

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
April 14, 2010
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions 1
Strategic Planning Process – Public Involvement Goals 1
TPA Draft M-15 and M-91 Change Packages 9
2012 Budget Workshop 12
Handouts 14
Attendees 15
April PIC Committee Meeting - Transcribed Flip Chart Notes A-1

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and introductions

Steve Hudson, Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) committee chair, welcomed everyone and introductions were made. In his opening remarks, he said that the HAB members should look into debriefing the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) meetings, as the PIC Committee is doing with public meetings, to discuss what changes could be made to strengthen the meetings. He said there has been discussion of evening seminars, which would be a good way to get better public involvement during non-business hours.

Strategic Planning Process – Public Involvement Goals

Steve said it is complex to combine all of the ideas surrounding public involvement. He said he hopes that suggestions can be offered by the PIC committee in regards to engaging in effective public involvement.

Review overarching goals – Are any missing?

Liz Mattson, PIC committee vice chair, framed the strategic public involvement planning discussion ongoing with the committee since January. She said the issue managers realize now that there is more work for the PIC committee to do prior to developing advice. She also said it may be useful to manage any draft advice in pieces. Liz provided a public

involvement handout and explained that it is a reference tool for committee members that consolidates the material from the past strategic planning sessions. Liz said that the draft of the working definition for successful public involvement in the handout needs to be replaced by the following version adopted at the February committee meeting:

The art and craft of Public Involvement is successful when clear goals are defined, when stakeholders contribute early to the design and development of the public involvement activity, when that involvement is interactive, inclusive, engaging and respectful and when the decision-makers demonstrate an openness to having input influence their decisions and the decision-making process. It should be:

- *Understandable at all levels of knowledge*
- *Collect values and input from all levels of knowledge*
- *Include that some are educational and some are interactive*

Liz said there were many goals developed for public involvement, and the overarching goals are a compilation of the reoccurring themes.

Erika Holmes, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said to add education of the public to the first bullet in the overarching goals. Paula Call, Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), agreed that education was critical, and said she believes education of the public is covered in the second to last bullet of the goals. Steve suggested clarifying that it could be different types of education.

Norma Jean Germond, Public at Large, said providing education early would address the concern of having information available to the public earlier in the process. Ken Niles said education and early involvement might be blending two different points.

Shelley Cimon said there should be a goal that keeps the future in mind. Steve said this was covered in the “preparing future generations for informed engagement and participation” goal.

Norma Jean said she is concerned that the overarching goals for public involvement are only referencing people in the Tri-Cities area. Ken suggested adding a “local, regional and beyond” aspect to show that these goals apply outside of Hanford.

Shelley suggested adding support of Hanford Cleanup as a goal.

Madeleine said to consider framing the goals to encourage public involvement. Liz said there can be continuous additions to the overarching goals for public involvement.

Shelley said it is important to make it easy and comfortable to have the community get involved, which could be in the framing of the overarching goals. The committee and agency representatives made some additional refinements to the goals and identified the following six goals (numbering does not indicate relative priority) as “overarching:”

1. Provide the public with timely, accurate and understandable information and public involvement materials that are easily accessible.

2. To ensure open and transparent decision making
3. To prepare future generations for informed engagement and participation
4. “To build a sense of community around Hanford (locally, regionally and beyond)”
5. “To incorporate public values in the decision-making process and in the decisions made”
6. “To engage the public early and often”

Tools and techniques – Are any missing?

