

Privacy/Security Notice



● CHARTER ● MEMBERS ● WORKSHOPS ● RELATED LINKS ●
● WHAT'S NEW ●

Hanford Openness Workshops
Meeting with DOE-Richland Senior Managers/Next Steps for Openness
February 23, 2000
142 Federal Building, 825 Jadwin, Richland, Washington, 99352

SUMMARY

PARTICIPATING

Mary Lou Blazek, Dirk Dunning, Oregon Office of Energy; Greg deBruler, Columbia River United; Christie Drew, Elaine Faustman, Michael Kern, Todd Martin, Chuck Powers, Donna Prsbrey, Lynn Waishwell, Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP); Norma Jean Germond, Oregon League of Women Voters; Kim Engle, Dave Watrous, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, National Security Analysis Team; Dennis Faulk, EPA; Dick French, Lucy Love, Paul Kruger, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (ORP); Diane Larson, former Hanford worker; Angel McCormack, Carla HighEagle, Nez Perce Tribe; Keith Klein, Harry Boston, Kevin Clarke, Linda Jarnagin, Gail McClure, Bob Rosselli, Yvonne Sherman, Jim Spraklen, Rick Stutheit, Steve Wisness, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office; Nanci Peters, Yakama Nation; Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest; Max Power, Joy Turner, Washington State Department of Ecology; Jim Trombold, Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility.

OPENNESS UPDATES FROM DOE-RICHLAND

Yvonne Sherman said the Department of Energy (DOE)-Richland Reading Room now has a "finding aides" section, because of discussion in the Hanford Openness Workshops (HOW) Information Tools Working Group. The web page that will allow online Freedom of Information Act requests at Hanford is still under construction. Gail Clark, who presented at 1999HOW #5 was recently asked by the Secretary of Energy to locate some documents and, because of the discussion at the last HOW and the recommendation to plan for release in all document review processes, she also plans to send the documents through the review process so they will be ready to go to the public. This was a good test on the process so the HOW have raised awareness at DOE-Richland of ways to operate more openly.

MEETING BUSINESS

Mary Lou Blazek announced that the HOW recently sent letters to the Hanford unions inviting participation in future HOW activities. She also read a letter from the

HOW to the University of Washington commending HOW facilitator Michael Kern and presented him with parting gifts.

Michael Kern reviewed an overhead that CRESA prepared categorizing the DOE-Richland response to the 1999 HOW Report. It put DOE-Richland's responses of 25 HOW recommendations into five categories: "We agree and are implementing/will implement," "We believe this is already implemented," "We disagree, because..." "We suggest you forward this request," and "This would be too expensive." Jim Trombold suggested that the category "too expensive" should be worded "not cost effective."

Participants identified the four responses that suggested the HOW forward its recommendation on to another organization and agreed to ask DOE-Richland to help forward those suggestions.

MEETING WITH DOE-RICHLAND SENIOR MANAGERS

Mary Lou Blazek welcomed DOE-Richland Manager Keith Klein and Office of River Protection (ORP) Manager Dick French to the HOW. She explained that in only nine workshops the HOW have produced two reports, nine fact sheets, and 76 recommendations for only \$30,000 in hard costs to DOE.

Keith Klein thanked the participants for their hard work and stated that cleaning up Hanford relies on people who care. He expressed support for the openness initiative and pointed out that poor communication leads to suspicion, but openness helps to overcome distrust. He said there are always ways for improving openness. He said he was not satisfied with employee health and safety tracking and would like to eliminate pockets where employees "on the front line" fear or don't care about speaking up. He stated that there is always room for improvement in any public involvement process. He expressed respect for the special status of the tribes. He expressed a desire to take advantage of new technologies, to improve the flow of information.

Dick French stated that he shares similar views on openness with Keith. He said that he was at Hanford seven years ago when openness started and things have changed. He stated he could not hope to get Congress to fund the vitrification plant without an open discussion of all the issues. He explained that DOE-Richland and the Office of River Protection share one point of contact in working with the public and the workforce to avoid duplicating efforts.

