



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

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

February 28, 2017

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 2

New Facilitation Team 2

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Update2-3

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Survey 4-7

HAB Summary Report..... 7-8

Hanford Live Webinar 8-9

Response to HAB Advice 291 9-10

Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Plan 10-11

HAB Member Self-Assessments..... 11-13

Next Steps 13

Attachments 13

Attendees..... 13-14

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

Steve Hudson, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. There were no changes to December meeting minutes.

There were no announcements.

New Facilitation Team

ProSidian Consulting introduced their credentials as a team with approximately 30 years of experience in Energy and Sustainability. Lindsay Strasser is our point of focus for the ProSidian Team. She has roots in the community with her husband being a math teacher in the community. She has extensive experience with Hanford working through PNNL and HPM Corporation who is a Prime Contractor on Site. Lindsay is housed in our Richland office located at 713 Jadwin, Suite 3, Richland, Washington 99352. She can be reached directly at 509-588-7010.

Our Lead Facilitator, Freddie Barrett, has over 15 years of Executive Coaching and Facilitation experiences. She has worked with agencies such as Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) in various capacities.

PIC members and agency representatives participated in a roundtable discussion how they got involved in the Board and what their role is.

Comments from PIC committee members included the following:

“Hanford is a very complex area and it will take many generations involved to keep things moving forward.”

“I have a sense of honoring those that came before us.”

“Hanford has a huge impact locally and regionally on our economy. More people should be aware of what is going on.”

“I am amazed at the talent involved on the board.”

“I have a passion for health and safety. Being a worker, I have a different perspective.”

“I think the perspective of an amateur is helpful in a situation like this.”

“I am very happy to be a part of the HAB and will continue for a while.”

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update

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

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

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

Q: With various things in the holding bin, are there thoughts about maybe taking some of these out for regional meetings? Is it possible to consider not to just hold one here in the Tri-Cities but to hold them in other locations?

A: We will consider that request. Those activities will be considered if there is interest. There will be a webinar to allow those who cannot join us in Richland to participate.

C: I would suggest you keep in mind that you would have to plan for advertisement as well. The Tri City Herald and ListServ are not going to do the job.

C: I have heard from the committee there is just a different dynamic when it's not in person. Technology is there to do that and to take public comment. We will see what that looks like.

C: If it went regional, I would like to see it more about funding Hanford cleanup. How are we paying for Hanford cleanup? What do you want to pay for? Different way to ask tax payers the same question.

Q: With the upcoming EE/CA for PUREX, what does the acronym AMU stand for?

A: Aqueous Makeup Unit.

C: Ecology is in review of this and we are waiting on response. This is what will drive the schedule.

C: You are going to see interim work for the chemical processing facilities being planned since the final decisions are still several years in the future. That's what these non-critical actions are being taken in the interim. The hope is to easily transition crews coming out of PFP. Those crews are here and trained now.

Q: Are there going to be public meetings for removal?

A: There is a public comment period requirement, no meeting requirement. This work is an interim step. As you see the EE/CA's come out, the HAB can determine if it's of high interest to them.

C: This would maybe be an action item for the RAP Committee, could be a joint activity. Maybe someone could come to RAP to explain.

C: Yes someone from DOE could come forward to discuss this. There are a lot of photos with these updated buildings.

Q: Which of these in the holding bin are public comment vs. meetings?

A: Most all of these (minus Hanford Live) will have a comment period. EE-CA don't require a meeting. Class 2 permit modifications require a public meeting. Greens items are permit related and will likely have a public meeting correlated. The blue ones not necessarily.

Q: When you are holding them online, are they being done in real time?

A: Yes, there is a webinar.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Survey

Helen Wheatley (Heart of America), HAB Issue Manager introduced the topic and provided a handout with ideas for improving public participation for Hanford activities.

