



**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

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

*June 6, 2017  
Richland, WA*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Opening..... 2

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update ..... 2

PUREX Tunnel Collapse & Related Activities Discussion..... 4

Hanford Live..... 9

Unpacking the Concept of Cleanup ..... 12

RCRA Permitting Discussion ..... 15

HAB Member Self-Assessments ..... 17

Attachments ..... 18

Attendees ..... 18

*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, Committee Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The February meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

### *Announcements*

Susan Leckband, Board Chair, announced the Public Budget Meeting would be held at the Richland Public Library at 5:30 p.m. on June 7, 2017.

## **Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update**

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) provided an updated Tri-Party Agreement Agency Public Involvement Calendar to all attendees [TPA Public Involvement Calendar Updated for June 2017](#).

Using the calendar as a guide, Dieter provided the committee members with an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities.

- A Class 2 permit modification to install underground transfer pipelines in the Effluent Management Facility. This facility is needed to treat the low-activity waste, which will treat some of the tank waste earlier than the full waste treatment plant.
- Hanford Budget Priorities Public meeting and comment period started June 7, 2017, with a public meeting scheduled for same day. Due to the Presidential transition, the budget numbers were not ready as anticipated in spring.
- A Class 2 permit modification for closure of 1301-N and 1325-N with a comment period starting June 5, 2017.
- Two Class 2 permit modifications concurrently running at the same time.
  - One for the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility and the 200-area Effluent Treatment Facility, which is to close out two small tanks not being used and to add a groundwater monitor well to the groundwater plan.
  - A second Class 2 Permit Modification in the 242-A Evaporator to remove a diesel generator.
- Proposed TPA milestone change for the cesium/strontium capsules for M-92. Comment period
- A Class 3 modification for WTP Analytical Laboratory operating permit.
- A Class 3 modification for the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment System permit.

### Holding Bin:

- TPA Five-Year Review: The agencies do not believe that the changes being proposed, meet the significant threshold to hold a public comment period.
- Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EE/CA).
  - B Plant Complex
  - PUREX Complex
- 100-BC Area Proposed Plan.

- Public Meeting regarding a new facility for dry storage of Cesium Capsules. A Notice of Intent, for new permitted facilities is required per state regulations.
- River Corridor 100-N Area Proposed Plan.
- Site-Wide Permit, Rev. 9.

Dieter informed members that the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board meeting is planned for this August 7 & 8, 2017 in Salem, Oregon.

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

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

Q: “If I’m not mistaken, the 242-A Evaporator is the long pole in the tent as far as ensuring that there is enough space in the double-shell tanks without actually building new tanks, right?”

R: “*It helps reduce waste in the double shell tanks.*”

Q: “It’s just a pump, right?”

R: “*Yes, it’s a diesel generator.*”

Q: “Do you really have to have a public meeting for that?”

R: “*Yes, Class 2 permit changes require public meetings.*”

Q: “What date are they looking at for the TPA M-92 Milestone to be completed?”

R: “*The new date is 2020, but I am not optimistic.*”

Q: “So, is that the date for getting them into the dry storage?”

R: “*In the next two to three years.*”

C: “2019 is the completion date of the design of the dry storage facility. The milestone will establish the actual date that it should be constructed by.”

C: “There is a fact sheet for this, as well.”

Q: “*Will Ecology have a fact sheet or is that DOE?*”

R: “*Yes, DOE will provide a fact sheet.*”

Q: “Will the fact sheet be available right before the public comment period or will it be available any time before that?”

R: “*Yes, it will be available right before the public comment.*”

R: “*These are to do repairs, more than likely maintenance upgrades.*”

Q: “Is there a sense of timing for when the public comment period for the dry storage of cesium capsules will start?”

R: *"If I had to guess, next spring."*

Q: "When you say talk about what that looks like, do you have a date of when you expect the design of the facility for the dry storage of cesium capsules of be completed?"

R: *"In July."*

R: *"What we want to do tomorrow is gauge your interest in proposed changes to the TPA. We tried to change paragraph 148 and 149 but that did not go very well because of the budget process. We tried three times to change it but it never worked."*

Q: "The time frame is this summer?"

