



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

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

*September 18, 2018
Bellevue, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update	2
Hanford Regional Dialogue Meeting & Planning.....	3
Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation Advice Review.....	6
PUREX Tunnel 2 Public Meeting Update	7
Committee Business.....	8
HAB Member Self-Assessments	9
Attachments	10
Attendees	10

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, Hanford Challenge and Chair of the Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee, welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

The [June meeting minutes](#)¹ were approved by consensus.

There were no announcements

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update

Agency Presentation

Echo Dahl, North Wind – supporting the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP), provided an update of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency [Public Involvement Calendar](#)² to PIC members.

Using the calendar as a guide, Echo provided an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities. Echo stated there are two active public comment periods. She also pointed out that the public comment period for the Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C (WMA C) was extended to November 7, 2018. Echo stated that a public meeting associated with the WIR was held on June 18, 2018 in Richland, Washington. She also noted that a regional public meeting will be held on October 16, 2018 in Portland, Oregon. Echo communicated that Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is the lead on a public comment period for the proposed modification to Plutonium Extraction (PUREX) Storage Tunnels that will end on September 27, 2018. She noted that there were two public meetings associated with the PUREX public comment period held on August 27, 2018 in Richland, Washington and September 5, 2018 in Seattle, Washington. Echo stated that the dates for the holding bin items have been updated. Additionally, the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB/Board) meeting is scheduled for September 19 & 20, 2018 at the Embassy Suites – Bellevue, Washington. A Hanford Site tour for HAB members is scheduled for October 2, 2018, followed by a combined Health, Safety and Environmental Protection (HSEP) and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting on October 3, 2018. The Hanford Regional Dialogue meeting is scheduled for November 1, 2018 in Hood River, Oregon. The Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board meeting is scheduled for November 5 & 6, 2018 in Cascade Locks, Oregon.

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

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

Q: “Why did the Site-Wide Permit Rev. 9 get pushed out to December 2022?”

R (Ecology): “I am not sure why the date got pushed out, but I can ask and get you answer later.”

Q: “Is there going to be funding to continue to work on it?”

¹ June 5, 2018 PIC Summary

² TPA Public Involvement Calendar – Fall 2018

R (ORP): “I know TPA Agencies are working on it, or at least having discussions about it.”

Q: “Does DOE have a plan on how they will address the comments given on the PUREX tunnels?”

R: “When we close out the comment period, an email will be sent out with a link to the comment response document.”

Hanford Regional Dialogue Meeting & Planning

Liz Mattson introduced the topic of the Hanford Regional Dialogue meeting and planning. Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided a presentation on the topic of the Hanford Regional Dialogue (HRD) formally known as the State of the Site (SOS) meetings.

Key points from the presentation:

- Emy provided a history of the SOS meetings. The SOS meetings offered an opportunity for interested members of the public to discuss Hanford cleanup progress, challenges, and priorities with decision-makers from the TPA Agencies. At the time that SOS was initiated, public meetings about Hanford were not held regularly.
- With input received from the PIC committee and stakeholders, the TPA Agencies are revamping the SOS meeting format. The new format is referred to as the Hanford Regional Dialogue, which will have a more interactive format. The first pilot of the new format will be held on November 1, 2018 in Hood River, Oregon.
- The TPA Agency objectives for the HRD meeting are providing brief statements from the TPA Agencies, which include DOE Richland Operations Office (RL), ORP, Ecology, and EPA, as well as local alternative perspectives. The TPA Agencies support the long-term discussions with the public about Hanford cleanup. The new format will support and encourage two-dialogue and address concerns identified by the public.
- The HRD meeting will be open to everyone interested in participating and learning about Hanford progress. The HRD meeting is an opportunity to increase public awareness of the progress, challenges, and priorities of Hanford. Members of the public will have an opportunity to speak directly with the Hanford decision-makers and subject matter experts (SMEs) on technical aspects and details of Hanford cleanup.
- The TPA Agencies will be looking at a variety of quantitative/qualitative factors to determine the success of the HRD meeting. This includes the number and age of participants, number of questions received in advance, number of media articles, audience retention, quality of discussion, quality of presentations provides, and overall satisfaction of participants.
- The TPA Agencies will be sending press releases to the City of Seattle, Portland, Richland, Hood River, and other Eastern/Central Washington cities.