- **Increasing Public Interest**
 - Encourage use of social media communications by HAB members as well as TPA Agencies to spread information related to Hanford.
 - Employ some of the techniques suggested by PIC meeting intern visitors last year (IE: using Q&A on Hanford Issues, Creating contests to promote Hanford).
 - Distribute information and advertise use of Hanford.Gov, the DOE quarterly reports and more to the general public.
 - HAB and TPA Agencies should approach local groups (CBC, WSU Extension) to participate in their regular classroom programs to promote Hanford issues and collect email addresses from interested parties.
 - Sponsor some university projects to work on Hanford related issues. Collect emails from interested parties. Encourage individual Hanford contractors to fund and support these projects.
 - Collect email listing of members from each HAB participating organization. This listing can be used to disseminate information on specific topics.
 - Update and improve annual PIP survey forms and distribute directly to email listings.
 - Revise the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) to describe the activities ultimately adopted for improved public participation.

- **Increasing Public Involvement**
 - Encourage/Advertise for public participation in HAB meetings and TPA document-specific meetings.
 - Continue to push to hold regional HAB meetings each year.
 - Use email lists (above) to encourage direct involvement.
 - Obtain DOE commitment to provide direct support as required to analyze and act upon the annual PIP survey results.

- **Increasing Public Input on Hanford Decision Making:**
 - Use email lists (above) to ask for direct input on topics of interest expressed by those listed on the mailing list.
 - Allow a select number of members of the public and students from local colleges/universities to directly participate as guest members (for several months each) through committee meeting and HAB meeting participation.

Discussion continued looking at the larger context of the handout. What does the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) says about the survey? One thing observed is there is a divergence between what the PIP says and what is actually happening. Helen provided a reminder that the PIP describes the role of the survey. It's the only required tool specified in the PIP for gathering public feedback and more tools may be needed, this may be too heavy of a burden for a survey.

C: The larger question is, is it time to revisit the question whether this is an adequate way to evaluate the public involvement process? Or do we need to get creative, expansive on public impact?

C: There is the opportunity to provide qualitative vs. quantitative questions.

C: Certain conversations generate comments.

Agency Comment:

EPA: Emy Laija:

To provide history: These were not done behind the scenes. There was a discussion and involvement with the PIC to develop the original questions in 2012. The agencies have briefed the PIC on the survey on an annual basis since then. The purpose of the survey is to evaluate public involvement activities at Hanford.

- A narrow scope for the survey was that way by design. Was to evaluate public involvement activity held over the previous year.
- I don't anticipate there will be major changes to these survey questions unless you are spending your time and resources checking other things.
- With the TPA PI survey, we are looking at what we did and how we can do better.

DOE-ORP: Dieter Bohrmann

Survey was not intended to be scientific or statistical. It was an attempt to capture feedback. Things we have been able to pull from the survey include:

- Preferences for meeting times
- Suggestions for meeting location

We have been able to pull some comments and responses from the surveys that are consistent over time. I think the most helpful feedback the PIC could provide would be related to the questions: Within the survey framework, are there tweaks we can make? We have reached out to Liz Mattson and have revised a few in the past. Are there other ways we can distribute the survey? Other avenues to look at for getting more responses? It was assumed that survey audience had some background with Hanford. We weren't trying to educate folks or get new audiences.

Q: In the past there was the opportunity to take a survey at each public meeting to evaluate each event and public comment period?

A: *TPA acknowledges that they have stopped. Ideally we would be handing them out after the completion of each event.*

Q: Did you compare survey results year to year? Are there trends?

A: *Yes we have. We could probably continue to do that and build on the history of the survey. What we found was that responses didn't change much. Responses were predictable based upon who took the survey.*

Q: Is it your opinion that the current survey as it stands is the only effort to reach out to the public to see how

we are doing? Is that adequate?

A: Assuming we add surveys after events (2 prong approach). An exit survey at the end to get immediate thoughts.

A: We are here to make the process better. We care about it and are actively in these positions daily to do just that.

C: Thinking ahead to designing feedback for 2017 public comment periods. They may be difficult to capture in the surveys. The current survey is not qualitative. In the past there was the opportunity to rate the public comment period. Because public comment is becoming a dominant part of communicating, we need a strategy to get feedback to improve public comment periods.

C: Might be helpful to have less specific questions.

C: There are always a lots of qualitative comments about other things. People are trying to use this as a tool for public comment itself. There needs to be a discussion on how to bring out more of the qualitative dimensions.

