



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Public Involvement & Communications Committee**

September 17, 2019

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 2

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar 2

Hanford Administrative Record..... 3

Hanford Live 2019 (Nov 7, 2019, 7-9 pm)..... 5

Regional HAB Meeting 6

Review of Draft Advice – Disclosure of Information and Meaningful Public Involvement in Setting
Cleanup Budget Priorities 6

History of the HAB Project..... 6

Open Forum 6

Wrap up and Topics for Next Meeting 6

Attachments 7

Attendees 7

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

Jeff Burright, Public Involvement & Communications Committee (PIC) Chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

The [June meeting minutes](#) were approved by consensus.

Announcements

Ruth Nicholson, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB/Board) Facilitator reminded members, Agency liaisons and contractors to sign in prior to leaving the meeting.

Jim Lynch, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) reviewed the October schedule, including the FY2020 Calendar¹ and review of the work plan².

Jim and committee attendees discussed the November meeting schedule and recommended the HAB push November committee week back from November 5, 6 and 7 to November 12, 13 and 14.

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair, informed the committee there is a National Academy of Science meeting in Richland on October 31 which is not on the TPA Public Involvement Calendar.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar

Jennifer Colborn, MSA, walked committee members through accessing the TPA Public Involvement Calendar on the Hanford website. She also reviewed several current and upcoming public comment opportunities, including a 60-day comment period on the LERF ETF permit modification, the 100-BC Proposed Plan, and DOE's response to the NRC regarding the Waste Management Area C WWIR.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: "Because the proposed plan [for the 100-BC Area], it is immensely important to the public and tribes. It doesn't seem there is any meaningful public involvement planned. This is the test of the commitment of meeting the standards to meet the MTCA, when there are restrictions proposed especially on the river with resources. The law says give explicit information to the public. There really should be meetings because we are talking about restrictions on the river for decades and decades. It is essential that it is not just a 30-day comment period. We need to develop a plan so there is ample time to do this."

R: "October 7 is beginning of the 30-day public comment period which can be extended based on public interest. The agencies would like to gage the public interest before assuming when/where there should be public meetings and before extending the public comment period. It is our obligation under CERCLA to allow the opportunity for the public to request a public meeting. The discussion for setting public

¹ [FY2020 Draft HAB Calendar](#)

² [FY2020 Draft HAB Work plan](#)

meetings is still on the table. We want to hear from the public if it wants a meeting in their area so we can gauge the public interest.”

C: “To be effective, we need 30-days’ notice before meetings. Waiting until to resolve this after the public comment period has begun is not helping with the turnout so it’s important in setting the outset.”

R: “We will need to move quickly to have this done in 30 days. The agencies realize this and are ready to act.”

C: “When the agencies are going back into the negotiations, the Board might be utilized in those negotiations to get better policy perspective. We have talked extensively on Tank Waste and how successful that was (single shell tanks and milestones) information given to head negotiators, DOE, and the Washington State Department of Ecology. It served the process well for agencies and the public. We haven’t talked about grout and to see it on the agenda catches my breath. There is a lot that needs to be done about that. The Board would be wise to understand the history and the perspectives of the agencies and ORP. We need committee meetings, so we know what to focus on in a really changing environment. There’s opportunity to expand dialogue.”

Hanford Administrative Record

Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair, introduced Ben Ellison and Carolyn Noonan, DOE Richland Operations Office (RL) and the Administrative Record Update. Key points from Ben and Carolyn’s presentation include:

- The information strategy is pushing transparency, and DOE wants to put as much information out as it can.
- Much like internal records management, the Administrative Record will be able to store many records.
- In conjunction with the upgrade, DOE has a new project. Record copies are scanned, loaded into internal records management, and synchronized into the external record website.
- Due to the increase in the creation of electronic records, the agencies are discussing changing wording in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) that requires DOE to keep administrative records on paper as hard copies.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “What is the relationship between this and DDRS?”