- Other consideration for the planning of the HRD meeting include professional facilitation services, pre-event survey to solicit topics, use of social media for advertising, use of post-event participant surveys, and solicitation for input from the public on meeting topics.

Emy opened the discussion for members to ask questions about the HRD meeting format, date, and location. A draft agenda and draft advertisements/publications were handed out for the members to review and provide input.

Liz stated that the PIC Issue Manager team submitted the HRD Guidelines Proposal with suggestions for the format, name, location, etc. Liz noted that the PIC committee will need to decide if the document should be a white paper or advice.

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

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

C (Ecology): “I think the TPA Agencies should add a question regarding the zip code the person is in to determine where the next meeting could be.”

C (RL): “The TPA Agencies met several times and referenced the HRD guidelines proposal from the PIC committee in order to determine the format of the meeting.”

Q: “Will there be presentation boards?”

R (RL): “Yes, there will be presentation boards.”

Q: “What consultation have you had with the citizen groups? What issues or topics will be covered at the meeting? Why aren’t you advertising in Portland and Vancouver?”

R (EPA): “We are looking to schedule a stakeholder call, particularly with the stakeholder groups that are very active around the Hood River area to discuss the topics that will be listed in the pre-event survey.”

C: “The fact that a date has been set for the HRD meeting without discussing with the stakeholder groups already creates a conflict. There are two large stakeholder groups in the Hood River area, which are Columbia Riverkeeper and Heart of America Northwest. For Heart of America Northwest, we have a conflict with the set date of November 1, 2018.”

R (EPA): “I hear your concerns clearly, but the challenge is trying to coordinate the schedules for all of the SMEs and Hanford decision-makers.”

C: “I will say that hearing about this meeting date here at a PIC meeting instead of having this conversation when the dates were being discussed, is flat out insulting that the two organizations that have a large presence in Hood River were not consulted. I do expect that we will be consulted regarding the issue topics.”

R (EPA): “We had originally asked the PIC to provide potential dates for this event, but did not receive many responses. One of the lessons learned from planning this event is that we should’ve asked the stakeholder groups if any major events planned over the next two or three months. That can be a question that we should ask for any future events that includes stakeholder participation.”

C (RL): “When we received the HRD guidelines proposal from the PIC committee, we called around to many different locations for meeting space that would accommodate the format proposed. The Hood River Inn in Hood River, Oregon had a great location and space that would accommodate the format of the HRD meeting.”

Q: “Is there a community college in Hood River?”

R (RL): “Yes, there is a community college in Hood River.”

C (ORP): “When we started planning this last month, we committed to holding this HRD meeting in the fall. We were able to secure the meeting space with a short time frame in a great location that would appease the stakeholders.”

C (RL): “One of the things we inserted was a line item in the facilitators contract to engage and build a relationship with the stakeholder groups.”

C: “I really like the survey questions that are being proposed. The Listserv email should have the date, time, and location in the introduction so that it can be shared among the various groups and interested persons.”

Q: “Will you be advertising the HRD meeting on the Hanford website?”

R: “Yes. We will be posting the meeting information on the Hanford website, Hanford Facebook page, DOE’s Facebook page, Ecology’s Facebook page, EPA’s Facebook page, and Hanford YouTube channel.”

C (RL): “We called the local government, radio stations, news talk shows, newspapers, and in Hood River for advertising.”

Q: “My concern with this format is that there will not be enough time for the wrap-up. Do you have to work with the facilitator on how the group report out is going to work? Can you elaborate on your thoughts of the facilitator?”

R (ORP): “Part of the group report out on the agenda will follow after the breakout sessions. It’s more of a breakdown or follow up with the SMEs and decision-makers.”

C: “My concern is there won’t be enough time for those follow up questions.”

R (RL): “That’s what the facilitator is there for, to keep the schedule on time.”

C: “I really appreciate the work the TPA Agencies have put into this, especially using the PIC committee suggestions. I think it’s really important that the public hear from the decision-makers during the wrap-up.”

Q: “What are the thirty-minute rotations on the agenda?”

R: “It’s so that everyone can go to the different tables and have a chance to view or hear about the different topics. Each topic will be presented twice.”

Q: “What happens to the managers during the breakout sessions? Will they be at the tables with the SMEs?”

R: “The idea is for the managers to be listening and observing the breakout sessions, but the SMEs will be participating in the discussion with the groups.”