Liz said she organized the tools and techniques for public involvement by the organization that uses them (stakeholders, agencies, etc.). The committee added tools and techniques to the list:

- Ken said he would add group presentations to the list of tools, which is a form of two-way communication.
- Steve asked Paula Call if there is a speaker’s bureau. Paula said the speaker’s bureau consists of making certain people formally available to talk to a group, and this tool can be used upon request.
- Liz suggested a panel discussion as an additional public involvement tool.
- Madeleine said written comments are missing from the list. Paula said there is formal comment, such as a court reporter and informal public comment.
- Sam Dechter asked what happens to public comments after they are submitted. Madeleine said Ecology issues a response letter after a comment period. Sam asked if information would be held if the comment someone submits may not be relevant at that time, but would be soon (e.g. if someone comments prior to a formal comment period). Madeleine said she is not sure if there is a mechanism for this.
- Paula said Facebook and Twitter are other tools agencies are starting to utilize.
- Madeleine said that lobbying is another tool. Ken said that stakeholders do use the lobbying process. Paula added people lobby for more resources to Congress. Ken mentioned groups have gone to congress to lobby for a public meeting on a topic.
- Norma Jean said public service announcements are another tool for public involvement.
- Madeleine suggested paid ads for the newspaper and radio.
- Shelley said Ed Net could be a useful tool, which is similar to a remote classroom or distance learning. Liz said there are professors teaching classes at Hanford with formal classroom curriculum, but it might be useful to make classes more available to the public.

- Shelley asked if the educational packet from Oakridge has been utilized.
- Liz added paper and online surveys as tools.
- Paula said DOE has a blog, which is a useful tool for public involvement.
- Ken added flyers as a tool.
- Liz said puppetry and singing are also public involvement tools.
- Paula added tours of the Hanford site.

Match goals and tools and techniques

Per Liz’s instruction, the committee, joined by agency representatives, separated into two groups. Each group took three overarching goals and were asked to identify tools that would be the most effective in reaching each goal for public involvement. The groups then reported out, including any key points from their small group discussions.

Ken shared the tools his group chose for goal one. He said goal one is about understanding information. The one-way communication list came together very quickly; however, the two-way communication list was more difficult. He said some of the tools start out as one-way, but could be a two-way information exchange as well.

(Goal One)

“To provide the public with timely, accurate and understandable information and public involvement materials that are easily accessible.”

<u><i>One-way</i></u>	<u><i>Two-way</i></u>
<i>Radio</i>	<i>FAQ</i>
<i>Fact sheet</i>	<i>Fairs and festivals</i>
<i>News/Political</i>	<i>Calendar for collaboration</i>
<i>Web sites</i>	<i>Presentations</i>
<i>Newsletters</i>	<i>Workshops</i>
<i>E-mail/links</i>	<i>HAB meetings/committees</i>
<i>Facebook</i>	<i>Public meetings/hearings</i>
<i>Informational videos</i>	<i>Miscellaneous meetings (OHCB, HPIN)</i>
<i>News articles</i>	<i>Movie nights</i>
<i>Twitter</i>	<i>Webinar</i>
<i>Youtube</i>	
<i>Clear writing standards</i>	

Ken presented the tools chosen for goal two. He said information with easy access, such as a web page that is easy to navigate, is needed for this goal. It is also important to have early notice for these tools.

Madeleine said it is important to listen for the word “should” in discussion of this topic to help think about ideas that could be formed into advice on public involvement.

(Goal Two)

"To ensure open and transparent decision making"

One-way
Easy access to relevant documents (email, web)
Early notice
Web page linking all relevant documents
Responsive, timely FOIA (open records request process)
Mailing list
Press releases
Radio announcements
Announcements/notices
Describe values impacted

Two-way
Comment period
Early dialogue
State of site (meetings with decision makers present)
HAB meetings
Conversations
Evaluation process with public involvement and agency/contractor progress
HPIN meetings
Policy to allow public access to agency meetings

Ken reviewed the tools that apply to goal three regarding future generations. He said using new media and providing a translation of the information is important. He said talking about the natural assets Hanford has to offer was another tool his group focused on.

(Goal Three)

"To prepare future generations for informed engagement and participation"

One-way
Facebook
Twitter
Youtube
Translated accessible information
Graphic recordings
Clear long-term risk information
Emphasize Hanford's natural assets (information/materials/tours)

Two-way
School presentations
Curricula
Fairs and exhibits
Tours for college classes
Improvisational skits
Long-term stewardship workshops
Civic involvement skill building workshops
External and internal programs

Steve talked about the tools gathered for goal number four. He said his group brainstormed ways to get information out to the community. He said having a form of communication coming out on a regular basis is important. He said community access to written commentary/columns could be used as a public involvement tool.

