



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT &
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE/BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE

December 3, 2019
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar Update	2
Future Land Use, End States for Hanford, the Inner Area Principles, and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)	3
The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan.....	4
Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priority Advice Direction and Planning	5
Workforce Planning and Development Draft Advice.....	6
Resource Material List from Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)	6
2019 Hanford Live Debrief.....	8
Regional HAB Meeting	9
Hanford Regional Dialogue	9
Diversity & Outreach.....	10
HAB Member Self-Assessments	11
Committee Business: Wrap Up and Topics for the Next Meeting	11
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.

Hanford Advisory Board

Opening

Shannon Cram, University of Washington, opened the meeting and welcomed committee members and others attending the meeting. Introductions of all participants were made.

The adoption of the September 2019 Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee meeting summary was postponed to the next PIC meeting.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar Update

Jen Colborn, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), showed meeting participants how to locate the Public Involvement calendar¹ on the Hanford.gov website. In response to the discussion at the PIC meeting in September, they are now revising the calendar more often than quarterly to be more responsive to changes. Jen walked through the items on the current public involvement calendar, including:

- Comment period on the 100-BC Proposed Plan which ends December 9, 2019
- Comment period on Capsule Interim Storage Permit Modification which ends December 20, 2019
- Upcoming comment periods on five (5) other permits and permit modifications, including T Plant closure, the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), Training and Inspection Plan, Hanford Emergency Management Plan (HEMP), and the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF).

In addition, Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reviewed the items in the holding bin of the Public Involvement Calendar, including:

- TPA M-91 Milestones
- Site-Wide Permit, Rev. 9
- Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR)
- 100-N Area Proposed Plans
- 200-BP-5 and 200-PO-1 Proposed Plan for 200 East Groundwater

Emy explained that some of the items are in the holding bin and public comment periods have been delayed because EPA requires additional headquarters review for projects exceeding \$50 million in cost.

Committee members were interested in the closure plans at T Plant and Central Waste Complex permit modification whose 45-day comment period is scheduled from December 16, 2019 to February 7, 2020. More than one meeting participant was unaware of the timing of this project and the upcoming public comment period. It is a project for which the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is the lead. No public meeting is scheduled. PIC meeting participants asked for more information on the topic. The PIC committee flagged this project for review by the River and Plateau (RAP) committee.

The group also discussed the IDF permit modification and how it's related to the ILAW WIR. DOE contract staff are working on a fact sheet, but it may not be ready until around February 2020. Committee member concerns regarding this issue included tracking the issue in the event the public comment period ends before the committee can discuss the issue and understanding when the permit modification will be coming out and the related technical documents.

The discussion on this agenda item concluded with feedback on the format of the TPA Public Involvement Calendar. Some liked that it fits on a single page. However, there were concerns about the

¹ [Tri-Party Agreement Agencies - Public Involvement Calendar – Dec. 2019 – Mar. 2020](#)

Hanford Advisory Board

ability to do that and still handle so many undefined acronyms. Members asked if space could be gained by not including completed events, although others liked the idea of being able to track recent activities and progress. Another suggestion was considering whether there could be a related document with additional background information on projects and comment periods or including links in the TPA Public Involvement Calendar document itself. Finally, the observation was made that perhaps the formatting should be related to how the calendar is used by its various audiences. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) staff and contractors plan to bring back some reformatting ideas for feedback at the February 2020 PIC meeting.

JoLynn Garcia, DOE, informed the committee that the DOE communications group has been looking at how the Savannah River Site (SRS) has started a conversation with its stakeholders to see how effectively the site is working and communicating. JoLynn asked if the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) would want to do something similar. Jim Lynch, DOE, added that DOE plans to get more details on what SRS is doing. PIC members were interested in how SRS was going to use the data collected from its stakeholder survey. DOE asked how Washington State University or the University of Washington collaborate and engage their students. Shannon Cram offered to see if she could get her students to use the Hanford website and provide some feedback which could be useful information.

Another issue raised in the discussion was the desire to collect oral histories. The group was unsure if any oral histories had been collected recently and decided that the PIC should follow up with David Bolingbroke, Public-at-Large, to see what information he may have collected.

Future Land Use, End States for Hanford, the Inner Area Principles, and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)

Shannon Cram introduced the Future Land Use, End States for Hanford, the Inner Area Principles, and the CLUP topic and explained that the purpose of the discussion was to frame the topic for a future meeting discussion. This included identifying possible speakers or presenters who can help PIC discuss what cleanup will look like when it is completed.

PIC members noted that they wanted such a future discussion to include tribal perspectives. JoLynn Garcia indicated that she would contact Karen Lutz, DOE Tribal Affairs Program Manager, and other DOE staff to see if they might be able to come to speak to the PIC.