C: A lot of times when I read through the questions, I am answering similar questions in the same way because the context suggests otherwise.

Q: If a board member is having trouble, how do they expect general public to really understand?

A: Depending on the hat you wear will determine how you will answer those questions. You will pick the hat you most identify with.

Q: You are always gathering information. What is the relationship between the agencies and the survey results? How do those inform each other?

A: Kris & Dieter meeting regularly to discuss all aspects of public involvement. There are some real checks and balances. We are all responsible in the roles that we are in and others in theirs.

C: Going forward, I would like to suggest that we have input on the 2017 survey evaluation process. That we might consider it a part of what we do. Helping to improve the summary process by talking specifically like we do with public notice.

C: What is tricky about this topic is we are talking about a lot of different things at the same time. It's hard to stay on topic of how we can provide evaluation of the past year's public involvement?

- Evaluate public involvement in real time?
- Interpersonal input (rolling) over time? This is more invisible to PIC.
- Lots of specific things like Helen was saying regarding public involvement process.

Q: Does it seem to you that of the things that we could provide input on, provide a more focused discussion? Is the input you receive from the general survey implementable input? Or input on how you design specific

surveys?

A: If you want to suggest tweaks or slight changes, let us know. We are not going to issue it again until Fall. As far as an event survey goes for specific events, we have a 2 sheet form that we have used previously. Ideally we could bring that back for review.

Q: Should we design the survey in house or by professionals? How we design is an area of social expertise. Is it worth thinking about bringing in an outside party?

A: The chance of getting resources to have a social scientist is slim to none.

C: There are social scientists on the HAB willing to provide time.

Q: Input is valuable on design. If there was the opportunity for folks to provide feedback on the survey before it was administered, it would be quick and easy. How can we use the data we have and use it effectively?

A: We have asked for feedback. We will incorporate it as much as possible but cannot say we will accept every change. If it would improve the survey, we will take that feedback and make those changes.

- *Rethinking how we do our lessons learned. What might that look like? We are flexible. We will use every ability to make it the best possible.*

Next Steps:

The committee decided to have an issue manager group that consists of Shannon Cram, Alissa Cordner, Helen Wheatley and Tom Galimoto to have a call to discuss proposed survey questions to be distributed after the Hanford Live Webinar.

HAB SUMMARY REPORT

Gary Garnant, HAB Issue Manager opened the discussion. Both Gary & Helen have been looking for books and articles that might be of interest to HAB members. The following list was distributed to members of the PIC committee:

Book Recommendations for HAB Members – March 2017.

- Hanford Site Historic District – History of the Plutonium Production Facilities 1943-1990 624 Pages (www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/807939)
- An Evaluation of DOE-EM Public Participation Programs – PNNL -14200 Feb. 2003, 151 Pages
- A Citizen's Guide to NEPA – Having Your Voice Heard, December 2007, 55 Pages
- Mitigation Action Plan Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016 – Final Environmental Assessment for Proposed Conveyance of Land at the Hanford Site, Richland, WA. DOE/EA- 1915 December 2016

It was communicated that if you run across any good books or articles to provide them to Gary or Helen so they may make them easily accessible to HAB members.

C: Ken Niles has put out 15/20/25 year reports that are very detailed providing information regarding all

activities at Hanford. Direct quotes from the people who are actually involved. You can access the most recent one on the website. Newest report summarizes what was captured in previous reports.

C: Roy Gephart has a great summary of the site.

C: Michele Gerber- Series of reports and a book, On the Home Front that details specific information on the 300 Area and T Plant.

C: America's Nuclear Wastelands by Max Power is also a great read.

Hanford Live Webinar:

Shannon Cram, HAB Issue Manager provided an introduction to the Hanford Live Meeting discussion. Shannon communicated her disappointment with the transition to the web based meeting citing the following potential issues with the change:

- Concern about the precedent that this webinar sets.
- Concern that Hanford Live Webinars may serve as a replacement for the State of the Site meeting or for public meetings in the future.
- HAB members specified both in committee discussions and in advice that webinars are an excellent tool to share information, but they are not an effective replacement for in-person meetings.
- Effective public involvement means building relationships and creating dialogue. The webinar format allows communication of information, but it does not facilitate two-way dialogue.