R: *"Yes, we are pretty much done with it so, if we do a public comment period, it will be this summer."*

Q: "So, the assumption is that it the dry storage facility will be done before the public meeting?"

R: *"It is scheduled to be done in 2019."*

C: "I really like this TPA calendar handout. I can share it and explain it at this level."

C: "So, another thing for peoples' benefit, Hanford is the only place that does not automatically do public meetings on CERCLA plans. Everywhere else does. When you read the national contingency plan, it really says you have to offer it."

Q: "Is it clear to our Tank Waste and River & Plateau Committees who has the lead on this?"

R: *"Our workplan is sorted out by subcommittee, so the committee itself determines who the issue managers are and at what level."*

Q: "Is there any more information on whether there will be a State of the Site meeting? There was discussion of possibly having one in the Fall."

R: *"The TPA agencies have not had any discussions about that. No meeting is planned for this fall."*

C: "If there are facts sheets to any of the items, there should be a link on the calendar."

Q: "Where are these facts sheets posted at?"

R: *"They are in development currently."*

Q: "Where are they available at?"

R: *"They would be listed on the [www.hanford.gov](http://www.hanford.gov) website and/or via Listserv emails."*

### **PUREX Tunnel Collapse & Related Activities Discussion**

Liz Mattson, Committee Chair, opened up the discussion of the PUREX tunnel collapse.

Kristin Holmes, Community Involvement & Public Affairs Specialist with the Department of Energy, Richland Operation Office (DOE-RL) introduced John Martell, Manager for Radioactive Air Emissions and Mike Priddy, Manager of Environmental Sciences, both from the Washington State Department of Health (DOH).

Mike Priddy is the field team coordinator who dispatched field teams during the PUREX tunnel collapse. John and Mike worked together to determine a strategy on how to dispatch the field teams to collect air samples. John Martell acted as the state health liaison. John and Mike were in constant communication with the state at Camp Murray State Emergency Operations Center (EOC). DOH has what they call an instant management team that they stood up and were in constant communication with them, as well. The DOH would communicate with the Secretary of Health and the Governor's office. They were also communicating with the counties. This communication was occurring simultaneously as field teams were sent out. They were working with the Department of Ecology (Ecology) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), who sent over a person from region 10 to provide support as needed.

Mark Heeter, Public Affairs Specialist for DOE-RL, was responsible for the joint information center which was the central platform for all the media and public inquires. Mark discussed the influx of inquires during the first and second day of the event. The first day of questions were more about what was going on and by the end of the second day, the questions were about what the plan was going forward. Mark noted that the Department of Energy thought the interest would have died down by now, but it has not.

Tom Rogers, Radiation Health Physicist with DOH further discussed the roles of John Martell and Mike Priddy who lead the field teams by reviewing the weather and figured out where the starting points were. They did all the brain-work. They communicated the sampling plans needed, monitoring air samples required, and what kind of dose and contamination readings they should be looking for. The field teams sampled the perimeter of the site to ensure that if there was something on the border, it would be seen and stopped for public health and safety. They had data from Benton and Franklin Counties along with years of data from DOH, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and Energy Northwest as part of the Hanford Environmental Monitoring program. The purpose of gathering all of this data was for reference. If something was seen they had years of data to compare too.

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

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

Q: "Are there lessons learned? Were four people enough?"

R: "To clarify, we had two teams. The other team had 3 people on it."

Q: "Were samples put into the radiation counter for a certain amount of time to ensure you have an accurate count?"

R: "We counted the samples for 30 minutes, which helps us determine if we are seeing radon or something else, then we send the sample to the Public Health Lab for analysis. Different analyzers require different methods for testing. We do a gross alpha and a gross beta gamma, which gives us a quick look to see if there is any public health concern. The samples passed through that no problem. We looked again to see if there were certain isotopes. Now were looking at strontium and plutonium. Plutonium 241 is the only one still in process."

Q: "So, you have done this kind of testing before, so you have something to compare too?"

R: *"Yes, we collect samples all the time, as part of the Environmental Monitoring going on 24/7 onsite."*

Q: "So, you do these kinds of analysis all the time?"

R: *"Yes, we have a rad lab with the public health."*

Q: "I could not find any data online, is this available?"

