marine Affairs;
 - Doug Mercer, Lecturer, Political Geography, University of Washington; and,
 - Dick Morrill, Professor Emeritus, Geography.
- The committee agreed on the need for a committee call on November 17. Topics to be covered during the call include a discussion of the next display board draft and an update on the CERCLA 5-year review and determine additional interest for participation in the 5-year review.
- Susan reported back to the committee that she talked with DOE about listing information on the Board website, and explained DOE agreed to list the membership composition of the Board including links to the membership organizations. Organizations should send appropriate links to the Board’s Webmaster. Dennis suggested the list should be written up and presented to the full Board for approval. The committee agreed this was the appropriate approach.
- The committee did not resolve issues concerning the suggestion to develop a Board speaker’s bureau. Susan commented that the decision to list web links for Board membership organizations and the speaker’s bureau are two different issues.

Action Items/Commitments

- Barb Wise will provide a copy of a priorities list to DOE as a sample of what the Board would like to see at the 2008 budget meetings.
- December 7th was suggested as the date to hold the next CERCLA 5-year review workshop. Several committee members volunteered to be involved in the workshop, including Gerry, Norma Jean, and Greg. A time would be arranged for a conference call to further define the workshop agenda.
- Susan and Greg will discuss issues regarding a Board member speaker's bureau and provide recommendations to the committee.
- The committee will further discuss the idea to list links to Board member organization websites on the Board's website.
- TPA agencies will provide the appropriate contact numbers to EnviroIssues and Susan for inclusion in the display board information.
- EnviroIssues will make the changes to the display board agreed upon by the committee and send the next iteration to Susan for review before the November committee call.

Handouts

- Hanford Site Public Involvement Activities, Fall 2005.
- CERCLA 5-Year Review Public Involvement Plan, DOE-RL, October 31, 2005.
- CERCLA Five-Year Reviews, EPA, October 27, 2005.
- Five Year Review: Public Involvement Goals, Greg deBruler, November 2, 2005.
- Draft HAB display board layout, EnviroIssues, November 2, 2005.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Greg deBruler | Jim Trombold | |
| Norma Jean Germond | | |
| Pam Larsen | Helen Wheatley (by phone) | |
| Susan Leckband | | |
| Gerry Pollet | | |
| Jeanie Sedgely | | |

Others

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Steve Chalk, DOE-RL | Nolan Curtis, Ecology | Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues |
| Cliff Clark, DOE-RL | Tim Hill, Ecology | Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues |
| Karen Lutz, DOE-RL | Ginger Wireman | Barbara Wise, FH |
| Joe Voice, DOE-RL | | Kelly Brazil, Innovation/ORP |
| | Alicia Boyd, EPA | Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec/ORP |
| Erik Olds, DOE-ORP | Dennis Faulk, EPA | Rebecca Sayre, |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | | Public/HOANW |
| | | Pricilla Cole, Public/HOANW |