

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**

*June 7, 2016
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement..... 1

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant and Communications Approach White Paper 4

100 D/H Proposed Plan..... 6

HAB Report Summary..... 8

Public Involvement Principles 8

Hanford Advisory Board Member Self-Assessments 10

Committee Business..... 11

Attachments 12

Attendees 13

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

Opening

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. The committee adopted the April 2016 PIC meeting summary.

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP), opened the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement Planning meeting.

*Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Calendar*¹

Dieter provided attendees with the TPA public involvement calendar, updated for June 2016. Dieter noted that the calendar gives an overview of ongoing, recently completed, and future public comment periods, as well as dates for upcoming advisory board meetings and links to additional resources.

Dieter highlighted upcoming opportunities for public comment, including:

- A 45-day Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) initiated comment period (anticipated to begin in late June 2016) on modifying the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) permit to include the installation of two melters at the Low-Activity Waste facility
- A 30-day comment period (anticipated to begin in mid-July 2016) on the River Corridor 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan
- A 60-day comment period on the closure plan for the 324 Building
- A 60-day comment period on a closure plan for two PUREX facility tanks

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said that the agencies will likely not hold a public comment period for the Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) associated with K Basin sludge storage at T Plant. He noted that the change associated with the ESD regarded extending the anticipated length of time that the sludge would be stored at T Plant due to funding and changes to milestone completion dates. He stated that the agencies already signed off on the ESD and considered the change in storage timeline to be minor.

Dieter encouraged HAB members to review comment periods in the TPA public comment opportunity holding bin and continue to identify opportunities for aligning upcoming comment periods with planned HAB meetings.

TPA Annual Public Involvement Survey

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, provided attendees with a handout² detailing some results from the 2015 TPA Public Involvement Survey, and she noted that a digital copy of the survey results were [published online](#). Ginger said that 183 people took the 2015 survey, 58% of whom categorized themselves as members of the public.

Ginger encouraged attendees to review the lessons learned and survey conclusions attached to the results handout. Overall, Ginger noted that the TPA agencies would continue working to ensure that involvement efforts were approachable, accessible, and impactful to the public.

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (June 2016)

Attachment 2: 2015 TPA Annual Public Involvement Survey (Lessons Learned, Conclusions, and Survey Demographic Information)

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Could the Board request that the 30-day public comment period for the 100 D/H Proposed Plan extend through the upcoming HAB meeting on September 14-15, 2016? The Board has already reviewed draft advice on this topic, and members are interested in adopting this as final advice before the close of the comment period.

R. [EPA] It is unlikely that that comment period on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan would remain open past 60 days. The changes that TPA agencies incorporated into the 100 D/H Proposed Plan are not likely to generate a level of public concern that would require a longer comment period.

C. The 100 D/H Proposed Plan comment period may represent an opportunity for agencies to go out to the public and share a Hanford cleanup success story. The agencies should consider this opportunity when planning the upcoming comment period.

Q. When do the TPA agencies anticipate that the Hanford Site-wide Permit Rev 9 will move to the public for consideration and comment?

R. [Ecology] Rev 9 of the Site-wide Permit is not imminent. The TPA agencies will continue to update the Board as progress continues on this effort and the timeline becomes more clear.

C. In question 13 of the TPA Public Involvement survey, 16% of respondents could not recall a discussion with a TPA agency representative at an event they attended. This may be because respondents did not know that they were having a conversation with an agency representative. Perhaps representatives should make their roles clearer at public meetings.

C. [Ecology] One lesson garnered from the survey results is that TPA agencies could work to better disseminate response documents following comment periods. These may provide members of the public with a better understanding of how their input influences Hanford Site cleanup decisions.

C. [EPA] Board members should plan to review the recently released response document for the TPA Central Plateau milestone series change package. Within this document, TPA agencies worked to clearly show how public and Board feedback influenced the final change package.

C. Results demonstrate that 80% of survey respondents were over the age of 45, and most respondents were white. This is problematic; it demonstrates that young people and people of color are not taking the survey and providing their perspectives. Strategies for administering the survey should be revisited to ensure that these key demographics are better represented.