Paula said forming partnerships with organizations is important. Steve said it was important to have partnerships with organizations represented in the community.

Steve said volunteer opportunities are important.

Steve said the HAB is a good venue and suggested that a might be useful during Board meetings.

(Goal Four)

“To build a sense of community around Hanford (locally, regionally and beyond)”

One-way

*Newspaper ads
Newspapers Articles
Columns/Communications, comments
Citizen guides
Videos
Radio/TV spots*

Two-way

*Forum/Focus groups
Tours (surveyed)
Partnerships
Speakers’ bureau
Volunteer
Curriculum
Class Presentations, activities
HAB (Committees)*

Steve described the public involvement tools that his group came up with for goal five. He said the group wanted to get at the public values that come up with specific issues. He said it is difficult to respond to all comments, so reoccurring topics should be the focus. He said providing agency responses to public comments on documents is a two-way communication.

Sam said it is difficult for the agencies to convince the public that they are being heard. Gerry Pollet suggested adding a required commitment from decision makers to read public comments.

(Goal Five)

“To incorporate public values in the decision-making process and in the decisions made”

One-way

*Publicized comment/response
Media Release (Feedback)*

Two-way

*Public meetings/Hearings
Attendance by regulatory agencies
Public comments to agency documents
Forums
HAB information booth
HAB
Public Lobbying
Decision makers read all comments*

Steve reviewed goal six and discussed ways to engage the public early and often. He said public involvement tools, such as performances, have a short lifetime but are good at informing people.

Paula said DOE is working on making tours more accessible to the public.

Shelley said having booths at events manned by Board members might be a good public involvement tool. She said the agendas for the meetings should be in the paper or in a form that is available to the community.

(Goal Six)

“To engage the public early and often”

One-way

Fact sheets (brochure)
TV/Radio spots (media)
Ads/announcements
Citizen guides
Web site info
(FAQ)
Print Media (flyers, posters)
Videos/Films
Press releases
Performance

Two-ways

Speakers’ bureau
Tours
Workshops
Public meetings (state of site)
Blogs
Bulletin boards
Classroom/Group Presentations
Discussions
Focus Groups
Evening seminars

Identify Hanford audiences – what makes them distinct?

The committee and agency representatives then broadly identified the different audiences involved at Hanford, and discussed the need to ensure that the public involvement tools are appropriate for the audience. The following audiences were identified by the group:

- HAB
- Oregon
- Public interest groups
- Western Washinton
- Tri-Cities
- Downwinders
- General Public
- Public interest groups
- Recreational river users/resource/issue-specific
- Elective officials
- Students
- Transportation corridor residents

Discussion

The committee and agency representatives then identified the distinguishing features of each of the audiences.

Ken said the Board has to be knowledgeable about Hanford.

Shelley said Tri-Cities’ residents have a sense of ownership. Barb Wise, Mission Support Alliance (MSA) disagreed and said many people have moved to these areas with little knowledge of Hanford. Ken said there are economic considerations for Tri-Cities. Madeleine said that the Tri-Cities rely on local news, but Barb said the internet has changed that. Norma Jean said the Tri-Cities are concerned about worker health.

Ken said the general public, as an audience, does not know much about Hanford. He said knowing little or nothing about Hanford could apply to Western Washington, Oregon, students, and many other audiences.

Steve said public interest groups are engaged and informed.

Ken said students are technologically savvy.

Sharon Braswell (MSA), said tribes have a unique government –to-government relationship. Sam said tribes have a lot of history. Madeleine said tribes are tied to the land.

Shelley said Oregon, as an audience, is concerned about transportation. Steve said environmental concerns are important to Oregon.

Liz said public interest groups are informers. Sam added public interest groups are valuable and critical.

Ken said the general public is too busy. Gerry added the general public has other primary interests.