Initial discussion focused on the CLUP. The CLUP was a process document with a Record of Decision (ROD) in 1999 and an amendment in 2008. The HAB issued advice on the topic in 2015. PIC members wondered if the CLUP assumptions are still valid so many years later. The group discussed the differences between an agency planning document and regulatory requirements for cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Other ideas and concerns raised by PIC Committee members included:

- The issue of clarifying and validating assumptions,
- Re-examining the 2015 HAB advice on the Inner Area Principles and seeing if the TPA agencies have any updates to their responses to that advice and how to fold in the Inner Area Principles into cleanup documents,
- Legacy management, and
- The role of the HAB in this issue.

The group developed a list of framing questions for a future discussion on this topic:

- What are the “assumptions”?

Hanford Advisory Board

- How do we tell the End State Story? Where is it being told? How often do we have to revisit telling the story? Where does it live?
- How are the CLUP and Inner Area Principles being used to drive cleanup? How should they filter down to cleanup?
- We want to hear the tribal perspective. How does it fit in? Where do we stand on this?
- It has been too long The members are trying to remember all of the decisions. HAB focuses on it, and it is still difficult to track. How do we make it permanently known? How do we keep things from losing traction over time? How do things change over time as we learn more?
- What are the basic assumptions underlying the land use end state vision? Are they still valid?
- From a public perspective, cleanup taking years, hundreds of billions of \$\$, and large pieces of land are not/may not be accessible. What is driving cleanup? Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)/CERCLA are isolated waste areas. The overall Hanford Question is what we will end up with. Need a tie between the two.
- Who is telling the story of the end state and who/how should it be told?
- Is this a question for a Committee of the Whole (COTW)?
- What is in our control and what is not?
- Check in on the 2015 HAB Advice on the Inner Area Principles. Are there any agency updates to their earlier response? The agencies might be able to talk to their recent discussions about how to fold the Inner Area Principles into cleanup documents.
- What is the legal structure around the title to the land now? What happens in the future?
- Using the 300 Area as an example. What would that land be able to be used for in the future?
- Where does the HAB's role play into this topic?

An Issue Manager (IM) team was created to frame this topic for future discussion:

- Jeff Burrig, Oregon Department of Energy, IM Team Lead
- Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board
- Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge
- Shannon Cram, University of Washington

The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan

Shannon Cram introduced this discussion by explaining that the goal of this agenda item is to explore how the document, also called the placemat", can be used in a public involvement and communication context.

Jim Lynch explained that the first time he had seen it was as a tool to communicate internally with DOE staff. He said that it helped him see a broader spectrum of Hanford cleanup components and goals. Jim also noted that the placemat was not intended to be a product that went into extreme detail, although it does try to identify things critical to achieving the cleanup mission. It could be a product to share with the public to show progress.

PIC members made a number of observations about the placemat:

- The placemat mentions working towards end state completion which is the topic of the last agenda item. End state is an issue that keeps popping up.
- You can come to Hanford and have a career working here.
- The icon for long-term stewardship is interesting (a hand holding a small plant).
- What types of signage and symbols need to be developed that indicate and communicate danger over the long term?

Hanford Advisory Board

- The map on the left side of the front page appears to be a mix of things that have been accomplished and things that will be accomplished. Is it cleanup to date or planned cleanup in the future?
- There is a lot of undefined acronym usage in the placemat that could confuse people who do not follow Hanford in great detail.
- What if the placemat included a visual sense of cost for various activities similar to the dollar signs we find on Yelp reviews?
- There are a number of terms in the fiscal year columns that all relate to Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW), but unless you know the insider Hanford language, you might not realize that.
- What if the placemat was posted on the Hanford website and included links for the individual items in the placemat that would provide more information on specific activities? That would be amazing. Ecology is working on a high-level interactive Hanford map for its website.
- The map in the placemat would be more effective if it was better connected in the geographical context of where the Hanford Reservation is located within the state of Washington.

There was general agreement that PIC members like the placemat, the significant amount of information it contains, and how it is designed. It is a useful tool for the HAB and the TPA agencies. It is easy to imagine it relating to the annual HAB work plan. However, many members also believed that the placemat would not be an effective tool for general public involvement because the general public is not as immersed in the detail of Hanford issues and acronyms as members of the PIC committee.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priority Advice Direction and Planning

Tom Galioto, Public-at-Large and Chair of the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC), introduced this discussion by noting that at the October Committee of the Whole (COTW), DOE is not at liberty to release all of the information that the HAB would like to receive prior to developing the annual HAB budget advice.