C. It is important to meet younger people where they are. Providing them with an incentive to complete surveys can also be a very effective strategy. Snacks, for example, could provide a low cost/high reward way to encourage students to complete a survey.

C. Once they become familiar with the issues on the site, many younger members of the public are interested in getting more involved in Hanford cleanup. Do TPA agencies need to first conduct outreach to educate younger members of the public on Hanford Site history and ongoing cleanup efforts?

C. [ORP] TPA agencies are interested in reaching out to and hearing from younger members of the public. Agencies are continually working to include diverse public participants, and agency representatives are open to suggestions for strategies that could help to accomplish this goal.

C. The recent defunding of public interest groups is an important message that emerges from the results of the survey.

R. [EPA] The defunding of interest groups occurred at the state level. If respondents have strong feelings about the need for state Public Participation Grants (PPG), their state representatives and senators are best positioned to hear and respond to their concerns.

Q. Why did the TPA agencies begin conducting annual public involvement surveys?

R. [EPA] It was a result of a major update to the Hanford Public Involvement Plan and a need for consistent feedback on public involvement.

R. [ORP] Prior to 2012, the TPA annual public involvement survey was printed and distributed. Approximately 25-35 survey responses were average. After 2012, the TPA agencies began to electronically distribute the survey, allowing the survey to reach more people. Agency representatives are continually working to identify what information is desired from the public through the use of the annual public involvement survey and what should be done with the feedback once it is provided.

C. [EPA] As Board members review the feedback from the 2015 Public Involvement Survey, consider the quality of information that this effort provides. There may be ways that the process of collecting public perspectives on public involvement could be streamlined. Much of the feedback provided by the survey is information that the TPA agencies are already aware of.

R. This could be a topic at future PIC meetings. It is important that agencies work to effectively target the annual survey so that it produces useful data.

R. [EPA] The next survey (for calendar year 2016) is planned for release in January 2017.

Attendees thanked TPA representatives for the information, and agency representatives closed the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Planning meeting.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant and Communications Approach White Paper

Liz Mattson provided PIC members with background information on the Board's efforts to draft the WTP communications approach white paper. She reminded members that the Tank Waste Committee and the

PIC had been jointly working on the document³ since early 2015 and that the Board had reviewed an early draft of the white paper at the April 2016 HAB meeting. Liz noted that HAB members planned to conduct a final review of the white paper at the next day's Board meeting prior to adopting it. Liz encouraged PIC members to review the white paper and note any remaining questions or concerns in anticipation of the Board's discussion and adoption.

Steve Hudson, HAB chair, reminded PIC members that the white paper was a consensus Board product. However, he also noted that the nature of the paper represented a diverse collection of ideas, and that Board members did not have to wholly endorse all strategies highlighted within it. Steve also encouraged committee members to keep the white paper's intended target audience, ORP, in mind in their review.

Agency Response

Dawn MacDonald, ORP and co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer for the HAB, thanked members for their continued work on the WTP communications approach. Dawn noted that the court-approved date for the full-startup of the WTP is 2036, and she noted that this date could be inserted into page four to clarify the language.

Committee Questions and Responses⁴

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. A fundamental problem with the current white paper is that the Board has released advice on public involvement that encourage regional public meetings that present approachable information. The Board should mention this advice within the white paper. The public has not had the opportunity to engage with ORP on the WTP for two years. The Board should recommend that this engagement with the public occurs soon.

C. Does the table within the white paper address communications through ORP's mechanisms for releasing stories through the media? The white paper should highlight the strength of ORP releasing timely, accurate information to diverse local, regional, and national media outlets.

R. This point could be enhanced in the table, under the "general public" audience.

Liz thanked committee members for their review and feedback. She encouraged those PIC members who had recommendations for additions or changes to bring them forward to the Board during the next day's meeting.

With regard to HAB white papers in general, Liz was hopeful that they could be made more accessible on the HAB website. She recommended exploring the HAB website structure with DOE and considering ways to make these Board products easier for online users to locate.