C: “Last month, Doug Shoop provided a presentation to the River and Plateau (RAP) committee about the risks at Hanford. Doug discussed the items that he said kept him up at night. I really appreciated this type of dialogue and honesty from a high-level decision-maker.”

C: “I think that’s the approach we are looking for or expecting from the SMEs at the HRD meeting. We want to hear about the items that are urgent.”

R: “That’s something that the members of the public attending the meeting can ask the SMEs.”

C: “I have been to a lot of SOS meetings. I would say that the regional turnouts were good. I think it would be beneficial if the people that participate have the opportunity to learn how they can continue to participate.”

C: “I have been to many of these types of meetings and employee concerns becomes one of the main focuses. A good facilitator is essential to having a successful meeting.”

Q: “Can the TPA Agencies elaborate on what the thoughts are for facilitation? How early in the planning process do they get involved? Any ideas on who the facilitator will be?”

R (EPA): “Yes. We were looking for a facilitator that has experience and strong facilitation skills.”

R (RL): “Susan Hayman will be the facilitator for the HRD meeting.”

Q: “Has it been decided that the meeting will only cover four topics?”

R (RL): “Yes. Only four topics.”

C: “I suggest there be a local perspective and tribal perspective in addition to the agency perspective.”

C: “I think the tagline is an important part of the advertisements for the meeting.”

Next Steps: The PIC committee decided to post the HRD Guidelines Proposal document on the PIC/HAB website as an attachment to the September PIC meeting placeholder.”

Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation Advice Review

Liz Mattson introduced the topic for the proposed Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C (WMA-C) advice from the Tank Waste Committee (TWC).

Liz stated that there will be public meeting on October 16, 2018 in Portland, Oregon regarding the Draft WIR Evaluation for Closure of WMA-C.

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and Board Chair read a note from Emmett Moore, Washington State University and HAB Member regarding his disapproval of referencing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) in the public input portion of the advice. Susan noted that Emmett will likely call into the HAB meeting on September 19, 2018 to make a statement.

Liz asked members to review the public input portion of the draft advice. Members had the opportunity to review the draft advice and provide input.

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

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

C: “The draft advice states the request for DOE to create a public comment opportunity to evaluate the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Technical Evaluation Report. I thought this was supposed to happen soon.”

Q: “I believe the NRC was supposed to send a Request for Additional Information (RAI) in the September/October timeframe. Can we request this information from DOE?”

R (ORP): “I will take this request back to management and get back to you.”

Q: “Is there a deadline for the draft WIR Evaluation and the NRC Technical Evaluation?”

R (ORP): “The draft WIR evaluation is currently out for public comment until November 7, 2018.”

Q: “Is the NRC required to have a public process, as they have been tasked with doing the WIR evaluation?”

R (ORP): “I don’t know if they are doing the WIR, but I believe they are evaluating the WIR.”

R: “I believe the NRC has to follow the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), so if they have a meeting in public it is considered a public meeting. The RAI meeting would be a public meeting.”

Q: “Do we know if the grout will withstand the time in the tanks?”

R: “In the performance assessment, it models out an assumption that the grout will last 500 years.”

PUREX Tunnel 2 Public Meeting Update

Liz Mattson introduced the topic of the PUREX Tunnel 2 public meeting. Liz noted that Ecology held a public meeting in Seattle and Richland for the permit modification on PUREX Tunnel 2.

Liz opened the discussion for members to ask questions about the PUREX Tunnel 2 public meetings.

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

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

Q: "Did Ecology decide to issue the public comment period or were they requested to issue the public comment period?"

R: "Ecology decided to do the public comment period."

C: "I did attend the public meeting in Richland. The meeting had a good turnout and people did make formal comments. I gathered from some of the comments made that the concern is that the grout will be the final disposition path of PUREX Tunnels."

C: "There were some great comments submitted."

C: "There was a great turnout of members of the public at the Seattle meeting."

C: "There were 35 people who signed in and 15 total comments at the Seattle meeting."

C: "Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest and Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge both had great presentations at the Seattle meeting."

Committee Business

Liz Mattson introduced the topic of Committee Business. Items of discussion include the following:

Review of Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Work Plan Items:

- Added
 - Permitting: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Site Wide Permit Rev. 9 date is now 2022.
 - Outreach: Evaluate and provide recommendations for the Hanford Regional Dialogue.
- Removed
 - Outreach: Discuss new approaches and recommendations for Hanford Regional Dialogue meetings.
 - Outreach: Rebrand State of the Site meetings.
- Committee of the Whole
 - Kristen Holmes, Public Affairs Specialist requires 30 days' notice per the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) prior to a Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting.