R: *"The data is available on the Hanford website at [www.hanford.gov](http://www.hanford.gov). There is still more data to come."*

Q: "What was the reading of cesium and at what standard do you report to the state that there is a concern?"

R: *"The first set of samples collected was sent to the public health lab. The initial readings on two of the samples came back positive for cesium. The numbers on both readings were almost identical, which caused some concern, so we sent out a field team two days later, to collect more air samples. We believe the first two had cross-contamination in the counter. We were able to count the samples again and not get the same levels that we saw the first time. "*

Q: "Were those air samples taken?"

R: *"Yes, they were air samples."*

C: "To clarify, In the State of Washington we actually have a federal rule 40-CFR-61, Subpart H, which applies to DOE; this is 10 millirem per year through the air pathway. That is from the facility. In the State of Washington, the WAC-173480 actually has an ambient air standard of 10 millirem. Would not allow any person to get more than 10 millirem and that's anywhere in the ambient air so when we're doing our air sample analysis were looking at those levels that would equate to 10 millirem or below. We actually try to get down to 10% of that. If we saw numbers in the 10-mil range that would have been made public. We were way below those."

Q: "Do you use highball air samplers?"

R: *"Yes, four-inch state plex."*

Q: "How many cubic feet?"

R: *"3,600 cubic feet."*

Q: "How long does it take to collect that information?"

R: *"So, the 3,600 number comes from trying to see 10% of the value. That's a previous sample, which took half an hour to take that reading."*

Q: "Can you spell out what NESHAP is?"

R: *"National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants."*

Q: “How long before do you think the tunnel was open?”

R: *“There was nothing strange reported on Thursday, so sometime between Thursday and Tuesday it occurred.”*

Q: “What was the dose rate and at what distance was it taken at?”

R: *“We heard it was between 1.4 – 1.5 millirem from within a few feet from the top.”*

Q: “What was the baseline number at the tunnel before it collapsed?”

R: *“We do not have this information.”*

Q: “Did you know what the source was or what was in the tunnel? What were you looking for?”

R: *“We were looking for everything, to be completely honest. We did key in on a few isotopes, which was cesium.”*

Q: “How prevalent is this tunnel and why did it collapse when other tunnels have not. What are the plans to prevent the other tunnels from collapsing?”

R: *“Yes, that information will be covered at tomorrow’s briefing, during the HAB meeting. You will see how this tunnel, that collapse, had wooden beams. This tunnel was the first of the tunnel to be built and was the smaller one. The second tunnel has steel and concrete. You will see pictures of the construction of one of them at the HAB meeting tomorrow.”*

Q: “What was the wind like that day?”

R: *“The wind was steady. If a release would have occurred, the alarms would have started to go off. There are alarms everywhere.”*

C: “One of the lessons learned from this incident, is that we are lucky no one got hurt. This incident is a model of what could happen. Each of us have an obligation to share our concerns of the infrastructure, not just PUREX. We have an obligation to engage the public and encourage for funding. I recall Jim Crownmold, who said that they’re never going to put enough money in here to clean it up until somebody dies or a horrible catastrophe occurs.”

C: “I find it interesting that Doug Shoop stated they are looking for 100 billion, but PUREX wasn’t on that list, so the numbers are inaccurate. I think that the board should consider saying that the interim action is not the answer.”

C: “The response needs to have a public review. With international attention and the public concern, the response should be in place on a technical level. I don’t see that this fits the pathway for a response. DOE and Ecology have already agreed on a path forward. This may cause controversy from not allowing a public involvement plan.”

Q: “What is the timeline for a decision process and what can the HAB do?”

R: *“This should be addressed at a meeting.”*

C: "It is very important for the agencies to explain what kind of grout is going to be used."

C: "One thing I am thinking about is the mortgage. Sue Cange gave us a snapshot and the snapshot is a one page of events that does not end until 2075. What bothered me the most about it is that this is what they hand to congress. The mortgage is included in those numbers and the numbers are voluminous because of the mortgage costs."

C: "Just want to clarify, when you are talking about mortgage costs, were talking about what is costs to keep the facilities safe over time."

Q: "Is there opportunity for the HAB to weigh in on the grout decision and if so, when do we need to do that by?"

