



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT &
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE**

*March 6, 2018
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update	2
Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement.....	4
State of the Site (SOS) Regional Meetings	7
Committee Business.....	9
HAB Member Self-Assessments	10
Attachments	12
Attendees	12

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, Chair of the Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. The November meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

Announcements

Dawn MacDonald, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of River Protection (ORP) and Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) announced James (Jim) Lynch, Tank Farms Program Manager will be the new representative for ORP as DDFO. Dawn served two years as DDFO and will be taking a new role at ORP.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update

Dana Gribble, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), provided a brief presentation on the Hanford Live event. Dana thanked the HAB and the PIC committee for the continued support for the event. Dana mentioned that MSA submitted an application on behalf of the Tri-Party Agreement Agencies (TPA) Public Involvement Officers for the Hanford Live event to the Local Chapter of the Project Management Institute. The submission was for the Project of the Year nomination. Dana noted the application highlighted the HAB's contribution for the event, including input on the logo and the involvement of the stakeholders. A video of highlights from the event was played for committee members.

Echo Dahl, North Wind – supporting ORP, provided an update of the TPA Agency [Public Involvement Calendar](#) to PIC members.

Using the calendar as a guide, Echo provided an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities. Echo stated there is one active 60-day public comment period through April 12, 2018 for the proposed modifications Plutonium Uranium Extraction (PUREX) storage tunnels, with a public meeting scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2018 at the Richland Public Library. She also pointed out the HAB Committee of the Whole (COTW) will take place on Tuesday, April 10, 2018 at the Washington State University (WSU) Tri-Cities Campus Consolidated Information Center (CIC). Additionally, Echo stated there is a tentative Open House on Monday, April 9, 2018 focusing on the tank farms mission path forward. Additional items on the calendar include an Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board meeting March 19 & 20, 2018 in the Mosier, Oregon and the Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) bi-annual meeting May 2 & 3, 2018 in Roswell, New Mexico.

Mark Heeter, Public Affairs Specialist for DOE Richland Operations Office (RL), provided an update for items listed in the holding bin. Mark stated that the 100-BC Proposed Plan briefing was provided to the River & Plateau committee on February 6, 2018 and the possibility of advice coming forward from that briefing. Mark noted that a public comment period for the 100-BC Proposed Plan is anticipated for late Summer or early Fall 2018. The 100-N Area Proposed Plan is still to be determined for a public comment period date but stated that in the Fall 2018 would be a good time to revisit this topic. It was mentioned that the PUREX Complex Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) AMU tank closure plan may be available for public comment in late Spring or early Summer 2018.

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

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

Q: “In our last HAB meeting, there was a conversation about the decision for grouting PUREX tunnel 1 being made without public input. So, what is this PUREX EE/CA comment period for?”

R: “It was DOE’s recommendation from the expert panel to grout tunnel 2. It was decided by Ecology to issue the full permit modification process, including a public comment period.”

Q: “Is there a link to the permit modification?”

R: “Yes, on the fact sheet. The fact sheet can be found on the [Hanford Events Calendar](#).”

Q: “What is the AMU?”

R: “Aqueous Makeup Unit.”

C: “The AMU closure plan is something that the PIC would be interested in. Maybe once the fact sheet is drafted, it can be circulated to the PIC committee via email.”

R (Emy Laija, EPA): “One reason this has been in the holding bin is because of the process of providing comments from the Regulatory Agencies to DOE and working through those comments. It’s taking longer since there have been a few incidents happen on site. For example, folks that would generally be working on the EE/CAs are spending their time working on PFP.”

C: “The open house is usually the kind of thing that the PIC committee likes to give input on.”

R: “Absolutely, we will definitely send communication out once we get to the point where we can actually move forward with planning.”

Q: “Can you tell us what the purpose of the open house would be?”

R: “Yes. It will mirror what the COTW will cover. It will be a good opportunity to have Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) available for discussion. This open house will be open to the public.”

R (Dawn MacDonald, ORP): “The way it was initially explain to me, was that the open house would be Brian Vance, Manager for ORP’s introduction to the public. When we do meetings similar to this, we are required to get approval from DOE Headquarters, so that is part of the reason this open house is tentative.”

Q: “So is the idea for this open house is to have people walking around learning about specific topics or will there be a presentation that will be given?”