Tom explained that there are a number of sources of information to which the HAB has access than can help it draft advice for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priorities:

- D Hanford Site 5 Year Plan
- The activities building blocks
- The assumption that the Hanford budget allocation will be about \$2.5 billion a year
- The activity list from the FY2021 HAB advice
- The HAB values statement that can inform how the HAB might prioritize cleanup activities and projects
- Input from each of the HAB committees.

Tom would like to get the IM team formed by mid-December with the BCC as the lead committee for developing the draft advice. The goal is to have the draft advice ready for consideration by the full HAB at its meeting in early February 2020. Liz Mattson volunteered to be the PIC representative on the IM team. Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper and HAB vice chair, also volunteered to be on the IM team in her broader role with the board, not specifically as a PIC representative.

Jim Lynch clarified that DOE wants to receive priorities and stakeholder values from the Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs). These will help DOE put together its budget.

Hanford Advisory Board

Workforce Planning and Development Draft Advice

Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management Employee and Vice Chair of BCC, introduced this topic and highlighted that his background is in human resources and his passion is representing the Hanford workforce.

Emmitt explained that the IM team developing this draft advice wants to take a look at what the new contracts at Hanford will mean, including understanding the ramifications of the new Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) approach. One of the key questions is if DOE has the training and knowledge to administer this new type of contract. Concerns include:

- Transferability or reduction of employee benefits,
- Continuity of service,
- An aging workforce,
- The potential for three “bump and rolls”, and
- The difficulty for smaller companies to bid on work because of the requirements to have technical expertise to do the job and limits on how many contracts they can bid on economically, especially in the event of contract award delays.

Similarly, to the draft advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities, the goal is for the draft advice on Workforce Planning and Development to be considered at the February 2020 HAB meeting.

Resource Material List from Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Tom Galioto reviewed the BCC resource material listing that is under development. He wanted to share the resource with the PIC committee and invite input. The document list contains many links, although a number of links that may not be easily found on the Hanford website. The four categories on the BCC list were created from a BCC perspective.

Tom asked that the list be included in the PIC committee meeting summary so that it would be easy for PIC members to find and use:

Contracts/Budgets:

- 1) EM Major Procurement Actions (with links to specific contract documents):
<https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2019/05/f62/EM-Major-Procurements-Chart-05-10-19.pdf>
- 2) Environmental Management website (for general info on EM organization and activities):
<https://www.emcbc.doe.gov>
- 3) Federal Budget Timeline (from Presentation by DOE Budget Director [Mark Coronado] to BCC, March 2018)
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Budget_overview_for_HAB_March_2018_final.pdf
- 4) DOE Procurement Process Review notes (from presentation by DOE Acquisitions personnel [Jenise Connerly, Tim Corbett, Marcy Aplet-Zelen] to BCC, April 11, 2018)

Available from Tom Galioto (not posted on Hanford.gov website, and no link exists for this material to date)

Hanford Advisory Board

- 5) DOE Procurement Process Review presentation notes (from DOE Acquisitions personnel [Karen Flynn] at the Nov 8, 2018 BCC meeting
<https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/BCCNov8.pdf>
- 6) HAB Committee of the Whole (COTW), “FISCAL YEAR 2017 AND 2018 HANFORD BUDGET PRIORITIES, dated March 16.
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/2016_0316_COTW_summary.pdf

General Info:

- 7) DOE Hanford website:
<https://www.hanford.gov/>
- 8) HAB website: (can also get to it through DOE Hanford website/Outreach/Hanford Advisory Board):
For HAB Advice/DOE Responses, Committee Membership, Meeting Minutes, Documents, Annual HAB Schedule, etc
<https://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/hab>
- 9) Current HAB/BCC Annual Workplan: (for FY-2020)
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/FY2020_FINAL_HAB_Work_Plan_10_1_19.pdf
- 10) Current HAB Calendar: (for FY-2020)
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/2020_FINAL_HAB_Calendar_10_1_19.pdf
- 11) New Member Orientation package, including HAB-Related Acronyms
Provided through DOE/HAB Facilitation Team (ProSidian)
- 12) Paper, “The Hanford Advisory Board: Democratic Participation in Technical, Bureaucratic Decision-Making,” Alex Sager (Portland State University) and Alex Zakaras (University of Vermont), SSRN-id2105113, date unknown.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2105113

Hanford Legal Documents:

- 13) TPA Agreement website:
<https://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/TriParty/TheAgreement>
OR:
<http://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HFFACO.pdf> This is a searchable pdf file kept current with real-time approved changes
- 14) Consent Decree website:
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Amended_CD1.pdf

Critical Reports/Documents:

- 15) 15) CRESP Report website (Hanford Site-wide Risk Review Project):
<http://www.cresp.org/hanford/>

Hanford Advisory Board

16) GAO Report GAO-19-28, “Program-Wide Strategy and Better Reporting Needed to Address Growing Environmental Cleanup Liability,” dated January 2019.