Jim Trombold expressed concern that the public has to "squeeze" information out of DOE and suggested DOE be more open about problems to the media. Keith Klein stated that DOE no longer "sugarcoats" problems. Dick French told of a recent interview with NBC about the tank farms where he expressed concern about the safety of the River and called Hanford "a ticking time bomb." He and Keith Klein also recently set up editorial boards with the Seattle Post-Intelligence and the Portland Oregonian.

Max Power asked Keith Klein and Dick French if the burden of the past found in historic documents and memories like those shared with Dr. David Michaels on Feb 3, 2000 are worth the investment. Keith Klein said he wants to put his time where it

is needed most and what he is here to do. He suggested people judge DOE on the present and let go of past mistakes. Dick French stated that although openness mistakes are remembered you can only focus on what you can do right now.

Norma Jean Germond expressed concern that important cleanup problems might be forgotten because of the high turnover of Hanford management. For example, there might be a messy trench somewhere that everyone has forgotten about. She stressed the importance of senior managers staying aware of history. Keith Klein agreed and stated that everyone needs to understand the past, so it is not repeated.

Dick French described his surprise at how many people spoke at Dr. David Michael's meeting on February 3, 2000, because he had never before heard workers express fear that their health was affected.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern that past promises for openness have not been kept. He called for participation of all contractors in the Hanford Joint Council for Resolving Employee Concerns and automatic penalization of all contractors for retaliation. He pointed to the Rocky Flats contracts, which contains automatic reprisals for retaliation.

Keith Klein stated that reimbursement may take place at the national level via Dr. Michaels' office. He said that Bechtel Hanford claims their process is better than the Joint Council and he is giving them a chance to demonstrate that. He stated that Fluor Hanford participates in the Joint Council. He said he looks forward to the day when there isn't a need for the Joint Council because the other mechanisms are working, but noted we are not there yet.

Gerry Pollet stated that DOE-Richland has never used its discretion to penalize for retaliation, which has sent a message of tolerance for reprisals to contractors, there is no "sure and certain" penalty. Keith Klein pointed out that people have lost their jobs in management. Gerry Pollet called for a penalization rooted in the contract mechanism. Bob Rosselli stated that in set fee subcontracts, DOE does not have the option of penalizing for retaliation. Dick French stated that several companies who used to work at Hanford lost their contracts because their workforce was unhappy. He expressed concern that it isn't productive to force things on management. He said holding the contractors accountable for the endstate is tightly coupled with keeping the workforce happy.

Mary Lou Blazek clarified that under the new evaluation mechanism, Fluor Hanford can lose fees for inadequate public involvement, but it cannot gain fees. She stated that last year, the Public Involvement Working Group heard that DOE-Richland wasn't getting very much feedback on contractor public involvement and expressed concern that DOE-Richland needs a feedback mechanism. Steve Wisness pointed out that DOE-Richland gets feedback from mechanisms like the Hanford Advisory Board's Public Involvement Committee, the Tri-Party Public Involvement Forums and the Hanford Openness Workshop Report. Keith Klein stated that he will have control over the Fiscal Year 2000 evaluations and that he will use the HOW's suggestions.

Greg deBruler expressed relief that a DOE Secretary has acknowledged health and safety problems at DOE. He stated that the HOW's recommendations are just a starting point. Openness would mean the interviews and Dr. Michael's meeting were just a starting point as well. He suggested creating a new forum to join worker retaliation, worker health and openness. He stated that neither the Hanford Advisory Board nor the Hanford Health Effects Subcommittee focus on worker health. He told of workers who are calling his organization because they cannot find a safe place to go with their concerns.

Keith Klein agreed that its good to give people a venue to communicate but its important give people results as well. Dick French expressed surprise at how management systems filter out bad news—that he could be around Hanford for so long and never hear of these worker concerns.