R: “I have not been personally involved in what the meeting will look like, so I don’t have that information yet.”

C: “I really hope that you press hard on DOE Headquarters to approve this. This meeting will be the perfect opportunity to introduce Brian Vance and to get the public engaged in the COTW.”

Q: "What is the plan for advertising this meeting?"

R: "There is a standard method that we always use for advertising."

C: "It seems to me that there is a compressed timetable for this meeting since you may not get approval from DOE headquarters in a timely manner."

R: "The planning of this meeting actually started a few weeks ago and the fact that it is approaching the COTW is just a coincidence."

C: "In an ideal world, this topic would have been put on the PIC agenda for discussion today, so I'm a little disappointed that we didn't hear about it sooner."

C: "This is a huge opportunity to emphasize that this is a change from what the public has seen before."

Q: "Do you have a timeline of when you expect to hear back from DOE Headquarters?"

R: "I am hoping by the end of this week or next week."

Q: "When was the last time that ORP had an open house similar to this?"

R: "I believe there was one for the Waste Treatment Plant and the Grand Challenge."

Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement

Liz Mattson, Chair, introduced the topic of reinvesting in public engagement. Liz stated that Tom Galioto, Public At Large and PIC committee member, took on the task of reviewing past HAB advice and/or documents related to public involvement. Liz stated that with the recent changes in management within the TPA Agencies, it seemed like a great opportunity to write a letter to management in regards to public engagement.

Tom Galioto reviewed 20 past HAB advice document for reference, as well as flipchart notes and white papers. The purpose of the letter is to iterate important information to management before formal advice comes forward at the June HAB meeting.

Liz opened the discussion for committee members to review and provide input on the letter.

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

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

C: "It is very important that we address this letter to the appropriate people. We typically copy the delegations for Washington State and Oregon, the Environmental Management Lead and the Secretary of Energy. I think it makes a difference when we copy these important people."

C: "I really like how concise this letter is. I have one little suggestion with the definition of regional. I feel it should be defined in this letter."

R: "I wouldn't define regional. When we define something like that, something gets left out."

Q: "Are the references available online?"

R: "Yes. You can find the references on the HAB website."

Q: "What's the difference between DOE responding to advice and to letters? Do they have to respond to letters?"

R: "No, they are not required to respond to letters, only advice."

Q: "I wonder if the references should be put in chronological order?"

R: "We are going to make sure the references are hyperlinked."

Q: "Who will the letter be addressed or sent too?"

R: "To the TPA Agency Managers."

R (EPA): "Typically, when the HAB issues advice, it is generally addressed to the TPA Agencies. The Agencies will decide if it's appropriate to send a joint response or sometimes they may send individual responses, which is dependent upon the subject of the advice."

Q: "As you read through the past advices, was there anything that you think could have been addressed in the past advices that were not?"

R: "The only thing that I noticed was that there are only specific public involvement activities that DOE is required to do from the Public Involvement Plan. The Public Involvement Plan only identifies two activities, which are the Public Involvement Survey once a year and a budget review once a year. We need to expand the Public Involvement activities to the broader public who may not be well versed in Hanford activities, but certainly are affected everyday by it living in the Hanford community."

C: "I think the clearer the advice is, the better it will be understandable to the TPA Agencies and will help their responses."

R (EPA): "The Public Involvement Plan itself is not an enforceable document. The requirements identified in the plan come from RCRA, CERCLA, and the TPA. Granted there are other things we do beyond the legal requirements, such as the public notification process. As far as advice that would add additional requirements to the TPA, the Agencies would most likely not comply, as it would require a significant change to the TPA."

C: "Maybe it would be helpful to define the role of the HAB and Public Involvement."

Q: "Have you looked at the disconnect of when the HAB gave advice and when the TPA Agencies needed advice?"

R: "Not specifically. I didn't connect a link between the timing."

Q (EPA): "Did I understand correctly in this discussion that the board wants to get information regarding sensitive information on upcoming negotiations ahead of time or before the agencies have started those conversations?"

R: "I think we are just flagging that timing is an important component as were looking at prep time as were looking at this."

Q: "Would it be valuable to mention additional meetings beyond the requirement?"

R: "It's not impossible to ask for the TPA Agencies to change the TPA."