R: *"The imminent concern is to get the hole filled up in PUREX."*

C: "There should be a process in place for public participation particularly when it comes to remedies once it calms down a bit. I think HAB can ask for a process that is reasonable."

R: *"You mentioned the word "remedy", this is just interim. This is not the final remedy."*

*Agency Response: "One of the questions we all have to ask ourselves is "what you're doing today, doesn't necessarily have an adverse impact on the final remedy." In my opinion, this doesn't because quite honestly, we are going to remove the material from the PUREX tunnels, so you are going to have to grout it to knock the dose rates down regardless and then we will have to cut them up and package them anyway. This is a step that has to happen anyway to fill the hole. I think where our opportunity lies regarding public involvement is there are other places out there that we should be very afraid of."*

C: "My concern is the information that reached the public shortly after the tunnel collapsed, I saw an email that this had happened. Having spent years at Hanford site, I fully understood what had happened to the PUREX tunnel. I fully understood what was happening in the emergency communication center and things going on at the site, having been an emergency responder myself, What I heard on the media was that a railroad tunnel, PUREX had collapsed and that Hanford was being evacuated. I don't think that they realized when they released the information that Hanford workers were being sent home, they didn't say the "because". There was a gap on what information was released, the way it was released, and when it was released."

C: "It is a lesson, although a bit of a negative one, that there was quite a bit of information that came out quickly and you had to go looking for it. There is always going to be that group of reporters or citizens or people looking for attention that will take 3 words and make it 400 and scare the public. Hopefully we can educate the public to know when to be concerned."

C: "The people that live in this area have a comfort level with Hanford and they know people they can call and ask what is going on with this. In this community, we know people that ask questions. The joint information center put everything on the internet."

C: "The media did an outstanding job helping us get the accurate information out to the public."

C: “Would it be worth going out and ask the broader public that has nothing to do with Hanford, how do they feel about it?”

Q: “Can the public call EOC?”

R: “Yes.”

C: “I actually heard from my wife, who was at the hairdresser, whose husband works at Hanford and he called her (the hairdresser) to say that the tunnel had collapsed. It is bizarre how the information travels around here.”

C: “There may be advice that comes out of the HAB on the PUREX tunnel and infrastructure. I imagine the PIC would have a role in that advice if there is interest on how we can use this to get information out about Hanford and how to move forward with the public involvement piece and looking to the future.”

C: “Right now, we should be advising public education, outreach, and involvement. Where is the public review? Currently, process wise, the smart thing for the HAB to do tomorrow is to have a discussion for the public involvement piece. Anyone that has an opinion can certainly weigh in tomorrow verbally. We could make an agreement to say we want there to be a more concerted effort to have public involvement and we want to know what the plan and schedule is. We could develop a letter that encourages this as an opportunity for the DOE to engage the public before decisions are made.”

Agency Recommendation: “Tomorrow at the board meeting is your chance to voice while Tom Teynor is there. Can possibly take the summer to work on a piece of advice for the September board meeting. Who would want to participate? Issue Manager Volunteers are Liz Mattson, Dan Solitz, Gary Garnett, and Helen Wheatley.”

#### **Next Steps:**

A recommendation was made to host an evening public meeting address the PUREX Tunnel collapse at the September HAB meeting in Hood River.

#### **Hanford Live**

Shannon Cram, Vice Chair, introduced the topic of the Hanford Live. Shannon opened the discussion asking committee members the following questions:

- What do you think worked?
- What didn't work?
- What were the lessons learned for the future?

Members used this opportunity have a lengthy discussion of the Hanford Live event.

Dieter Bohrmann North Wind – supporting DOE Office of River Protection (ORP), provided a recap of the Hanford Live event. Key points from Dieter's presentation:

- Notices were sent via email a month before the event. 175 people pre-registered for the livestream via email.
- The livestream had anywhere between 100 – 110 with 120 viewers at one point.
- Facebook Live had more than 1000 views, 12 shares and 17 questions/comments. 50 questions were received before and during the event.
- The event was posted on Twitter with a hashtag of #hanfordlive2017. One question came through Twitter before the event.
- There was a follow up story in the Tri-City Herald after the event.
- The Hanford Live video was posted on YouTube a week after the event took place. Currently there are 850 views.
- A survey was sent out right after the event. There were 57 responses from the survey.
- We have a map of all the location where people were watching. We had views locally and UK, Washington D.C., and Oregon.