Jim Trombold suggested Dick French may not have heard about worker's worries because pseudo-macho patriotism creates a tendency to ignore exposure at work. He stated that the workers are now retired and Dr. Michael's meeting provided an opportunity to finally be open. He suggested that now is the time for management to focus on individuals' worries, not on more public meetings.

Max Power suggested that the senior Managers turn to himself, Attorney General Gregoire and others at the State for the history of why Washington State has supported the Hanford Joint Council. He expressed support for the renewed focus on endstates at Hanford and suggested that this is the perfect time to create automatic zero tolerance for reprisals in contracts, like those at Rocky Flats. Keith Klein pointed out that proving reprisals is difficult and Max Power stated that such a finding has to come out of a legitimate process.

Max Power asked the Hanford managers to understand that not all the public involvement needs come from the Tri-Party Agreement. He also pointed out that although informed stakeholders are aware that some of the bad public involvement comes from DOE-Headquarters, the general public doesn't distinguish between DOE-Headquarters and DOE-Richland.

Nancy Peters expressed that there is a trend in the community to pull back from working at Hanford. She explained that although she has worked at Hanford for 21 years and is educated in both hematology and health physics, she will not let her sons apply to work as welders in the vitrification plant construction. She said there are six bone marrow cancers in two blocks in her neighborhood and she sees astounding levels of cancer at the Yakama Nation. She called for help for the tribes who are not as highly funded as the contractors.

Dick French stated that construction of the vitrification plant would not be at the contaminated sites. He said cancer issues are for the doctors to determine and he needs to focus on doing the best job he can on the vitrification plant.

Dirk Dunning thanked the senior managers for visiting the HOW and stated that talking face to face like this is a big part of openness. He explained Russell Jim's idea of "Institutional Alzheimer's," organizations only remember as much as the people involved. He said stakeholders like Russell Jim, himself and Todd Martin

have institutional memory and can recognize the recurring, serious problems. Dirk Dunning said stored data also provides institutional memory, but only if there is a good way of accessing it.

Mary Lou Blazek explained that the HOW plans to take the advice of the DOE-Richland response and forward several recommendations to other federal organizations. She asked if the senior managers would consider co-signing the letters. They agreed to consider it. Mary Lou Blazek will work with Yvonne Sherman in drafting appropriate language for a letter addressing issues in recommendation 99-12.

Elaine Faustman spoke as a member of the public about documentation. She said the recent beryllium findings resulted from documentation. If scientists had access to documents sooner, they may have been able to intervene sooner. The records are now available for issues like beryllium, but for more mundane issues (like noise) science is not being as responsive—providing neither new studies nor good records.

Diane Larson told her story as an example of a worker who was retaliated against. She expressed concern that although the contractor changes, the management and the problems stay. She said reprisals and loss of career are issues today, not just of the past. She stated that its good that the senior managers are here today to hear what people in the lower levels are going through. She expressed concern that there seem to be problems that do not get communicated up the management chain.

Carla HighEagle expressed concern that the Tribal Involvement section of the Richland response is woefully inadequate in addressing how DOE will implement treaty obligations. She said it should have added the issues raised in the 1998 HOW report. She said the tribes educate and reeducate new leaders because the respect is not institutionalized. The loss of tribal land, culture, and diet is not part of the past. Tribal members live it today. She asked the senior managers to visit the Nez Perce Tribe to discuss tribal issues. She expressed the hope that the senior managers' hearts are in their words. Keith Klein and Dick French both expressed a desire to visit the Nez Perce Tribe.

Max Power acknowledged the DOE staff who have worked with the HOW, including Yvonne Sherman, Linda Jarnagin, Paul Kruger, Kim Engle, Rick Stutheit, Gail McClure and others. He said the staff has explained complicated issues, so the participants can understand and talk intelligently with the senior management. This is an example of real openness.

MEETING WITH DOE-RICHLAND AND ORP MANAGERS

Employee Openness

Managers: Bob Rosselli, Business Services; Harry Boston, Site Transition.