R (EPA): "To help support this discussion, I would really like it if you would review the operating ground rules and it states what the HAB's role is for interacting with the public."

C: EPA has its own Public Involvement guidelines, but would Ecology have its own set Public Involvement guidelines as well?"

R (Ecology): "It's all regulatory. We don't have any standards beyond what's required by law."

R (EPA): "There is a lot of guidance and suggestions from EPA on community involvement. There's an entire tool kit and handbook with a lot of information."

C: "I just want to reiterate that it's important to know the role of the HAB and to provide suggestions, but I don't think it's the HAB's role to make that information accessible to the public."

C: "Our role is to represent the people were here to represent. They will ask us questions so we have to be able to answer those questions. It's important for us as the interpreter."

R (EPA): "There is a lot of energy in this discussion. Something I'd like to point out to the group, particularly because we have been on this strategic plan topic. We have had this conversation before, as you referenced in the letter that you have provided advice and Agencies responded to that advice. It seems like we get into this loop of the HAB not liking the Agency response, so the HAB sends another piece of advice that reiterates what was already sent. Our answer has not changed even though the advice has changed or reiterated differently. We want to see the HAB give advice that promotes change."

Q: "Is this letter going to be sent out soon?"

R: "Yes. It is going to be reviewed tomorrow at the full HAB meeting."

C: "I think your letter is going to help you with new people understand all the things in the background. This committee has had a lot of discussion about perspectives and requirements. Emy Laija listed somethings with RCRA and CERCLA, so that may be something the committee should discuss as you go forward with your issue and resolution of your advice."

C: "Something that I think may be help is when you go to the public, are you going to be able to provide that next step of being able to explain to the public of how input is used."

Next Steps: An Issue Manager Team was formed with Liz Mattson, Tom Galioto, Ken Niles, Shannon Cram, and Helen Wheatley.

State of the Site (SOS) Regional Meetings

Liz Mattson introduced the topic of SOS Regional Meetings. Liz noted that advice #294 State of the Site Meetings was issued in November 2017, which a response has not been submitted by DOE.

Dawn MacDonald, ORP stated that over the last year there has been a lot of changes within the Agencies. There have been two different Agency Managers change positions, as well as major events happen at Hanford, such as the PUREX Tunnel collapse and the most recent PFP incident. The new managers needed to get up to speed in their own roles before they could take on this initiative. Discussions have started between the managers but with the difference of opinions not all parties have reached a conclusion of agreement yet. Dawn recommended that the committee review previous discussion points on SOS Regional meetings, in particular with the format. The format is of concern among the TPA Agencies. Dawn suggested that the committee discuss the possibility of renaming the SOS meeting and repackage it with a new format.

Liz opened the discussion for committee members to discuss the idea of possibly rebranding the SOS meeting with a new title and format.

Committee members reviewed the list of format, locations, and styles from a previous SOS discussion.

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

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

C: “The meetings I thought were more successful are the more interactive ones with subject matter experts and managers available.”

C: “I took the Hanford Public Survey and they had a list asking what we would like to know about Hanford. I think that list could be the kinds of questions made available. I think any title that has the words ‘the site’ in it.”

C: “I like the idea of a general presentation by the higher-level managers from DOE. I appreciate Dawn’s explanation of why there is such consternation regarding the SOS terminology. If people come with a specific agenda and push that agenda, then I can why SOS is not efficient.”

C: “There needs to a facilitator who is really strong to be able to deal with the public forum. I think the meeting needs to start with a list of expectations.”

C: “I agree that having a strong facilitator is key.”

C: “Creating a physical and meaningful space for the concerns. There is a disconnect on how the HAB sees these kinds of meeting versus how the Agencies see the meetings.”

C: “I have not been to these kinds of meetings and I gather from the thoughts in this room that there maybe different emotions when talking about cleanup decisions versus health and safety decisions. Maybe if each one of those were given their own space could be another way to keep topics on what they’re supposed to be.”

C: “I think it would be helpful to read the past public surveys. The comment section could give an indication of what to expect. I think having a survey at these meetings would be helpful too.”

C: "I think that technology ruins the conversation, as it's a distraction."

C: "Focusing on the future is very important. Even as a possible name 'Hanford focus on the future' in replace of SOS."

C: "I went a gala recently and there were voting devices on the table and the responses would pop up on the overhead."