Liz Mattson read the survey questions and results to the HAB members.

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

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

Q: “Did you get any sense of how long the YouTube video was viewed?”

R: “That was the tricky part. If you clicked on the video it was considered a view.”

Q: “Do you know if there were a jump in views after the PUREX event?”

R: “I do not know that information.”

C: “We had an issue manager team that consisted of Helen Wheatley, Shannon Cram, Alissa Cornder, and Liz Mattson. We had a call to discuss questions to submit before the Hanford Live event that were not asked during the event. “

R: “We appreciate the input. Those questions were given consideration. Not all questions could be accepted.”

C: “It was a positive experience to be on the panel. I think it’s a good start, I do believe this has a place but not to take place of public meetings. I think it’s an opportunity for single subject items or a few subjects to have an educational discussion.”

Q: “How much time did it take to put together?”

*R: "We started to meet 6 to 7 months before Hanford Live. We met an hour or two a month and then an hour or two a week in addition to all the other work we were doing. I would say we put in about 100 hours between the 6 to 8 of us."*

Q: "How does that compare to an in-person meeting?"

*R: "I think it's almost apples to orange because it was so different between the technology and the preparation work that went into it. For example, the upcoming public comment period is probably 4 to 5 hours of preparation."*

Q: "Do you think it will go faster next time?"

*R: "Yes."*

Q: "Do you have a reflection on why the age gap on the digital format?"

*R: "It was surprising. I am not sure."*

Q: "Do you think as a committee we should break that down more specifically?"

C: "There were a number of college age students that had pre-registered, or it appeared that way. I don't know if they ended up watching."

Q: "How did you figure out who to send the survey too?"

*R: "It went out on Listserv and people who had registered for the event."*

C: "Each presenter covered enough of the same material. It was not different enough to really make sense of why they were talking about the same thing again.

C: My impression is that each individual presenter did an excellent job, but the problem was that it was static in a way that the moderator had a lot of power so we were listening to the moderator more."

Q: "How many of you sent out a link to people for the Hanford Live?"

*R: "About ten HAB members raised their hands."*

C: "Presentations were not attention grabbing."

C: "The survey results were surprising to see that a majority of the results were local to Richland."

Q: "How much did it cost to put on the State of Site meetings?"

*R: "About \$20,000."*

Agency Perspective:

- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency, was most skeptical about the Hanford Live event. Dennis stated that overall, the event turned out to be more positive than expected. He agrees that this format would do well with a general meeting, specifically with a single topic that

would solicit a public comment. After reviewing the video of the event, he felt the panel participants were quiet and the energy levels were low. Due to being unable to see the public participants during the event, the panel found it difficult to gauge the body language and response to the comments by the public.

- Randy Bradbury, Washington State Department of Ecology, agreed that the Live event was a better forum; however, there was real skepticism in advance. They were gratified after participating in the event and realized it will be a valuable addition to the tools already in place. He stated that people shouldn't lose sight of the fact that doing live event like this (and he hopes that they do more in the future), it adds great value as an additional tool to get more public involvement. On the technology questions, they did talk about different suggestions on how to make it more interactive. As a personal observation to the comments about the event being dull, is now people wonder why journalists do what they do to make their reports more exciting. He stated "I'm not saying that what they do is defensible, but there is nothing worse than dull television, so they are under pressure to not have that happen in their reports."
- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency, stated the main lesson learned from this event, is that when it comes to an in-person meeting or webinar, people really have to be aware of what the goals are for that specific meeting or webinar. People can't reach all audiences. Something for the general public versus the Hanford workforce would be very difficult to combine into a single meeting or webinar. Some of the goals here were to improve awareness of the youth of online tools and increase those interested in Hanford. Know what your goals are and go from there.
- Dieter Bohrmann, ORP, stated that they learned that they can do it. They knew it would be a work in progress and would have a lot of lessons learned. One of the things of concern was would this thing even work and how would this even go down. They were able to pull it off and the production value was good with all things considered. There are some kinks needed to work out for next time. He doesn't know what the answer to this would be, but he found it interesting that this is the first time they have used Facebook Live for the Hanford Live event. He did not recall the agencies using that tool before Hanford Live and then a month later they used it extensively to report on the PUREX tunnel collapse. He did not know if there was a correlation there or if using Facebook Live for Hanford Live made them more likely to use it going forward. Another thing is the body language responding to comments. Panelists found it difficult to know how to respond and at what level, when the panel was only looking at a box.
- Rich Buel, DOE-RL, thanked the members. They got a lot good feedback here at the PIC meeting and a lot of good feedback from the survey. He stated that it is a good tool they can look at in the future.