Yvonne Sherman explained that the only aspects of openness that are general enough to include in training for all employees are health and safety and employee concerns which is why response 99-4 says DOE is already including openness in new employee orientations. Michael Kern expressed concern that openness and

the connections between different aspects of openness need to be explicitly spelled out in training. Bob Rosselli agreed with this recommendation and said openness is a value that helps the mission. It can be incorporated in training and orientations. Michael Kern suggested using executive summaries of HOW reports and/or the Fact Sheets in training.

Nanci Peters suggested including tribal concerns and tribal sites on property in training and suggested taking the information from the Tribal Openness Workshop (1999 HOW #4).

Harry Boston asked the HOW for suggestions for specific words they might review and consider adding to the training. He suggested the HOW distill ideas in the executive summaries down to a sentence.

Greg deBruler suggested the HOW see the training so the HOW could provide more feedback. Bob Rosselli said they don't actively target openness in the training and the HOW has a good idea. Greg deBruler suggested bringing in outsiders to train the managers about openness.

Harry Boston said the DOE training tries to provide transparency and communicate with workers. He praised the new ORP policy on Environment, Safety, Health and Quality and said the HOW's recommendations influenced it. Greg deBruler expressed concern that often the changes from a new policy don't impact through the management structure. Bob Rosselli said its not the policy but rather actions that get the public and workers to understand DOE's objectives, what need to be done, and what DOE is doing. These actions will soon create visible changes.

Jim Trombold wondered whether workers understand openness and why it is necessary. He wondered if "informed consent" is part of the training and explained that in medicine, "informed consent" is part of openness. DOE did not respond.

Performance Measures

Managers: Bob Rosselli, Business Services; Harry Boston, Site Transition; Paul Kruger, Office of River Protection.

Harry Boston stated that openness is DOE's responsibility and openness evaluation of contractors falls to DOE.

Gerry Pollet asked why there are no measures, accountability nor incentives in contracts to promote public openness. He expressed concern that without contractual incentives there is no "zero tolerance." He called for clear performance metrics and penalties for contractors who fail to be open. He expressed concern that ORP has no incentives for openness. Paul Kruger said that ORP will have incentives, consistent with their desired outcomes.

Bob Rosselli agreed that DOE needs to gather information from those who are effected by the contractor's performance to better evaluate the contractor's work. Evaluation will always be subjective but DOE's job is to get the most input before making judgements. Mary Lou Blazek expressed concern that DOE has no mechanism to get feedback from the public. Gerry Pollet pointed to the Public

Involvement evaluation mechanism in the HOW report and asked whether it was going to be used. Bob Rosselli and Harry Boston expressed interest in using the metrics for Public Involvement measurement.

Paul Kruger explained that the strategy of the ORP is to incentivize specific outcomes and use the contracts' conditional payment of fees clause to decrease fees. He is working on a team to design a metric to trip the clause and expressed interest in metrics to measure openness. He asked for feedback by April. Gerry Pollet pointed to the metrics in the HOW report. Gerry Pollet expressed concern that since DOE has never penalized contractors for failing to be open that discretion is on their side and DOE is tolerant.

Paul Kruger pointed to the conditional payment of fee clause in both the Fluor and CH2M Hill contracts. He said it is the first time a contract at Hanford has such language and he encouraged the HOW to build on it. He agreed that metrics need to be put into place.

Harry Boston suggested participants contact his office if they wanted to discuss these issues outside of the workshop.

Tribal Openness

Manager: Kevin Clarke, RL Indian Nations Program.

Kevin Clarke described the steps DOE has made toward Tribal Openness, which were included in response 99-25.

Kim Engle described how the National Security Analysis Team used the comments they heard in the Tribal Openness Workshop (1999 HOW #4) to set aside old photographs they were reviewing which might be sensitive to tribes—for example pre-construction landscape and sacred sites. He encouraged the tribes to each take advantage of the invitation to review the photos and help explain more of the issues that are sensitive to them.