<https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/696632.pdf>

17) National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine Report, “*Independent Assessment of Science and Technology for the Department of Energy's Defense Environmental Cleanup Program*,” dated 2019.

<https://doi.org/10.17226/25338>

18) Transmittal of Report DOE/RL-2018-45, “2019 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report,” dated January 2019.

https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/2019_Hanford_Lifecycle_Report_w-Transmittal_Letter.pdf

2019 Hanford Live Debrief

Shannon Cram introduced the PIC committee debrief of the November Hanford Live event².

Ryan Miller, Ecology, and Jen Colborn, MSA, presented an overview of the event. The goal of Hanford Live was to provide information from Hanford leadership about the Hanford cleanup mission. Jen explained that following the September 2019 PIC meeting, the TPA agencies revised the outreach materials for the event. The outreach flyer was distributed weekly to 12 regional outlets. It was also available on the Hanford website.

There were 114 people who pre-registered for the event. About 50 people participated during the live broadcast. An email was sent to all who registered and invited them to take the survey. Survey responses were noticeably different when the last Hanford Live was compared to this year’s event. There were 57 responses in 2017 but only 5 responses to the survey in 2019. Jen explained that viewership for the event went down by 50%.

Three people submitted questions early. Since it was a live event, most of the questions and answers were done in on the fly. However, the TPA agencies had a dozen questions in hand to use to start the process if needed.

Ecology developed seven videos related to the event which included the main broadcast as well as short snippets of some of the questions and answers and closing remarks.

The committee discussion included a number of observations and concerns, including:

- It appears that some questions from participants were being watered down or rephrased.
- How can participants ensure that their questions will be answered? Some committee members felt questions were overlooked or avoided even though public officials are used to being able to take live questions. The people in the room for Hanford Live were Public Relations (PR) staff, not engagement or public involvement staff. There is a risk when PR managers reframe questions to give to top Hanford managers.
- People appreciated seeing the stream of questions.

² [Hanford Live 2019 Outreach](#)

Hanford Advisory Board

- Are we trying to do too much at one time? There is a concern that if the questions and answer session is too long, we will start to lose people and participation. How do we keep the questions and answers session general enough and not too in the weeds?
- A lot of people were asking for explanations in simple language. Hanford Live did not achieve that.
- It is less effective when people are told to “go read this document” instead of receiving an explanation or answer to their question.
- It looked unbalanced to have three DOE people and only one person from Ecology and EPA. How many managers and subject matter experts are really needed?
- The perspective in the room was that it was hard to get the people talking to look at the camera.
- It looked like an in-person meeting was simply placed on line. Does the event need a different format?
- The most exciting thing about the format was it offered a real-time dialogue between the people on the screen.

Regional HAB Meeting

JoLynn Garcia reflected that at the last PIC meeting in September there were concerns about holding the meeting in Seattle in April because that is when Seattle Public Schools are on Spring Break. DOE’s MSA contractors have done a lot of research about a variety of possible locations in Seattle, including collecting suggestions from PIC members. There was talk of moving the meeting to June, which would allow for more planning time but could result in more expensive hotel costs.

There is no perfect location that is available that will accommodate all of the needs, especially since the space needs are different between what the HAB needs for its meeting as compared to what the Hanford Regional Dialogue needs. Although there has been a desire to co-locate those meetings in April, that may not be possible. It is important to reserve the meeting venue(s) soon.

The group discussed various locations, most of which MSA staff had researched or contacted about availability and features. Concerns were raised about how to ensure that interested parties and the public would attend. Committee members suggested that the HAB agenda include topics that would be attractive to engaging the public and possibly fit into a student project that would link the Hanford Regional Dialogue to something on the HAB agenda. Although the group did not have general agreement about a preferred location, it agreed that location was important and had contributed to successful regional meetings in the past.

The committee had general agreement that it would be acceptable to hold the HAB regional meeting and the Hanford Regional Dialogue in two separate locations that were relatively close to each other.

Hanford Regional Dialogue

The PIC Committee had an open discussion of the upcoming Hanford Regional Dialogue proposed for April 2020.

The discussion included the following observations, concerns, and suggestions:

- Remember, this is not a HAB meeting.
- A lesson learned from past events is that when DOE gets into the weeds, the information is not as understandable to the public.