### **Unpacking the Concept of Cleanup**

Shannon Cram, Vice Chair introduced the topic and a group exercise for Unpacking the Concept of Cleanup.

Shannon asked the HAB members to complete the following sentences to open the discussion of how to explain that Hanford waste is not going away, it is just being managed. What does cleanup mean and how can that be communicated to the public.

“Hanford waste doesn’t go away, it…”

- *Naturally attenuates*
- *Is more safely packaged and stored to isolate the hazards.*
- *Remains dangerous to human health & the environment because its buried just below the surface – 20 feet.*
- *Is retrieved, treated and shipped to an engineered destination.*
- *Must be placed in safe, permit storage.*
- *Must be safe for countries for future generations.*
- *Is removed from a vulnerable place and into a more stable place.*
- *Is moved to the center of the site.*
- *Is evaporated to reduce volume.*
- *Is grouted in place and packaged.*
- *Is carefully watched and monitored.*
- *Sites where it is and USDOE says that is a cleanup remedy.*
- *Will remain on site, some contained, some not, as it moves through time going through half-lives.*
- *It degrades.*
- *It is subject to institutional controls.*
- *Is stored on site and continues to be monitored for years to come.*
- *Is processed & stored in a more environmentally safe manor.*
- *Put in another area.*
- *Is managed according to bureaucratic (legal and regulatory requirements).*
- *Stabilized and stored on site.*
- *Just moves from burial site to burial site.*
- *Suck up dollars and dollars.*
- *Is remediated in a way that lessens its danger to human health and the environment.*
- *Moved around to a better location.*

“The river corridor has been....”

- *Represents an improved ecology.*
- *An object of focus; in regard to an emphasis on protection; since cleanup began.*
- *Made safer and should remain a national park.*
- *Taken from Native Americans (can it be returned to them?).*
- *Aggressively remediated with new and old technologies but we cannot say that it is clean.*
- *Remediated.*
- *A success story to congress and makes the CP difficult to communicate there is more work to be done.*
- *Contaminated.*
- *Prioritized so that radioactive and chemical contamination is moved away from the river and put in a landfill at the center of Hanford.*
- *Has been relocated to the center part of the Hanford site.*
- *Gets remediated, stabilized and disposed on the Hanford site or transported & buried deep underground in a disposal area.*
- *Partially remediated but is still contaminated so that no ground water, can used to drink in some areas.*
- *Actively protected from radioisotopes reaching the river, but much work is yet required to protect the river in the long term.*
- *A success story.*
- *Cleansed of the loose toxic and radioactive material.*
- *Merely made available for public use.*
- *Managed to 15 feet below the ground.*

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

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

C: “Cleanup isn’t the same thing as Hanford waste. Cleanup is a process and waste is a material.”

C: “What’s problematic is that you can say “capped” and then say it has been cleaned up.”

C: “You can tell a narrative with those statements and create sentences.”

C: “Some people thought Hanford cleanup was done in 2015.”

C: “We have created materials for the public that say, “Cleanup is public involvement,” “moving waste from one place from another,” “is treating groundwater and returning it to the ground,” “is packaging waste and taking it to New Mexico.” When you show that to people along with pictures, it immediately complicates their perception of Hanford.”

C: “Someone asked if the term managed could be used.”

C: “In one sense it’s no different from your household trash, we clean up the city every week and take it to a landfill, which we are not allowed to go into because its toxic and hazardous. So, were moving the trash to a landfill same as Hanford is moving the waste from “here and here” to the center of the site.”