Liz said the HAB is knowledgeable on technical issues and the PIC committee added that the HAB represents different demographics, has institutional knowledge, commitment and gets in-depth on topics.

Liz said the issue specific audience tends to have narrow focus.

Gerry said the transportation corridor audience lives near the transportation corridor where waste is transported.

Madeleine said down winders care about health. Gerry said there are past and present down winders who are concerned about airborne risks.

Liz then tasked the PIC committee with applying audiences to the overarching goals for public involvement and to brainstorm effective tools to reach the audience. The group did not create an exhaustive list; rather, they chose a couple of goals and identified 2-3 tools for a specific audience.

Liz said for goal one with Western Washington as the audience, news articles would be a good tool to use. Gerry said Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) reaches people in Western Washington with email and Facebook. Websites and political blogs would be good tools to use for Western Washington, as well. Shelley said YouTube should be utilized more. Ken said having good information on a web is important, but it needs to be something engaging to entice people to read it. Liz said the radio is something people in Western Washington regularly utilize.

Steve said with the combination of a student audience and goal three, it is important to present information in an understandable way. Barb said not to do a fact sheet for students. Norma Jean said presentations in classrooms would be a good public involvement tool. Gerry said having relevant curricula is important. Steve said there should be tours of Hanford for college classes.

Liz wrapped up the strategic planning discussion by putting the activities the PIC committee has been doing into context. She said this process of defining public

involvement started in January when there were stories of successful public involvement shared in that month's PIC Committee meeting. She said Barb Wise told a story about Greenlake and how posters and children selling lemonade were used for effective public involvement. Dennis Faulk talked about having a free giveaway so the public could learn about his church. She said that these were successful because they matched the goal with the right technique for the specific audience they were trying to reach.

Liz said for the next steps advice has been considered for the June Board meeting; and there needs to be issue manager work to see if advice or a white paper could be developed.

Sam asked if measuring the effectiveness of public involvement tools is something that could be generated by June. Liz said probably not by June; however, these types of conversations need to be had in order to make public involvement more effective.

Liz also shared a preliminary draft flow diagram of considerations during the public involvement planning process. Steve said a critical revelation is that there is not enough time spent in planning prior to engaging in public involvement. Liz said this flow diagram is something that she will develop further with the issue managers before presenting it back to the Committee.

Liz said that, given her schedule, it is unlikely that she will be able to work with the issue managers to develop advice in time for the June Board meeting. The committee decided that the advice was not time-sensitive, and that it was more important to have well-developed advice in September than to rush a product for June.

TPA Draft M-15 and M-91 Change Packages

Steve said the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) draft change packages are dense, and it is important to provide enough time for the public to review this document. He said the PIC committee wants to know what kind of information is needed from the PIC committee, and by when.

Steve asked Paula how much time is available for the PIC to comment on the change packages. Paula said there is a 45 day comment period. She said the agencies have been talking about these changes for over a year. It started when DOE realized that there was not enough money to meet milestones. She said with the information from public meetings in Seattle and Portland, DOE needed to have change packages to address Central Plateau cleanup milestones. She said DOE sent out a list serve message on March 2 giving people a heads up that the change packages would be released soon, with the public comment period starting April 26 and ending June 11. DOE is preparing an ad for the local newspaper and fact sheets will be in mailboxes by the beginning of the comment period.