HAB New Member Orientation:

- An Issue Manager Team was formed. Issue Managers for the HAB New Member Orientation include Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge; Tom Galioto, Public At Large; Susan Leckband, Board Chair; Julie Atwood, Yakama Nation; and David Bolingbroke, Public At Large.

HAB Member Self-Assessments

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

- Shannon Cram – In June I went to Argonne National Lab for a training and spend the week discussing various issues.
- Tom Galioto – Summer is a slower time for me. I did post some articles regarding cleanup issues on my Linked In page.
- David Bolingbroke – I attended the Hanford Forum. I will be teaching a lecture on Hanford history in the next month. I actively share articles on Twitter regarding Hanford.
- Susan Leckband – I was asked to speak to the incoming class of Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) Fellows in June. There were 52 Post Grads and PhD candidates that are hired by PNNL. I spoke about the history of Hanford and the HAB. I attended the EM SSAB meeting in September in Washington D.C.
- Rebecca Holland – I started working at the 324 Building recently. I had an opportunity to educate my coworkers about the HAB. In June, I was invited by the Principal at Rivers Edge Alternative school in Richland to present on career opportunities at Hanford.
- Dan Solitz – I have been to a couple of meetings that had a huge turnout. I have been to some meetings that had presentations about Hanford.
- Jeff Burrigh – In August, I went to an event held by the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry and gave a speech on Tank Farms. Ken Niles gave a speech about the history of Hanford. We will be holding a public meeting on October 16, 2018 at the Unitarian Church in Portland, Oregon, which will be after the WIR public meeting.
- Dana Miller – I have informed the Tribal Council about Hanford issues. This is my first time attending a PIC meeting.
- Kris Holmes – I attended the EM SSAB workshop in September. In August, Doug Shoop was invited to a National Nuclear Cleanup Caucus by Congressman Chuck Fleischmann to give a speech.
- Jim Lynch – I attended the EM SSAB meeting. It was a great experience meeting the EM Technical Board. We discussed public outreach at the meeting. While I was in Washington D.C., I took a leadership through effective communications course that had a communications survey on how to communicate with people.

- Helen Wheatley – I live in Olympia, Washington. The Port of Olympia has a 3 person commission team that is interested in the HAB. I was invited to help with their public involvement process. I was named Thurston County Democrat of the year partly for the work I do for the HAB.
- Liz Mattson – We have a “Comment Writing Happy Hour” event flyer that everyone can take and share. It was a nice event and great opportunity for people to learn about the WIR.
- Julie Atwood – I attended the Hanford Forum. I also attended the Patagonia sponsored meeting with our Education Outreach Coordinator who gave a statement for the Yakama Nation. We did the same at a Vancouver meeting with Columbia RiverKeeper.
- Dana Cowley – I made a lot of calls in Hood River in planning the Hanford Regional Dialogue meeting.
- Jennifer Colborn – The Connect Tri-Cities event is coming up in October. This event is similar to the Safety Expo. It is related the STEM majors.
- Jennifer Copeland – We are excited about the social media updates for all the progress at Hanford.
- Echo Dahl – I have been working on and supporting the WIR public meetings and the HRD meeting.

Attachments

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

Attachment 2: Hanford Regional Dialogue Format Guidelines Proposal

Attachment 3: TPA Agencies Planning Hanford Regional Dialogue

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Liz Mattson	Susan Leckband	Shannon Cram
Helen Wheatley	Gerry Pollet	Tom Galioto
Dan Solitz	Steve Wiegman	Julie Atwood
David Bolingbroke	Jeff Burright	Rebecca Holland
Shelley Cimon	Dana Miller	

Others:

Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP	Kristen Holmes, DOE-RL	Echo Dahl, Northwind – Support for DOE-ORP
--------------------	------------------------	--

Dieter Bohrmann, Northwind – Support for DOE-ORP (Phone)	Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Dana Cowley, MSA
Jen Copeland, CHPRC	Ginger Wireman, Ecology (Phone)	Randy Bradbury, Ecology (Phone)
Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)	Amruthom Babu, Hanford Challenge	Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian
Melissa Amaro, ProSidian		