Carla HighEagle expressed concern that the DOE-Richland document failed to address government-to-government issues. Yvonne Sherman explained that the response addressed only the recommendation about declassification included in the report. Carla HighEagle said the response should have been a full progression from last year's response. Nanci Peters suggested that the response should have included issues from the central themes on the Tribal Concerns Fact Sheet. Kevin Clarke agreed to add such information.

Public Involvement

Managers: Steve Wisness, Acting Director, Office of Intergovernmental Public and Institutional Affairs for Gail McClure, RL Public Involvement Program; Lucy Love for Peter Bengtson, ORP Public Involvement Program.

Steve Wisness explained that he is temporarily filling Karen Randolph's position and that DOE announced today that Marla Marvin, previously of Senator Patty Murray's staff, will be appointed the next Director of the Office of Intergovernmental Public and Institutional Affairs.

Michael Kern asked how DOE was addressing the HOW recommendation to initiate an annual stakeholder evaluation of public involvement activities about Hanford, which the Working Group designed to help make the evaluations more formal. Steve Wisness agreed that the HOW matrix is a good starting point.

Joy Turner expressed concern that an evaluation needs proper funding to be done right. Mary Lou Blazek stated that an annual review does not have to be expensive. The recommended 3x5 cards after meetings are one example of a simple way to improve public involvement evaluation. Gerry Pollet stated that the most important part of an evaluation is that it can be trusted—that its impartially gathered and actually used.

Information Tools and Declassification

Managers: Yvonne Sherman, Office of External Affairs; Rick Stutheit, Security and Emergency Services Division; Kim Engle, National Security Analysis Team.

Dirk Dunning expressed concern that the DOE decision, explained in response 99-15, to scan at 200 dot per inch (dpi) was cost effective when only humans needed to read the documents, but now that optical character readers need to read documents as well, he recommended DOE reevaluate the dpi level.

Yvonne Sherman expressed concern that she needs to know who wants what information for her to know what technology to use for it, because there are just too many documents to scan them all. Max Power said that Yvonne Sherman's question creates a circular problem because in order for the HOW to recommend which documents to actually scan, they need to know what are in the documents. However, since we don't know what is in the documents—titles aren't enough—we need to abstract or scan them for software like SPIRE. But we can't, because there are too many documents.

Yvonne Sherman pointed out that improving general document access is more difficult than providing documents for specific projects like the Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project. She is exploring the option of scanning the Records Transfer Files first, which would provide a description of the documents available. However, she doesn't know if there are other options that are a better start. She asked for suggestions from HOW participants on where to begin.

Mary Lou Blazek suggested a small group of the participants go through the boxes and eliminate categories that do not seem important. Yvonne Sherman suggested using the records series descriptions to weed out entire series that would not be of interest to stakeholders. Linda Jarnagin explained that when DOE needed to find epidemiological data, it first froze certain records series and then looked within the series for the actual information.

Diane Larson suggested the HOW make it a goal to get her records. Steve Wisness expressed concern that her records are involved in litigation.

Rick Stutheit, Linda Jarnagin and Kim Engle explained that classified documents are being reviewed for release, and must be altered for declassification (for example, any classification markings must be removed). All documents, including

declassified documents, must also be reviewed for certain information—such as that covered under the Privacy Act—before it can be released to the public. At Hanford all documents that are declassified are reviewed at the same time. They are then released to the public by scanning them and submitting them to OpenNet web page. Kim Engle said it was mostly documents relating to the nuclear weapons designs that are remaining classified. All the declassified documents at Hanford will be available to the public on OpenNet by 2003. There is a backlog of documents waiting to be scanned, but the National Security Analysis Team recently acquired two new scanners, which will hopefully end the backlog in six months.

The stack of classified documents at Hanford is the size of two Washington Monuments. The Team is finished reviewing one "monument." The classified documents are only one percent of the total number of documents at Hanford—800 boxes out of the 80,000 total boxes of documents at Hanford.