Discussion

- Liz attended yesterday's RAP meeting, and said the issue of whether there will be a Committee of the Whole (COTW) or a joint meeting to discuss the change packages is unresolved.
- Madeleine asked if the fact sheet will be tweeted or blogged. Paula said yes, and all the information on the change package is on the DOE Web site. Madeleine said Ecology will link the change package information on their Web site.
- Paula said there will be a formal response document issued prior to the TPA making final decisions. She said DOE could use the PIC committee's input for a lot of things, but it is a constrained window of time. She said the draft ad has to be in the paper by April 20th and DOE still requires input from Ecology and EPA, meaning a quick turnaround if comments were made.
- Paula said she will look at May 6th and 7th to see if a COTW on the change package would work for DOE.
- Paula said an issue manager meeting regarding the change package will be in late April, on the 27th or 29th.
- Liz said having input through issue managers might be a better process for PIC committee input.
- Norma Jean suggested having a focus group on the change package with key people present. Liz said it might be useful to have a working group for the change package.
- Gerry said he has concerns about the comment period conflicting with the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). He said there is no reason not to wait until after May 3rd for the change package comment period to begin (which is when the TC&WM EIS comment period ends). He said it is challenging to get public comment concurrently on two complex documents. He is concerned that one of the topics is not going to get fully addressed as a result. Madeleine said a change in the dates would not affect the confusion if there are already comments made on the TC&WM EIS package. Gerry said it will compound the confusion. Paula said language could be added to help with confusion, or DOE could wait until May 3rd; but as Madeleine said, there might still be confusion due to the TC&WM EIS comment period being already underway. Norma Jean asked if there is a critical urgency to get the change package out. Paula said she is not the person to answer, but the agencies have been working on the change packages for a long time. She personally does not think a one week extension to the comment period will make a large difference.
- Norma Jean asked if there is a way to express to the public the impact and meaning the change packages have for Hanford. Madeleine said Ecology has a "why it matters" section on their fact sheets. Norma Jean said the information that goes out does not tell people why they should be concerned. Paula said the typical agency person tries to simply provide the factual information. Gerry said the headline on the fact sheet should state that the proposals delay cleanup until 2039.

- Liz suggested crafting a statement about the timeline in order to make the new milestones easily understood. Gerry said this same discussion was had about the notice regarding single shell tanks, which lacked the bottom line information.
- Liz asked how long it takes to get agreement on the language of fact sheets. Paula said the group that writes outreach material is made up of 8-10 people. Liz asked if there would be conflict with adding a value statement to better engage people. Paula said probably not, but she could not guarantee it.
- Paula asked if there was one person from PIC who would be willing to incorporate comments and changes into one document. Steve said there was currently not, but offered to do it himself.
- Gerry said the concerns for this fact sheet are similar to the TC&WMEIS summary and notice. He said this change package includes delays to the current schedule, which is a big deal. People need to know the impacts. Paula said the target dates are explained in the document.
- Gerry said there needs to be time allowed for stakeholders to review these documents. Paula said there should be more talk about making the review process better. Gerry suggested a calendar showing the dates for review and input opportunities.
- Gerry said the comment period starts soon, and he was not aware of the significance of the change package until it was presented in yesterday's RAP meeting. He said the scope is just being understood and there needs to be more time to allow for public involvement.
- Norma Jean asked what is expected as an outcome from the public meetings. Paula said the value is to be responsive to public concern and let the public give input, and receive responses from DOE. Sharon said agencies do not sign off on the decision until public comments are considered and changes are made if needed. Steve said if that is the goal then there needs to be a COTW to understand how to display the change package to the public.
- Sharon asked if the public is interested in the change packages. Gerry said there are related issues people have commented on in the past, so there is public interest in these topics. He suggested having a facilitated meeting, with neutral note taking, for public comment to talk about pointed issues with less people. Paula asked if this approach would be more like a focus group. Gerry agreed and said then the meeting notes could be used as public comment, instead of a public hearing.
- Paula clarified that Gerry is saying a targeted workshop on the change package with agency presence with an outcome of using the notes as public comments. Gerry said yes, he was suggesting a discussion with agency decision makers present.
- Paula said the agencies should talk about this and get back to PIC regarding these ideas.

Steve said PIC would like to have a PIC member in addition to Gerry at the issue managers meeting for the change packages. He said he will get in touch with Pam Larsen to arrange this.

2012 Budget Workshop

Paula said at the April 7 PIC Committee meeting in Portland, DOE provided a draft agenda for the 2012 budget workshop. She said that, based on the discussion in Portland, there will be a general overview session, followed by breakout sessions (DOE-ORP in the morning and DOE-RL in the afternoon) with all agencies represented. She said DOE has looked to the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) for comments regarding the workshop topics.