Hanford Advisory Board

- We want to engage the public more, not just be informational.
- If one of the breakout sessions is Hanford 101, it should only be done once. We would like to not exceed 30-40 people for that session.
- We talked about having a wall for sticky notes or places people can contribute their thoughts. Perhaps this could be focused on why we should cleanup Hanford or how to justify the time and money for Hanford cleanup.
- The Hanford Site 5 year placemat would be a good handout for this event.
- There was a suggestion that the TPA agencies avoid situations in which subject matter experts were seen as competing with each other.

Diversity & Outreach

The PIC committee had an open discussion of how to reach a wider variety of audiences and public concerning Hanford cleanup.

The discussion included the following observations and ideas:

- We tend to reach the same audience. How can we reach new audiences by going to them instead of expecting people to come to us?
- Can we reach out as a part of the educational MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement), GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs), and STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) programs in high schools and colleges?
- The workforce issue makes it ripe for us to talk to the unions about what they are going in middle schools and high schools.
- Washington state has launched a new connect program for high school students related to apprenticeship programs.
- A significant difficulty in reaching out to school programs is simply getting a foot in the door.
- There was a suggestion that establishing direct communications with professors both at local colleges and virtually at other colleges could result in setting up a program similar to what Shannon Cram does at the University of Washington.
- Teachers do not want someone to come in to speak. They want something that is interactive.
- What if we sent direct invitations and made personal contacts with people in the Native American community?
- As HAB members, part of our mission is public outreach.
- How do you make public involvement effective?
- What if we created a template that explains what the HAB is and why people dedicate time to HAB work?

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, shared a story about her recent work this fall which took students from the STEM program at Chiawana High School to experience a mock-up of working at the 324 Building. It included quite a few female students. She explained that it was a great experience, and the kids asked how to get involved.

JoLynn Garcia, DOE, offered to bring information and statistics on DOE outreach to the next committee meeting. There was interest in the committee to compile examples of how to reach out and engage new audiences.

Hanford Advisory Board

The group agreed to keep this topic on the list of active discussion items for the February 2020 PIC meeting.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, invited committee members to share recent public involvement experiences. He began describing an experience he recently had giving a television interview in English that was broadcast with Russian subtitles. Ken also arranges for an annual Hanford tour for Oregon elected officials and state employees.

Tom Galioto, Public-at-Large, noted that he has posted a lot on LinkedIn about Hanford and has received numerous positive responses.

Tom Galioto also observed that he has come to realize that no matter how effective we think we communicate, sometimes it is not that effective. Communication with DOE is sometimes constrained. Sometimes the level of detail is not communicated well. He mused that it might be really nice if we had a more open communication pathway communication with our Hanford partners when we need it.

JoLynn Garcia, DOE, and Ginger Wireman, Ecology, both indicated that they are available for anyone to contact. JoLynn noted that because of privacy issues, not everyone may want to share their email address. Jeff Burrigh, Oregon Department of Energy, noted that Slack is a communication channel that anyone can be a part of.

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, shared that there are Twitter and Facebook discussions of transportation. There was a two-day workshop in Sweden and France that got people involved in this issue because they are more environmentally conscious.

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, announced that she is a part of a nine-week Chiawana High School program.

Jan Catrell, Public-at-Large, explained that she is a part of a life-long learning organization, and she has taught some classes for seniors in Bellingham.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, said that he recently had a great tour of Hanford for his university students, including a panel that included Ecology and EPA staff, as well as Susan Leckband, HAB chair.

Committee Business: Wrap Up and Topics for the Next Meeting

Committee members identified the following topics for the February 2020 PIC meeting:

- Inner Area Principles topic and follow up work from the Future Land Use IM team (2 hours requested)
- Hanford Regional Dialogue (90 minutes requested)
- Preserving photos and data when Hanford contracts switch

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar – Dec. 2019 – Mar. 2020

Hanford Advisory Board

Attachment 2: Hanford Live 2019 Outreach

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Tom Galioto, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member	Dan Solitz, Alternate
Shannon Cram, Member	Gerry Pollet, Alternate	Jacob Reynolds, Alternate
Emmitt Jackson, Member	Ken Niles, Member	Tom Sicilia, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Janice Catrell, Member	Jeff Burrigh, Alternate (Phone)
Liz Mattson, Member (Phone)		

Others:

Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP	JoLynn Garcia, DOE-ORP	Lindsay Strasser, Northwind
Dana Gribble, MSA	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Anne Knapp, Ecology
Jen Colborn, MSA	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Colleen Drinkard, MSA (Phone)
Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)	Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator, ProSidian	Ashley Herring, Facilitation Team, ProSidian