C: “We need a better view of what the end game is, I don’t know that I’ve ever seen that. What is the end goal?”

C: “How to make sure we don’t forget that Hanford is here. When you say it’s cleaned up, you have to think that it’s still here.”

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

#### **Book Recommendations – June 2017**

- Atomic Geography – A personal History of the Hanford Reservation, by Melvin R. Adams, Hanford Engineer for 24 years. WSU Press, 2016 (available in Tri-Cities bookstores).
- Understanding Radioactive Waste, by Raymond L. Murray. Battelle Press, 1989.
- Basic Hazardous Waste Management, by William C. Blackman, Jr. Lewis Publishers, 1993.

#### **Article Recommendations for Background on PUREX Tunnels – June 2017**

- **Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste Permit Application, PUREX Storage Tunnels**, DOE/RL-90-24, Revision 2. Nov. 1995 --Diagrams of tunnel construction, contents, wood strength survey for Tunnel #1, closure plan development, etc.
- King TV News Report, “Hanford Officials ignored own expert’s advice on tunnel safety for decades.” May 19, 2017. Document references.
- Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “Time to end the decay at the Energy Department.” May 25, 2017. –Deferred Maintenance.

#### **RCRA Permitting Discussion**

Liz Mattson, Chair, introduced the topic of the RCRA Permit Modification Process.

Dieter Bohrmann (ORP), provided a presentation for the RCRA Permitting Process and opened the discussion with the following questions:

- How can the process be simplified?
- What is the public being asked to comment on?
- How can the public engage on this process?

When DOE submits a Class 2 or 3 change to the permit, they're asking the State of Washington for permission to modify the permit. The state requires DOE to hold a comment period as part of the permitting process. The only difference between Class 2 and 3 permit modifications, is that in a class 3, Ecology has an additional 45-day comment period after the initial first 60-day comment period. DOE notifies the public, no less than 30 days before the start of the comment period. An email is prepared 45-60 days before to be sent out to the public. This email is a "head's up" to the public that the comment period is coming. These emails don't often have the dates but they have a range of when to expect it to begin. After the first notice is sent, the permit is prepared and a permit packet is sent to Ecology. Within seven days after submission of the permit modification, the comment period is required to begin. The comment period generally starts on a Monday and ends on a Friday. This is not a requirement, but more a process. The day before a comment period starts a ¼ page Sunday ad is put in the Tri-City Herald.

DOE provides notices to the contractors and holds the public meetings. The presenters are usually from DOE; however, the public is instructed to send their comments to Ecology. There are a number of places the public can view the permit modification information for the public meeting online, such as the administrative record, Ecology's website, etc. There has been a recent move for administrative record to drop the requirement to have paper copies. One of the requirements for holding a comment period is to produce a fact sheet. The fact sheets state what is the change that is being proposed and why the public should care. The fact sheets will look a little different depending on what is being proposed or changed. The fact sheets are physically sent to everyone on the postal mailing list, which used to be 2500 people, but is now about 1500. Comment periods are mailed, emailed, on the web, and periodically posted on Facebook. The meetings are generally an hour long and held at the Richland Public Library, unless stated otherwise.

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

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

C: "Part of the confusion is if you look at the public comment period of the public involvement plan, it does not talk about the purpose of the comment period. What is the general purpose of the public involvement plan and comment period?"

Q: "What is the public comment and why are we looking into it on the front page of the fact sheet?"

R: "The fact sheet is the who, what, when, where, and why?"

Q: "The wording EPA uses makes it simple to understand."

R: "The fact sheets look like they do today is because of the feedback that had been received."

C: "I think the thing that is missing, as people try to get their head around the permit modification is that DOE is asking to do something new. "What are you asking to do?" "What do you need that you have to go get a permit modification for?" "What is the input needed?"

C: “What I have found when making comments on the fact sheets is that they’re trying to get better at incorporating the information in the fact sheets.”

C: “I feel like we are not addressing the question of how do you get people to know when to click on the link?”