Sharon listed the suggestions provided by BCC:

Richland Office (RL)

1. Characterization
2. Waste retrieval
3. Funding requirements for Central Plateau inner and outer areas

Office of River Protection (ORP)

1. Feed for waste treatment plant (out year funding required verses current planning)
2. Supplemental treatment
3. Tank retrieval

Other

- Why is the public not able to see the detailed Integrated Priority List (IPLs)?
- What could be business sensitive?
- What do the regulators see compared with the public?
- Why are the regulators not requesting that the public have access?

Discussion

- Gerry added that there were also concerns of budget slowdowns for transuranic waste retrieval.
- Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL, said last year at the budget workshop DOE provided an overview of the accomplishments with the Project Baseline Summary (PBS). DOE puts out a list of their milestones and identifies them within the request. She said DOE will give an overview of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 and then the requirements for FY 2012.

- Gerry said the public wants to see a list showing the cut off for money being allocated and the items that will not be funded. Shannon said DOE will give a list of items above and below the target.
- Liz asked when the milestones are going to be changed and if DOE has to ask for additional funding. Gerry said yes, and it would be nice to have access to this information. Shannon said there are items added and items delayed included in the PBS.
- Paula said DOE does not want to ignore topics in the workshop that might be of interest to the public. Gerry said topics should not be cut off, and there should be time for questions and answers regarding the river corridor and not just the central plateau. Shannon said there is normally a two hour presentation block for RL and ORP. Paula said in the past there were basic overviews by RL and ORP before breakout sessions.
- Shannon said this workshop is to provide understanding of what actions are being requested in FY 2012. Laura Hanses said it would be good to emphasize that the public is not going to be giving input on priorities. Shannon said this is not about the larger priorities; it is more about the smaller issues that DOE needs input on. Norma Jean asked if the BCC and agencies have an agreement on priorities or is it just DOE. Gerry said in the question answer period if an issue comes up then the BCC will consider including this as it crafts advice based on the issues.
- Paula said DOE is checking into having Webinar capabilities at the workshop. Sharon said there Webinar capabilities are available.
- Gerry said he wants to make sure that there is a method to capture questions and comments with enough time for a response.
- Shannon said DOE is trying to get the public meeting comments incorporated before the budget is submitted, however the comments will still be useful after the budget has been submitted, as they have in the past.
- Gerry said in the last couple of years not many have come to the public meetings, and it shows that the money issues are generally understood.

Committee Business

Agency Response to Board Advice #222

The PIC committee reviewed DOE and Ecology's response to Board Advice #222.

Steve said he reviewed the advice responses and prepared some comments. He identified several items that the PIC committee should look into: 1) He suggested a need to measure the value of the meetings which the PIC has talked about; 2) He said it is important to not have a default model for public meetings, he said there should be a formal process; 3) He said PIC does not provide enough information to show that different meeting formats

might be more effective; 4) He said the efforts of HoANW and others need to be formalized and incorporated to produce a checklist of sorts; 5) Steve said there are ideas in the response that PIC should think about for operational consistency to strengthen the strategic plan and the public involvement plan.

Gerry said the agencies' response to the advice is great. Madeleine asked why Gerry likes the response to the advice so much. Gerry said the structure and content is very good. It was specific and addressed the Board advice point by point.

Gerry said there was talk about an evaluation post meeting instead of evaluation forms. He said it might be worth trying something like this.

Liz said Hanford Challenge is investigating alternative formats for public meetings.

Steve said finding someone from the PIC Committee interested in dealing with the press would be good.

Mid-Year Evaluation of Committee Work on Board and Agency Priorities

Steve said he has a list of PIC progress on Board priorities. Susan Hayman handed out the TPA priorities and the HAB priorities. Steve said it is important to be aware of these priority items.

The committee reviewed the identified priorities and briefly discussed their contributions to date. Liz asked if the agencies' felt that the PIC influenced the agencies' use of social media. Paula said she thought the committee had an influence.