Max Power pointed out that the amount of documentation that remains to be reviewed for release to the public is what makes the information tools important. He explained that the question is how to mine the rest, because the unclassified documents contain important information.

NEXT STEPS FOR OPENNESS

Michael Kern went through a list of questions he gathered from participants about potential next steps for openness at Hanford. They are:

- Workshops in 2000?
- Continue Working Groups with Program Managers?
- Provide correspondence/advice on openness issues?
- Presentations/publications on the HOW?
- Role of the Hanford Advisory Board?
- Host a national workshop?
- Foster openness workshops at another site?

Greg deBruler said there has been a movement toward openness, but DOE isn't there yet. He recommended that the HOW:

- Try to obtain Diane Larson's records as a test for openness and transparency.
- Become a panel for workers to come and pointed out that workers came to a non-profit that doesn't even deal with workers
- Take their unique expertise to other sites in the DOE complex.

Elaine Faustman asked what is happening with the Openness Advisory Panel of the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board. Yvonne Sherman said it still exists, but it has not met since 1998.

Max Power suggested changing the HOW from meeting quarterly to a different format. Instead of formal meetings the HOW could focus on working with program managers on:

- The ability of former and current workers to voice concerns in a broader sense than Employee Concerns, and pointed out Dr. Michael's visit reveals and unmet

need.

- Proactive and innovative public involvement work with Marla Marvin. He suggested the public involvement part is the easiest to try handing off to the Hanford Advisory Board.
- The problem of access to public documents, exploring the challenges of unclassified documents and keeping an eye on the declassification process.
- Taking the openness message out after the new administration goes in.
- He said each focus might need a different approach, and other participants might have different key topics to recommend.

Mary Lou Blazek said the HOW has done what it set out to do; it looked at openness issues and made recommendations. The HOW needs a champion for the recommendations. She suggested the Hanford Advisory Board Public Involvement Committee, though she admitted she didn't know if they were willing. Yvonne Sherman recalled the HOW once talked of the possibility of becoming a Hanford Advisory Board Ad Hoc Committee.

Jim Trombold expressed concern of going to the Board because the Board's recent consensus advice about the HOW met resistance. However, if the Board was the only option for keeping the HOW going, then he recommended participants go to the Public Involvement Committee.

Michael Kern explained that the Hanford Advisory Board's Public Involvement Committee had planned on making a full presentation to the Board, explaining the HOW and then presenting the advice. However the agenda was changed and the Committee only had time to present the consensus advice out of context.

Norma Jean Germond suggested trying to get on the Board's agenda in April to do the full presentation and bring in today's results.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that the work of the HOW will not interest the Board. Dr. Michael's meeting showed there is a clear need for a neutral base. He recommended keeping this energized core going.

Dirk Dunning expressed concern that openness will die without a champion but because of the heightened awareness of security, now is not a good time to push for more workshops. He recommended the HOW pause.

Todd Martin said the resentment in the Board arose from people who regret not being involved with the HOW, now that it has been a success. He said one option is to ask the PI committee to figure out a bridging process that will fold the HOW into the Board, while picking up the dissenters.

Diane Larson recommended the HOW help workers like herself. She also expressed interest in pursuing stories of whistleblowers becoming afflicted after they come forward. She expressed concern that managers can not hear workers needs and recommended the HOW communicate worker concerns to the managers.

Jim Trombold expressed concern that a meeting like today would not happen at the

HAB. He recommended continuing discussions with DOE managers.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that negativity at the HAB will sap participants' energy. He recommended the HOW carry on because there are still worker, openness, transparency, change of culture and tribal needs to address. He recommended the HOW look at forming a panel where workers stories can be distilled and communicated to DOE.

Elaine Faustman reminded participants of the problems of forming an ongoing panel. She said they are more difficult to convene than temporary workshops, conference calls, or roundtables. She said CRESP would also be less able to participate in an ongoing project like a panel than a short-term project like workshops.