C: "A strong facilitator is an important piece to a successful meeting."

C: "Maybe having the meeting open a half hour early to give people something to write questions down prior to the actual meeting starting."

C (RL): I really appreciate this discussion. Speaking from an RL side, we definitely want to go out and engage the public. We talked about the definitions of regional and the term State of the Site. I look back at all of the HAB advice that refers to a State of the Site meeting, so maybe this is a good time think about changing the name of the event. This is your opportunity to bring forward your ideas for a meeting to the Agencies."

Q: "What do you see as the role of the HAB as an intermediary between the public and the site managers?"

C: "Even though the meeting might be handled by the local managers, maybe they could have at least one person from DOE Headquarters. This person can be used as a funnel to report all of the local concerns and take it back the Headquarters."

C: "One strategy I use is breaking down the larger group into smaller groups. This allows more people to have a say and voice opinions. I also want to point out that I think the HAB works so well is because we have good relationships with each other."

C: "Managers that reach the level of managing an entire site, have administrative gate keepers that don't necessarily share everything with them. I'm sure there have been many occasions daily that managers don't hear everything that goes on. These kinds of meetings are a great opportunity for the managers to hear what may be going on, where it can be improve, etc."

C: "It sounds like were talking about redesigning these meetings, which is essential on all sides. There is also an expectation that the public has for these kinds of meetings and they're not good."

C: "This has been a really good discussion, which a lot of us have been apart of for many years. I think have the Agencies work with the facilitator on the presentations is a great idea. I think that the first meeting should be a report back to the public about what we have heard. There is an opportunity to have an impact."

C (RL): "Something to think about is the timing you have for these meetings. Frequency is not important just yet."

C: "We need to think about what the goal is. What seems best is when the public feels like they're being asked to participate."

C (Ecology): “Ecology’s decision has always been in support of spreading information with some kind of meeting that give people to discuss Hanford. We agree with this discussion and we think the way you are going is very positive.”

C (ORP): “I think that both ORP and RL take back what was discussed to management to show what the committee is thinking. Its possible they could take this discussion into consideration when management gets together again.”

C (RL): “I think we are at a point where the Agencies need to get together their collective thoughts on this. We will go back with this discussion to management and work on our response. I think we should come back to the discussion after the response to advice #294 is received.”

C: “My only concern is that there is a history of delay so I just want to make sure that there is some urgency to this because there is.”

Next Steps:

The PIC will form an issue manager team for a new meeting design, format, and new name for the SOS meeting.

Committee Business

Committee Leadership Nomination

Liz Mattson was nominated for Chair of the PIC committee. Shannon Cram was nominated for Vice Chair of the PIC committee. Both nominees agreed to serve another term as leadership for the PIC committee. The leadership selections were approved by consensus.

3-Month Work Plan

April: Regional dialogue update and PUREX EE/CA update added

May: Regional dialogue update and reinvesting in public engagement issue manager update added

June: review of potential advice removed. Regional dialogue update, reinvesting in public engagement issue manager update, Dave Borak potential visit, Hanford website, and public involvement survey results from Ecology added.

Other Items of Discussion

PIC FY2020 Budget Priorities:

- Regional public meetings (regional dialogue update)
- Fully fund the HAB including HAB regional board meeting
- Multi-media capability on deck to record and publish meetings online
- Fully fund public participation grants

- Investing in the next generation
- Regional budget meeting
- Fully fund both primary member and alternate to attend all committee meetings and board meetings
- Policy research analyst (Ecology)

Leadership Workshop:

- Investing accessible and meaningful public meeting language (best practices)
- Prep time and advance notice for the Board to provide meaningful feedback
- Continue to build transparency

Gary Garnett, HAB Issue Manager recommended a list of articles to the HAB members:

Article Recommendations – March 2018

- June 18, 2017 – A near-disaster at a federal nuclear weapons laboratory takes a hidden toll on America’s arsenal.
- September 24, 2017 – Report: Los Alamos National Lab violated nuclear safety standards.
- October 31, 2017 – Birthplace of the atomic bomb in chaos as National Nuclear Security Administration calls for help.
- November 29, 2017 – Safety Concerns Remain at New Mexico Nuclear Waste Storage Site.
- January 19, 2018 – After safety breaches, new Los Alamos director pushes for accountability at nuclear weapons lab.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

An introduction was made by Shannon Cram. This time was used for a round table discussion of what members have been up to. What members have done to share information about Hanford with the community and/or family and friends? Have members heard from anyone in their network that would be helpful to agencies?