Follow up, Action Items and May meeting topics

Susan H. reviewed the follow up and action items:

- Susan H. will resend the blue handouts with the updated definition of successful public involvement (from February) by 4/16
- TPA liaisons will discuss public meeting proposals and provide feedback on April 22 committee call.
- Steve to follow up with Pam re: PIC participation at issue managers meeting
- Steve work with Pam and RAP on NRDWL (May RAP)
- Susan H. to distribute the TPA change package add to committee members by 4/15 COB
- TPA liaisons will explore changing TPA/RCRA comment period (answer 4/22 call)
- Steve to provide feedback on fact sheet by 4/19 7 am to Paula
- PIC to provide feedback on fact sheets to Steve on Saturday 4/17

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tgilley@enviroissues.com

Draft-Fact Sheet, Proposed Tri-Party Agreement Changes for Transuranic Mixed and Mixed Low-level Waste, DOE.

HAB advice #222

Public Involvement and Communication Committee Handout, Liz Mattson, April 14, 2010

Response to HAB advice #222

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Laura Hanses	Ken Niles
Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Norma Jean Germond	Liz Mattson	

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL	Erika Holmes, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Wayne Walten, DOE-RL		Blair Scott, EnviroIssues
		Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Barb Wise, MSA

April PIC Committee Meeting - Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Goals/Comments

1. Goals should include reference to “educate” the public.
2. “Resources” not overarching
3. To prepare future generations for informed engagement and participation
4. “in support” of Hanford, locally, regionally and beyond

Page 1

Goals/Comments

5. To provide the public with timely, accurate and understanding information and public involvement materials that are easily accessible
6. Consider framing goals in terms of effective public involvement.
 - a. “to engage the public and “allow the public to engage”

Page 2

Other Tools and Techniques

- Group presentation (two-way)
- Speakers Bureau
- Panel discussion
- Focus group
- Solicit written comments (inside/outside eg. During comment period)
- Comment response document
- Lobby
- T.V. announcements
- Paid Ads (newspaper, radio)

Page 3

Other Tools and Techniques (continued)

- Ed Net (“distance learning”)
- Formal Classroom Curriculum
- Using Curriculum in classroom presentations
- Paper surveys
- On-line surveys
- Blog
- Bulletin Board (electronic)
- Flyers

Page 4

Other Tools and Techniques (continued)

- Puppetry
- Singing
- Tours

Public Involvement Tools

To engage the public early and often (6)

Input/inform

Fact sheets (brochure)
TV/Radio spots (media)
Ads/announcements
Citizen guides
Web site info
(FAQ)
Print Media (flyers, posters)
Videos/Films
Press releases
Performance

Two ways

Speakers bureau
Tours
Workshops
Public meetings (state of site)
Blogs
Bulletin boards
Classroom/Group Presentations
Discussions
Focus Groups
Evening seminars

Public Involvement Tools

To incorporate public values in the decision-making process and in the decisions made (5)

Input/inform

Publicized comment/response
Media Release (Feedback)

Two ways

Public meetings/Hearings
Attendance by regulatory agencies
Public comments to agency documents
Forums
HAB information booth
HAB
Public Lobbying
Decision makers read all comments

Public Involvement Tools

To build a sense of community around Hanford (locally, regionally and beyond) (4)

<u>Input/inform</u>	
Newspaper ads	Forum/Focus groups
Newspapers Articles	Tours (surveyed)
Columns/Communications,	Partnerships
comments	Speakers bureau
Citizen guides	Volunteer
Videos	Curriculum
Radio/TV spots	Class Presentations, activities
	HAB (Committees)
	Long-term stewardship
	Public monitor organization

Two ways

Page 8

Public Involvement Tools

To prepare future generations for informed engagement and participation (3)

<u>Input/inform</u>	<u>Two ways</u>
Facebook	School presentations
Twitter	Curricula
Youtube	Fairs and exhibits
Translated accessible information	Tours for college classes
Graphic recordings	Improvisational skits
Clear long-term risk information	Long-term stewardship workshops
Emphasize Hanford's natural assets (information/materials/tours)	Civic involvement skill building workshops
	External and internal programs