R: “DDRS collection should never grow. It is its own collection. Over time, we would like to pull it out and put it into the external administrative record. We’re working on making all documents accessible. The current interface is specific to AR collections.”

Q: “What happens to the hard copies after they’re scanned?”

R: “We go through the disposition cycle from the hard copies. Some you have to keep for a little while, and some may have to be kept a little longer.”

Q: "I'm troubled by that. Legally you have to keep the hard copies for everything. How can you shred them considering FOIA?"

R: "You have to have the record, which we will."

Q: "What about holding the hard copies?"

R: "That is something we are discussing, using the computer to access administrative records. Once we get the copies, they are processed into the federal records repository. We would have to keep the records 75 years after the Hanford site is complete."

C: "One of the criticisms with the administrative record is related to it becoming more searchable. It's still not organized in such a way that if I wanted to research all documents in relation to BC in the administrative record, I can get every record under the sun for the BC operable unit but not for the formal administrative record for this particular instance. You basically have to search thousands of records and put in search terms rather than just saying it's a formal record."

R: "We have helped prepare indexes, and it may not be that they have published those yet. We would love ideas on how to link and search documents together."

C: "Maybe if it referenced in the decision document, you can make sure it's tagged and linked."

R: "We have the structure in place. The agencies need to work together and need to be better about identifying what is in there. We need to be better in our transmittal letters, training, and be more transparent in conversations."

C: "The only way to view it is to download the entire document instead of previewing or opening in a new window. If you want to filter through, it's several links. I've had to click every link, download, and identify if it is was useful. It's not user friendly."

C: "I would love to hear your feedback as you do this all the time. I feel nervous at the moment being as advanced as we are. Destroying documents makes me nervous, especially with nuclear waste. It's as much about waste management as it is about information management. You keep the documents for the future because you don't know what the future is going to be like."

R: "I don't disagree. We have federal requirements. We're supposed to be all electronic. The bulk started with printing and scanning them back in. There are a lot of people not comfortable with the idea of getting rid of paper. We need to manage the integrity and the availability of it. To be able to call it a record, I need to be able to guarantee if you are looking for record X it will be record X. If you're looking for a record, you can get it. We will make sure all those are met before considering disposition of paper."

Q: "Thinking deep time in public involvement, the digital interface is always going to be available, and someone will continue to make sure the records are accessible. How does it transfer to legacy management? How do we make sure we're thinking in the long-term in this being the way we're going to communicate?"

R: "Yes, it is. DOE is planning on working on the interface to make it more user-friendly."

Hanford Live 2019 (Nov 7, 2019, 7-9 pm)

Jeff Burreight, PIC Chair, introduced Emerald “Emy” Laija, Environmental Scientist for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the topic of Hanford Live. One flyer³ and two other documents⁴ ⁵ were provided. The intention is for the event to be more of an online conversation so people can be seen through the comfort of their online camera. The agencies will be taking public questions afterwards. The agencies want to reach a broader audience so it’s not just a technical conversation.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses

Q: “Who is the intended audience for Hanford Live for this round?”

R: “The biggest audience we can reach. Maybe younger, less experienced, to add to the conversation if possible. Those that are comfortable logging in on their phone and still allow more experienced folks to participate. Not to make it so technical so the newer audience can participate.”

Q: “What is your gatekeeping process for questions?”

A: “Last time behind the scenes, we had someone doing the webinar and those were being pushed to a single person. One-person monitoring Facebook and those also pushed to one person. It was a learning experience, but we did take questions from different platforms. All those topics were at least touched on if not discussed in webinar format. We also have a screen to filter non-Hanford related questions.”

C: “I would like to suggest that people tap into their contacts at CBC (Columbia Basin College) or WSU (Washington State University) and make it compelling for them.”