Attachment 3: Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Communications Approach (Version 2, Revision Date 5/31/2016)

Attachment 4: Transcribed flipchart notes

100 D/H Proposed Plan

Liz Mattson provided PIC members with context for discussion of the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan topic and review of an updated question and answer document⁵ associated with the upcoming public comment period. Liz noted that the goal of the document was to provide members of the public with a better sense of the history of the 100 D/H Area and the cleanup efforts that already occurred.

Agency Perspective

Kris Holmes, DOE Richland Operations Office (RL), thanked PIC members for their thoughts during the process of creating the 100 D/H Area question and answer document. She encouraged committee members to consider and share potential strategies for sharing the final document with members of the public.

Regulator Perspective

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, said that the updated question and answer document was improved, but she noted that the chronology of work completed at 100 D/H was difficult to effectively capture in a fact sheet format. She recognized that similar future efforts may benefit from an interactive, online tool.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The terms “Monitored Natural Attenuation” (MNA) and “Institutional Control” require further description within the question and answer tool, as these are important cleanup strategies in the preferred alternative included within the Proposed Plan. These terms are challenging to describe to the public in approachable ways. MNA essentially means that no active cleanup work will be done and that contaminants will be left to decay or degrade through natural processes. A strong definition of MNA is especially important within this document, as much of the work in the 100 D/H Area is transition from active Remove, Treat, and Dispose remediation to MNA.

C. It is still unclear in the document what cleanup remains in the 100 D/H Area. This need for information could be addressed by detailing two questions—one that notes the remaining cleanup work discussed within the Proposed Plan and another that details cleanup work remaining outside of the Proposed Plan (e.g. reactor dismantlement).

C. These questions could be part of a larger overall question that seeks to better illustrate how the interim cleanup decision-making process works.

C. The question and answer document needs to clearly state that a majority of the waste removed from the 100 D/H Area will not move off of the Hanford Site—it will be disposed of in the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility.

Attachment 5: Draft 100-D/H Area Proposed Plan – Questions and Answers (with tracked updates)

C. The questions that are highlighted within the question and answer document may not address the fundamental questions and concerns that members of the public will have concerning the 100 D/H Area. For example, people will be interested in what contaminants are present, the health risks associated with each contaminant, how long it will take for contaminants to degrade or decay, how long the public will be restricted from accessing the Area, and what areas and resources will be restricted from public use during that period of time. The document also downplays the history of contaminant releases at the 100 D/H Area.

C. Members of the public are likely to be interested in the interconnectivity between groundwater contamination and the Columbia River. This should be further explained and simplified.

C. A discussion of Tribal treaty rights and cultural resources is currently missing from this document and should be added.

C. The response to the question “what cleanup work has been completed in these areas so far?” is still too complex for general consumption. This response could potentially be broken into a bulleted list to more clearly demonstrate past efforts.

C. The graphic included within the question and answer document does not print well in black and white. It could be made more accessible by incorporating textures instead of colors.

Q. [Ecology] What is the best strategy for getting this question and answer document out to the public? It is too lengthy to be a mailer.

R. Initially, PIC members wanted to compile the institutional knowledge about the 100 D/H Area from contractors, agency representatives, etc. into a document that could be a starting point. The goal of the information is to better prepare members of the public to comment on the Proposed Plan when it is released.

R. The information in the question and answer document could potentially be placed into a presentation format, available online. This product could include imagery and a voiceover.

R. There may be general interest in holding regional public meetings about the 100 D/H Area. These questions could be used to inform potential public meetings, as well.

Liz noted that the PIC members were finished providing input on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan questions and answers document, as the comment period for the Proposed Plan was anticipated to begin soon, in mid-July 2016. Liz encouraged any committee members who had outstanding questions or ideas to reach out to her directly.

PIC members expressed great appreciation for the opportunity to work with TPA agency representatives on the document, noting that they were very pleased with the information and detail found in the document.

HAB Report Summary

Gary Garnant presented PIC members with a list of books⁶ that he had recently reviewed and summarized. Gary also recommended that interested members review *Hanford Cleanup: The First 25 Years*, authored by the Oregon Department of Energy.