R: *“I don’t think there is a need for public input but I think the law says we have to give you the ability to do that. It is getting you active is all it is doing.”*

Agency Perspective:

Randy Bradbury, Ecology, shared when I arrived and saw these, I thought “holy cow, are you kidding me.” I tried to do some editing to turn them into English. It covers a lot information on the basis that these follow the regulations. A lot of this is issue based and they think they have to spell every letter of every rule. I agree they can be more desirable to say “Hey this is your opportunity to become involved!” I will also tell you that we do friendly them up as much as we can within the context of not having someone come back and tell us to change it.

**Next Steps:** Liz Mattson would like to continue this topic at the September meeting.

### **HAB Member Self-Assessments**

An introduction was made by Liz Mattson, Chair. This time was used for a round table discussion of what each HAB members have been doing to share information about Hanford with their communities and/or friend/families.

- Shannon Cram has done speaking engagements about Hanford. She went to Chicago and gave a speech. I went to Washington D.C. and participated in the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability Day and got to talk to Sue Cange, Patty Murray, and Jeff Merkley, and other representatives about Hanford. The usual of talking to her students about Hanford. Shannon’s students did a podcast project with Washington PSR, which is available on the web. Shannon participated in a Hanford forum.
- Kristin Holmes has nothing to report outside of her DOE job.
- Jan Catrell participated in a LIGO tour and talked about Hanford on the bus of 45 people for an hour and half. Jan contacted by the local league of woman voters to do an education program about Hanford in the Fall.
- Dieter Bohrmann reported ORP has been speaking to several Rotary Clubs. ORP staff shared Hanford information with some schools this spring. ORP’s spring lecture series at WSU included talks on Hanford in general and one specifically on the Tanks.
- Jean Vanni had spoken with the Secretary regarding PUREX. Jean stated that DOE is not going forward with the phosphate injection process in the 300 area this year as stated. A notice of intent was filed the previous week. The Department of Justice, the Yakama Nation, and EPA met together and it was stated that Phase two and three would not happen as planned.

- Dana Cowley-Gribble reminded the HAB members that the Budget Priorities meeting was going to be held at the Richland Public Library.
- David Bolingbroke presented at a few conferences, one related to the Manhattan Project and another at WSU Pullman.
- Dan Solitz has been responding to questions about the tunnel collapse.
- Gary Garnett has spent time explaining about the PUREX tunnels.
- Tom Galioto took a few opportunities to pass on Hanford information associated with the tanks and update on the tunnels.
- Helen Wheatley has continued to speak with Ecology regarding about the public participation grants. Helen spent time talking to public interest groups and participants explaining the complexity of working at Hanford.
- Liz Mattson has organized the 7<sup>th</sup> Hanford Forum for shared conversations about Hanford in Leavenworth, which brought together tribes, contractors, members of the public, etc. Participated in conversations this year on the focus of crowd surfing and trying to draw ideas from a broader group of people to improve public involvement, with a meeting summary that will come out on this. Liz has been trying a new tactic for sending new action alerts to get people to reach out to elected officials more and engage more people.
- Dawn McDonald has been answering questions about Hanford to students.

**Attachments**

**Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2017 – June 2017**

**Attachment 2: Hanford Live Numbers**

**Attachment 3: Hanford Live Map**

**Attachment 4: Hanford Live Data**

**Attachment 5: Hanford Live Feedback**

**Attachment 6: Book and Article Recommendations for HAB Members**

**Attachment 7: Transcribed Flipchart Notes**

**Attendees**

**Board Members and Alternates:**

Gary Garnett	Jan Catrell	Susan Leckband
Shelley Cimon	Dan Solitz	Helen Wheatley

Tom Galioto	Liz Mattson	Shannon Cram
Sam Dechter	Alex Nazerati	Rebecca Holland
Pam Larson	David Bolingbroke	Jean Vanni
Gerry Pollett		

**Others:**

Tom Rogers, WA DOH	Kris Holmes, DOE-RL	Maggie Elliot, Tank Farms
Dieter Bohrmann, Northwind/DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	George Rangel, Vit Plant
Jen Copeland, CHPRC	Theresa Bergman, CHPRC	Dana C. Gribble, MSA
Dawn McDonald, DOE-ORP	Paula Call, DOE-ORP	Emy Laija, EPA
Randy Bradbury, Ecology	Brenda George,	Jennifer Colborn, MSA
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Melissa Orona, ProSidian	