Agency Comment:

EPA: Emy Laija:

We are trying something new this year.

- We envision people in their home. Cameras will be on panel speakers. There will be videos and not pictures.
- We encourage people to submit their questions by video ahead of time and send them in. This material will make it more interactive for participants.
- You will login and there will be both live and facilitated questions. A formal facilitator will run it all much like an in person.

Q: Would it be possible for my students to record questions now?

A: *Yes, you can send them to us now!*

C: With your students being familiar with the information, we may get useful questions.

C: We did something similar to this for a webinar in Oregon. I recommend doing everything as a prototype before you actually do it, this way you can work out the kinks.

Q: How do we advertise?

A: *We will rely on what we have available. This includes ListServ, Facebook and other avenues. STEM*

programs and colorful fliers as well. We want to provide fliers to groups so they are able to provide to their people. We would like feedback on the flier (provide to committee members for review). The goal is to make it a product that people want to share.

Q: Will people be able to share PowerPoint slides?

A: *It will be just like the news. Recorded and put on YouTube for review and storage.*

Q: Will there be a limit on the number of people who can be on the webinar?

A: *Hundreds can login to the webinar, should not be an issue.*

Q: These colorful fliers are going to cost \$1 to print. Can these be provided?

A: *We are currently looking at electronic distribution. I don't think we can agree to pay to print many.*

C: There is always looking at the simplistic option. Most people have cell phones and the capability of texting. You could snap a picture and include as an attachment or text message.

Q: Is there an advertising budget for the Hanford Live event?

A: No there is not.

Next Steps:

The PIC discussed debriefing the Hanford Live event on their April committee call.

Response to HAB Advice #291

A response was received on February 13, 2017 to Advice 291 ([TPA Response to HAB Advice # 291](#)). A discussion regarding the response was led by committee chair, Liz Mattson. Reactions to the response included the following:

- My biggest concern is that participation in the meetings may be controlled. This includes mute buttons and so forth. There is broken trust around creating space for public involvement.
- What we lose in the webinar is real time dialogue surrounding hard issues. That feeling of engagement and actual conversation. There seems to be an intent that we want to make people feel better about Hanford Cleanup. For me, that's the least important part.
- In an in-person meeting the actual decision makers are in the room and are directly hearing from a person who can have a conversation and clarify comments and questions. I am worried that will be lost in a webinar.
- Webinars do not serve best as a two way means of conversation.
- In person meetings have a lot of discussion between participants. This platform does not allow for this to happen.
- Key thing is it's not either or, it's both. We don't want to lose both.

Q: I hear someone say that webinars are not a replacement for in person State of the Site meetings, can you

clarify that?

A: We are piloting this program for 2017. It is difficult for us to come and say we are going to have public meetings that are not required in the letter. Until we have a budget, we don't know what it looks like. We aren't trying to hide anything, we are simply waiting.

Q: Do you have advice on how to reach STEM students and so forth? How would we respond to this feedback?

A: People would send an email. Collect email as a group and send a package. I ask you guys to provide feedback in a way that works for you. I would prefer you have one set of comments to send to us.

Q: What is the timeframe in which you would need the recommendations?

A: The latest we could take them and do something with them is mid-March. Webinar is April 12, 2017.

C: I am pretty sure other Ecology programs have done target advertising with Google and Facebook. Not sure what the budget is but we will try something. This would be the perfect thing to try it with. It's a great value for what you can get.

C: I recommend talking to various radio stations, something like this might work for us.

A: A press release will be going to major cities. This is part of the plan.

Next Steps:

PIC members are to provide any suggestions or recommendations to Lindsay Strasser no later than March 10, 2017. Lindsay will then provide these suggestions to Emy Laija for review.

Tri Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Plan

HAB Issue Manager, Alissa Corder provided an introduction to the TPA Public Involvement Plan for discussion. Alissa communicated that the TPA are doing minor revisions and in the process shared their proposed revisions have pushed it into the major revision category. The group provided a lot of feedback at the last meeting and is interested in hearing how the TAP received that input.