C: “Most of the meetings we have are local and regional. This is a global meeting, potentially. There are people that this might spark their interest 10 years down the road. I suggest we reach out to several places and big groups because this is an online event, and anyone can be anywhere.”

C: “We need real input on policy issues. How clean is clean? How deep is deep? When we have an opportunity to get public input, it feels the most important to garner. What about this solution? Sharing this kind of information that builds urgency and builds questions on how we can move forward.”

Q: “As we are thinking about audience, is it possible to do a youth discussion on Hanford?”

A: “We need to consider what that might look and give them the example that this is taxpayers’ money and why it matters.”

³ [Flyer for Hanford Live](#)

⁴ [Hanford Live Pre-Notice](#)

⁵ [Lessons Learned from the Last Hanford Live](#)

C: “We need to focus on the audience dynamic, so people feel valued and allowing people to understand that dialogue is available.”

Regional HAB Meeting

Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair, introduced the topic of the Regional HAB Meeting. Members took the opportunity to have an open dialogue regarding location and capacity of the room. Members agreed it should be located centrally in Seattle, easily accessible, and hold about 100 people. The size of the meeting space recommended was to ensure the ability to have a dialogue, and the group agreed that it is difficult to have a dialogue with more than 100 people in such an event.

Members articulated a desire to have this topic on the next PIC meeting agenda to begin discussion about topics since last year, it took a while to discuss topics. In addition, it was pointed out that there was a meeting in Richland during the afternoon, and it was not successful.

PIC members were invited to send ideas for meeting locations and venues to ProSidian to forward on to DOE.

Review of Draft Advice – Disclosure of Public Information and Meaningful Public Involvement in Setting Cleanup Budget Priorities

Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair, introduced Budget Priorities Advice⁶. Members reviewed the draft advice and recommended edits for inclusion.

History of the HAB Project

Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair, introduced the top of the History of the HAB Project and David Bolingbroke, Washington State University. David provided members a brief update on the timeline for completing the project which is a digital history of the HAB. He plans to come to Richland to find images. David is expecting to have a presentation ready to deliver in December.

PIC members expressed interest in the project but there were no questions regarding the project at this time.

Open Forum

Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair, introduced the topic of Open Forum. He invited PIC members to discuss topics that may not have been on the agenda or on the HAB’s work plan. Members utilized this time allotted to discuss Hanford-related items of interest.

Wrap up and Topics for Next Meeting

Gary Garnant, HAB Issue Manager, provided book and article recommendations to PIC members.

Book & Article Recommendations – September 2019

⁶ [Disclosure of Public Information and Meaningful Public Involvement in Setting Cleanup Budget Priorities](#)

The Nuclear Almanac: Confronting the Atom in War and Peace by Jack Dennis

The Legacy of Chernobyl by Zhores Medvedev

Hitler's Scientist by John Cornwell

The Review of HAB Public Comment Guidelines and HAB Member Self-Assessments have been postponed to a future meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 1: FY2020 draft HAB calendar

Attachment 2: FY2020 draft HAB work plan

Attachment 3: Hanford Live Pre-Notice

Attachment 4: Flyer for Hanford Live

Attachment 5: Disclosure of Public Information and Meaningful Public Involvement in Setting Cleanup Budget Priorities

Attachment 6: Lessons learned from the last Hanford

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Jeff Burright, Chair	Gary Garnant, Member	Rebecca Holland, Member
Jan Catrell, Member	Susan Leckband, Member	David Bolingbroke, Member
Gerry Pollet, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member	Shannon Cram, Member
Dan Solitz, Alternate (Phone)	Liz Mattson, Member (Phone)	

Others:

Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP	JoLynn Garcia, DOE-ORP	Dana Gribble, MSA
Abigail Zilar, Northwind	Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Ginger Wireman, Ecology
Emerald Laija, EPA	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC	Mostata Kamal, DOE
	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Northwind
Anne Knapp, Ecology	Ruth Nicholson, ProSidian	Ashley Herring, ProSidian