Liz encouraged PIC members to send any additional documents of potential interest to the Board to Gary for his review, especially those that may be of special interest to new Board members who may be unfamiliar with the Hanford Site.

Report summaries will be compiled and made available to Board members on the HAB's SharePoint site, under PIC.

Public Involvement Principles

Liz stated that PIC members were interested in continuing discussion on HAB general public involvement principles, noting that the Board may wish to author additional advice or a white paper that provides an updated HAB perspective on public involvement needs associated with remediation of the Hanford Site.

Liz also requested that PIC members consider the differences between informing and engaging members of the public through outreach efforts. She noted that recent conversations at the Executive Issues Committee Leadership Workshop began to identify different virtues and challenges associated with each of these efforts, and she asked PIC members to further consider the role that each strategy could play in future Hanford Site outreach.

Agency Response

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting ORP, highlighted major ongoing TPA agency public outreach strategies, including speaker bureaus, websites, social media, and quarterly newsletters. Dieter noted that the TPA agencies always have room to do more, and he highlighted that the agencies were interested in more effectively reaching younger members of the public.

*Committee Questions and Responses*⁴

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. What is the distinction between information-sharing and engagement as they pertain to public involvement?

Attachment 6: Recommended Reference Books for Hanford Advisory Board Members (Gary Garnant, June 7, 2016)

Attachment 4: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. Information-sharing is usually one directional, and it provides members of the public with facts about Hanford. Engagement provides the public with opportunities to provide input and to influence cleanup decisions.

C. An important question for PIC members, especially as the committee begins to consider the potential upcoming State of the Site meetings, is to discuss what the best format for Hanford public meetings is. Committee members and TPA agency representatives need to review whether or not the traditional presentation format is best or if an open house format would do a better job of conveying information?

C. Increased information-sharing with the public is important, and it needs to happen at a local, national, and regional level. The local newspaper, the Tri-City Herald, is currently the most robust source of news and updates about the Hanford Site.

R. [Ecology] TPA agencies need to work hard to tell both the good and the bad news coming out of Hanford. Because the bad news is not always communicated well, the good news is not always very impactful to the public.

C. The Board could potentially consider authoring policy advice that would encourage meaningful public involvement—part of meaningful public involvement is engaging the public in the conversation. There are a lot of good DOE efforts to share information with the public, but further public engagement is needed for engagement efforts to be meaningful. Young people, for example, are very unlikely to engage with the TPA agencies through a comment period. How could they become engaged with and influence Hanford cleanup?

R. The PIC could potentially explore the possibility of bringing in an outside expert to help pursue answers to the committee's questions related to public engagement strategies.

C. The discussion about the upcoming 100 D/H Proposed Plan and the creation of the question and answer document is a great example of public engagement—creating that information was a back and forth between the TPA agencies and the PIC.

R. If the PIC reviews past HAB work in preparation of a future Board project, this process could be noted as an example of an effective effort.

Dawn MacDonald, ORP, requested that interns attending the day's meeting provide examples of outreach and engagement strategies that could potentially be incorporated into future Hanford outreach. Interns provided PIC members with the following ideas:

- Keep information short and accurate as a way to capture and hold attention (e.g. use “listicles”)
- Continue enhancing agency social media presence
- Use competitions (photo, video, etc.), both internally among TPA agencies and externally among members of the public

Liz thanked PIC members and attendees for their comments and suggestions. She noted that issue managers for the topic would work to review and compile past HAB products on public involvement in

preparation for the next discussion on the topic at the committee's next meeting. As material is compiled, Liz said that issues managers would consider what format a potential next step could take (advice, white paper, sounding board) and what information and suggestions may need to be stated/restated.

Hanford Advisory Board Member Self-Assessments

Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, said that she has recently been working with her students at the University of Washington, Bothell to create podcast segments for the Physicians for Social Responsibility's Down by the River series. She noted that her students were very excited to contribute to this effort. Shannon also noted that she was working with Tracy Atkins, Interim Superintendent of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park, to design exhibits for the newly created Park. Finally, Shannon noted that she was able to co-curate the *Particles on the Wall* exhibit at the University of Washington, Bothell campus.