A: After collecting the input, the next step was for the Public Involvement Liaisons to go over it. They met last week to discuss if this was an easy change. The following items were discussed:

- *Can we make this change easily?*
 - *For a lot of those, the answer was yes. A number of changes were a yes, we can make it.*
- *If we can't make this change, we asked ourselves if this was a major change.*
 - *If so, we tabled it.*
- *There were some changes that were not appropriate to make.*
 - *For those, we decided to not move forward.*
- *Next will be going through comments one by one.*
 - *The desire is to move forward with any non-major changes.*

Q: What determines if the change is considered minor or major?

A: This can be subjective. If you are changing one or two words that don't change the meaning of a sentence that would be considered a minor change. If the word changes the meaning of the sentence this would be

considered a major change. Our intent is not to upset anyone.

Q: Is there a timeframe in mind for completion of major changes?

A: There is no date in mind, this is not driven by time. What would change would be in the field that would say our public involvement plan is out of date. One thing we would like to be able to do with the next version of the public involvement plan is to bring that through and have that conversation to discuss why changes were made and not made.

Q: Were there a lot of comments?

A: There were six sets of comments, and they varied. Not new ideas but maybe adding more substance. This will be a lengthy effort. We are going to meet again in the next few weeks to have a cleaned up version by early summer.

Q: One of the changes to PIP, the previous meeting had hard copies. We would carry them around and could use them as a document for the public to go through. Will the most recent one only be available electronically?

A: To get PIP printed is not easy. Anything considered an extra expense is hard to argue for. Because we relied on the 2012 version to be mostly electronic, and there are no major changes, we most likely will not reprint.

Next Steps:

Emy Laija agreed to attend another Public Involvement & Communications committee meeting to discuss what suggested questions were taken and not taken.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

An introduction was made by Liz Mattson, committee chair. This time was used to go around the table and discuss what you have been up to. What have you done to share information about Hanford with your community and or family/friends? Have you heard from anyone in your network that would be helpful to agencies?

- Ginger Wireman recently visited both Vancouver and Clark College. They held a well-attended STEM seminar series. It was a very broad cross section of the community and the Rotary Club. In 2 weeks she will be going to Coyote Ridge Prison and Delta High School.
- Steve Hudson met with Deans to discuss interest level in having a program. Trying to get STEM at the community college level but did not have much interest. People are under a lot of pressure to increase graduation rates. They are concerned that STEM students could be attracted away before they finish their degrees.
- Shannon Cram currently has classes working on Hanford based projects. Students have been conducting interviews, including Ken Niles, Tom Carpenter, and a professor at OSU. They pick topics and do a five minute podcast that goes online. Every time she teaches about Hanford, students get really into it. Topics for the podcasts included the following:
 - Why it's so hard to care about Hanford?
 - Why did I not know about Hanford?

- Apathy related to Hanford?

A lot of students come back and want to learn more about Hanford. It really is compelling. Students are very proud of their work.

Shannon along with Holly Barker and Liz Mattson have organized a mini brown bag lunch series on campus at the UW Campus to have conversation across disciplines on Hanford. In addition, Shannon will be attending a conference at WSU Tri-Cities March 15-18.