Max Power proposed taking the HOW to the Hanford Advisory Board one piece at a time, starting with Public Involvement. He expressed concern that the HOW may start to get in the way of government-to-government relations between tribes and DOE if it continues to pursuit tribal issues.

Nanci Peters said the Yakama Nation has experienced difficulties in both personalities and process at the Hanford Advisory Board, which has caused the Nation to back away. She praised the HOW for being above-board and comfortable for the tribes. She recommended the HOW continue to meet with Gail McClure, Yvonne Sherman, and Kevin Clarke and she offered a conference room, logistics and support at the Yakama Nation for such meetings.

Yvonne Sherman said Keith Klein wants to focus on the Hanford Advisory Board as the stakeholder group and is less inclined to support separate groups with separate agendas.

Elaine Faustman said CRESP is in the middle of reorganizing as it renews its contract, and there is uncertainty in the resources it can devote to the HOW. She said CRESP is philosophically compatible with the HOW in worker health and tribal issues, among others. Chuck Powers said CRESP is very interested in data issues relating to workers. He suggested the HOW seek to communicate that they gave recommendations to such a large body as DOE-Headquarters and received a response. He suggested the HOW might convene in a year and follow up on what the managers said will happen. He suggested spending the intervening time communicating nationally what the HOW accomplished.

Norma Jean Germond recommended the HOW keep its Public Involvement evaluation plan alive by carefully explaining it to the Hanford Advisory Board's Public Involvement Committee and then presenting it to the Board.

Greg deBruler said the election year is no reason to stop working locally, since the HOW has support for worker, public involvement, and tribal issues. He recommended spreading the HOW complex-wide. He suggested incorporating interested people from the Board into the HOW. He recommended planning the HOW's next steps through emails and offered to start this process.

Jim Trombold recommended holding a conference call in three months to plan the future of the HOW.

Max Power expressed concern that rather than pushing to go complex-wide, it is an important time to stay focused and keep momentum.

Elaine Faustman said CRESP can host a conference call. She suggested the HOW consider having an email dialogue which culminates in the conference call and presentation to the Hanford Advisory Board.

Max Power recommended a small group draft a proposal to discuss at the conference call.

Mary Lou Blazek volunteered to draft the four letters for the recommendations to be considered by Keith Klein and Dick French and forwarded to other federal organizations.

Chuck Powers suggested participants might take this message to DOE's Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) and Todd Martin volunteered to take EMAB copies of the report. Chuck Powers said his sense is the work of the HOW fits with what Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Carolyn Huntoon wants to get done.

Yvonne Sherman reminded participants that the International Association for Public Participation presentation in May is another way to get "feelers" for moving nationally.

Max Power said he and Angel McCormack are willing to take copies of the report to the State and Tribal Government Working Group. He also recommended HOW draft a letter to Marla Marvin.

Michael Kern said CRESP will begin the planning process by getting the meeting summary out quickly and closed the meeting by thanking participants for their hard work.

The participants created the following list of Next Steps:

- Summary of Meeting (CRESP).
- Letters
 - To forward to other federal agencies, may be cosigned by DOE-RL and ORP (Mary Lou Blazek).
 - To DOE-RL about the information tools challenge in response 99-12 (Mary Lou Blazek).
 - To Marla Marvin (Mary Lou Blazek).
- Work with HAB Public Involvement Committee to gauge HAB response on Public Involvement section of HOW report (Max Power, Mary Lou Blazek, Norma Jean Germond).

- Email exchange brainstorming (Greg deBruler).
- Straw proposal (Max Power).
- Conference call in three months (hosted by CRESP).
- Report to State and Tribal Working Group (Max Power and Angel McCormack)
- Report to Environmental Management Advisory Board (Todd Martin).

Hanford Home Page | Openness | Workshop Summary Index

For questions or comments about this page, please send email to Yvonne_T_Sherman@ri.gov

URL: <http://www.hanford.gov/boards/openness/summary/022300.htm>

Last Updated: 10/31/2002 11:47:16