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting ORP, noted that Kevin Smith, ORP Manager, will speak at a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math event in Pullman, Washington. Dieter noted that ORP planned to speak to groups throughout summer 2016.

Kris Holmes, RL, highlighted that she is coordinating tours on the Hanford Site, including public and special request tours.

Jan Catrell, public-at-large, said that she would help plan a course at the Academy of Lifelong Learning that would focus on current issues at Hanford as well as the role of the HAB. She highlighted that this is an opportunity for people to learn more about Hanford. She also noted that she was involved with United Methodist Women, and that she planned to discuss Hanford issues as they relate to climate justice within the group.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, said that he recently did an interview on a televised news segment that focused on the topic of leaking tanks at Hanford. He noted that there was public interest in learning more about Single-Shell Tanks and the leak in the primary tank of Double-Shell Tank (DST) AY-102.

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest, highlighted tank vapors and DST AY-102 as a topic of interest to people in Olympia, Washington. She said that people were interested in hearing following-up information on both topics.

Gary Garnant, Grant and Franklin Counties, said that he was continuing to conduct small group meetings on the Hanford Site cleanup within his community. He identified that his community was particularly interested in how the Hanford Site could potentially impact the agricultural industry.

Tom Galioto, public-at-large, said that he was sharing Hanford information with his connections via LinkedIn, including information on the status of the Hanford Site as well as ongoing cleanup activities.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, reiterated that her organization lost its funding when Washington's PPGs were not renewed. She said that the organization is continuing to look for strategies to engage with

others on Hanford cleanup, noting that she recently presented a case study of Hanford whistleblowers for a Seattle-area high school class. She noted that the group was continuing to keep the public informed of developing Hanford news through their social media outlets.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, said that she recently participated in the annual Salmon Summit in Kennewick, which drew a crowd of approximately 500 fourth grade students. She also noted that she has been presenting information on Hanford habitat and other Hanford issues at local high schools.

Committee Business

*PIC 3-Month Work Plan*⁷

PIC will plan to hold a committee meeting prior to the September 2016 Board meeting. To prepare for this upcoming discussion, committee leadership will request a committee call for in August. PIC members identified that the next committee meeting would tentatively include the following activities:

- Receive an update from TPA agencies on Hanford public involvement (TPA Quarterly Planning Meeting)
- Review past HAB advice relating to Hanford Site public involvement principles and determine the potential need for additional HAB products on the topic
- Review the TPA comment response summary proposed changes to TPA Central Plateau milestone series
- Discuss strategies for updating the HAB's Bi-annual Report
- Receive an update on HAB-generated summaries of relevant reports, publications, and articles
- Receive public involvement self-assessments from HAB members

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (June 2016)

Attachment 2: 2015 TPA Annual Public Involvement Survey (Lessons Learned, Conclusions, and Survey Demographic Information)

Attachment 3: Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Communications Approach (Version 2, Revision Date 5/31/2016)

Attachment 4: Transcribed flipchart notes

Attachment 5: Draft 100-D/H Area Proposed Plan – Questions and Answers (with tracked updates)

Attachment 6: Recommended Reference Books for Hanford Advisory Board Members (Gary Garnant, June 7, 2016)

Attachment 7: PIC 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Jan Catrell	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Shannon Cram	Pam Larsen	Jean Vanni
Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	Helen Wheatley
Tom Galioto	Liz Mattson	Dawn Wellman
Gary Garnant	Emily Peterson	

Others:

Dawn MacDonald, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Noah Cruz, CHPRC
Samantha Harting, DOE-ORP (intern)	Marra Clay, EPA (intern)	Signe Lindquist, Hanford Challenge (intern)
Zara Guzman, DOE-ORP (intern)	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Jennifer Copeland, MSA
Taylor Spence, DOE-ORP (intern)	Rochelle Twomey, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind/DOE-ORP
Kris Holmes, DOR-RL	Earl Fordham, WDOH	Becky Wiegman, Perma-Fix Northwest
Richard Buel, DOE-RL		Shintaro Ito, PNNL
		Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Brett Watson, EnviroIssues