- Tom Galioto communicated that he does not have the convenience of a large list of people he interacts with daily. However, he has had discussions within his inner circle and has taken the opportunity to post on LinkedIn. A lot of people have reviewed and commented. Posted a quick article about Hanford cleanup and referred people to the Hanford.Gov website. Tom had 40-50 hits in only a few days.
- Jan Catrell sponsored a class with Ginger Wireman. The gentleman who taught this class also teaches a class at LIGO. This upcoming May they are taking a group from Academy of Lifelong Learning on a tour at LIGO. Jan helped the man received a package of fliers to provide to his members. Jan was also invited by her church to submit a proposal for a workshop in Columbus, Ohio in 2018. She had to add religion into Hanford. Her proposal is for private justice, talk about Hanford and EM SSAB Nuclear conflict. I want people know where these facilities are and how they can get involved. She also attended a seminar on renegotiating the Columbia River Treaty.
- Alissa Cordner has worked Hanford information into her lectures at Whitman College. She is in the process of setting up another internship for this summer. If people know of any internship opportunities, let Alissa know. She may be able to match you with a student.
- Emmitt Jackson has not had the forum to share information or gather information or data. Going to do some brainstorming to make this happen.
- Dirk Dunning communicated he has been working with the STEM community. Met with the South Portland STEM Group to discuss what's available they might use. Dirk communicated it's hard to get below the 6th grade level due to the technical nature of the information.
- Ken Niles provided a presentation to Linfield College.
- Helen Wheatley communicated there is a lot of legislating going on that has been very time consuming. Facebook and web presence are still there. Heart of America has not had the opportunity to do a lot of Hanford related outreach. A lot of involvement is being pulled away to other projects.
- Liz Mattson and Helen Wheatley have been participating in meetings over public participation grants. Rule making process is currently going on. There is a concern with environmental justice. The timeline for this unknown. Public webinars took place 2 weeks ago and hopefully the grant program should return soon.
- Liz Mattson has been contributing to the PPG rule-making process through Ecology in Olympia. There has been a lot of general enthusiasm for Hanford outreach, and requests for speakers. She has been asked by a number of people to do things but just does not have a lot of time. There are a lot of people who are looking for ways to be involved. The interest is out there.
- Emy Liaja has been involved in teaching an environmental class. EPA also has an intern this summer.

- Dieter Bohrmann shared the following in regard to ORP outreach:
 - ORP Federal Project Director, Steve Pfaff is giving a Hanford talk to the Columbia Chapter of Professional Engineers in Portland on March 7.
 - ORP continues to make STEM outreach a priority and is working closely with students and staff from Washington State University.
- Kris Holmes provided an update regarding upcoming tours.
 - March 2, 2017 – Japanese visitors
 - March 13, 2017 - Citizens & foreign nationals
 - March 16, 2017 - Oregon students & staff
 - April 5, 2017 – Oregon students & staff
 - May – Potential HAB tour
- Jennifer Colborn shared she had the opportunity to meet with Christopher Herbert from Columbia Basin College (CBC) who is looking for Hanford historical documents for a display case. Maybe an old photo or a report that could be shared? She encouraged the committee to look for items that they may be able to provide. You can reach Christopher Herbert at CHerbert@columbiabasin.edu.
- Shelley Cimon communicated that she has not had the opportunity to do much outreach. She shared that people are overwhelmed when discussing Hanford. She shared that there is a local teacher in her area that teaches state vs. federal rights to seniors each year. It's a very interesting way to address the site.

Next Steps:

3 month work plan will be discussed during the PIC Committee call in April.

- **Attachments**

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

Attachment 2: Draft Ideas, Ideas for Improving Public Participation in Hanford Activities (2-26-2017)

Attachment 3: Hanford Public Involvement Survey Questions

Attachment 4: How to Evaluate Public Involvement Handout

Attachment 5: HANFORD LIVE 2017: A Virtual Conversation and Site Wide Update Flier for review

Attachment 6: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch	Rebecca Holland, HAMTC	Shelley Cimon, Columbia River Keeper
-----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------

Jan Catrell, Public at Large	Helen Wheatley, Heart of America	Tom Galioto, Public at Large
Gary Garnant, Franklin & Grant County	Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters	Sam Dechter, Public at Large
Emmitt Jackson, Hanford Workforce, Non-Union	Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board	Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington
Alissa Cordner, Public at Large	Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge	

Others:

Jennifer Colborn - MSA	ShinTaro Ito -PNNL	Kris Holmes, DOE-RL
Dana Cowley-Gribble - MSA	Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind, DOE-ORP	Rich Buel - DOE
Dawn McDonald, DOE-ORP	Freddie Barrett, ProSidian	Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian

By Phone:

Adrian Woolcock- ProSidian	Ken Niles – State of Oregon	Ben Durosola- ProSidian
Earl Fordham, WA State Department of Health	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC	Scott Keifer, PE Virginia