- Ken Niles stated the he was a guest speaker at the request of Norma Jean Germond on February 14, 2018 at a League of Women voters of Clackamas County meeting in Lake Oswego, Oregon. Ken stated that there will be an Oregon Cleanup Board Meeting in a couple of weeks in Mosier, Oregon. Ken will be giving a presentation to the Public Utility Commission to talk about Hanford. Ken also mentioned that there will be another Science Hub at the Oregon Museum of

Science Industry in August 2018, as well as a Umatilla County Emergency Management Office will be have a booth on Nuclear preparedness at the Umatilla County Fair in August 2018.

- Jeff Burright stated that he talked to a Barista about Hanford in The Dalles, Oregon on his trip to Washington.
- Tom Galioto stated that he shares articles about Hanford regularly that get some views and a handful of likes.
- Susan Leckband stated that the League of Women Voters state convention will be held in the Tri-Cities in June, in which she was asked to give speech.
- Shannon Cram stated that she was on fellowship this year so her outreach has been talks about Hanford. She gave talk in Santiago, Chile in November 2017. She gave talks in Washington D.C. and Vermont, as well. Shannon also gave guest lectures at the University of Washington and will be attending the Waste Management Symposium this year.
- Alissa Cordner stated that Yuki Miyamoto will be speaking at Whitman College on March 7th. Alissa stated that there is display at the History Museum on Campus that is called “Hanford Reach.” Whitman is redesigning the Intro to Environmental Studies curriculum to include a unit specific to Hanford.
- Gary Garnant stated that he will be giving a presentation to some community groups and classrooms about Hanford.
- Sam Dechter stated he spoke about his work with the HAB to some people he was conversating about in Oklahoma.
- Shelley Cimon stated that she hasn’t had many speaking engagements in a couple of months.
- Helen Wheatley stated that she spoke on a radio show about Hanford. She stated that she was asked to speak about Public Involvement at a meeting for Port of Olympia and she used the HAB work as an example.
- Echo Dahl stated that there will be a speech about Hanford at a high school in College Place.
- Mark Heeter stated that he has been working with the HAB and with RL communications team on the recent events at Hanford. Mark stated that he has been working on getting the HAB membership packages submitted to DOE Headquarters.
- Dawn MacDonald stated that she went to Africa last year and met two teachers from Vancouver, Washington and a couple from Alaska. She stated that one of the people from Alaska graduated from Richland High School. She stated that they had a conversation about Hanford.
- Jim Lynch stated that he just stepped into the role of DDFO working with the HAB. He hasn’t not done a lot of public outreach lately.

- Liz Mattson stated that she did a live interview with Dan Serres and Tom Carpenter about Hanford.
- Jen Copeland stated that she has done a lot of outreach with CHPRC.
- Jen Colborn stated that she has posted on social media about her job and Hanford.
- Dana Cowley stated that the HAB was mentioned in the application for the Project Management Institute nomination.
- Becky Holland stated that there have been a lot of struggles with the respiratory equipment and the hygiene of the masks.
- Ginger Wireman stated that she will be at the National Conference for Social Studies to give a speech. She will also be at the National Association for Environmental Professionals Conference. She will also be at a rotary meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar – Spring 2018

Attachment 2: Hanford Live 2017

Attachment 3: Article Recommendations for HAB Members

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Liz Mattson	Shelley Cimon	Tom Galioto
Shannon Cram	Gary Garnant	Sam Dechter
Helen Wheatley	Alissa Cordner	Gary Karnofski
Jeff Burrigh	Rebecca Holland	Ken Niles (Phone)
Dan Solitz (Phone)		

Others:

Dawn MacDonald, DOE-ORP	Mark Heeter, DOE-RL	Echo Dahl, Northwind – Support for DOE-ORP
Dieter Bohrmann, Northwind – Support for DOE-ORP (Phone)	Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Jim Lynch – DOE-ORP
Jen Copeland, CHPRC	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Dana Gribble, MSA
Kyle Rankin, DOE-RL	Rich Buel, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Melissa Orona, ProSidian	