Page 9

Public Involvement Tools

To ensure open and transparent decision making (2)

<u>Input/inform</u>	<u>Two ways</u>
Easy access to relevant documents (email, web)	Comment period
Early notice	Early dialogue
Web page linking all relevant documents	State of site (meetings with decision makers present)
Responsive, timely FOIA (open records request process)	HAB meetings
Mailing list	Conversations
Press releases	Evaluation process with public involvement and agency/contractor progress
Radio announcements	HPIN meetings
Announcements/notices	Policy to allow public access to agency meetings
Describe values impacted	

Public Involvement Tools

To provide the public with timely, accurate and understandable information and public involvement materials that are easily accessible (1)

<u>Input/inform</u>	<u>Two way</u>
Radio	FAQ
Fact sheet	Fairs and festivals
News/Political	Calendar for collaboration
Web sites	Presentations
Newsletters	Workshops
E-mail/links	HAB meetings/committees
Facebook	Public meetings/hearings
Informational videos	Miscellaneous meetings (OHCB, HPIN)
News articles	Movie nights
Twitter	Webinar
Youtube	
Clear writing standards	

Audience

General Public

- Knows little or nothing about Hanford
- Too Busy
- Pay attention when there is a problem

Tribes

- Government to Government relationship
- Tied to land/resources/history

Page 12

Audience

Tri-Cities residents

- Sense of ownership of site (Richland?)
- Economic considerations
- Worker health considerations

Oregon

- Knows little or nothing about Hanford
- Transportation concerns
- “Green”

Page 13

Audience

Recreational River Users/Resource/issue specific

- Narrow Focus

Western Washington

- Knows little or nothing about Hanford

Page 14

Audience

Students

- Knows little or nothing about Hanford
- Tech Savvy
- Job information

Downwinders

- Health risk
- Past downwinders
- Present downwinders

Page 15

Audience

Public Interest Groups

- Engaged/Informed
- Informers
- Valuable outreach/input
- Critical
- Package information

Elected officials

- Self-conscious/interest
- Concerned about money and progress_(local?)
- Bullet points/Quick access

Page 16

Audience

Hanford Advisory Board

- Hanford-Savvy
- Technical issues-Savvy
- Represent demographics
- Inst. Knowledge
- Impact oriented/committed
- Time to delve in depth

Transportation corridor residents

- Live in corridor where waste moves

Page 17

Current TPA Strategy (M-15/M-91)

7. List serv – March 2 (Heads – Public comment period coming)
8. Set comment period (AP. 26 – June 11)
9. Paid Ad in paper (T.C.H.) – Annouces TPA CP and comment period. Placeholder for public meetings.
 - a. Submit to paper by April 20
10. Fact sheet (to full list)
 - a. In mailboxes by April 26
11. Tweet it, Blog it
12. Post full package to website DOE/Ecology
13. Formal comment response document prior to decisions

Page 18

Input: PIC (TPA Change Package)

1. Feedback on fact sheet
 - a. PIC individual feedback to Susan (Susan to Steve to synthesize for Paula)
2. Interest in public meetings
 - a. Targeted workshop with interested stakeholders
 - b. Focus/Facilitated group with neutral documentation discussion
3. What attributes to evaluate
 - a. May be a new meeting format
4. Feedback on Ad
 - a. PIC individuals feedback when available
5. Input through issue manager group re: ways to bring information to public

Page 19

Committee Feedback (TPA Change Package)

1. Overlapping comment period with TC&WM EIS (EIS ends May 3)
2. Clearly articulate “why it matters” in public materials
3. Articulate how affects values of stakeholders:
 - a. Time (delay)
 - b. Vadose zone (positive)
 - c. Etc.
 - d. Other impacts/risks
4. Include RCRA changes, concurrent comment period.
5. Refer to suggestions on TC&WM EIS notice summary

Page 20

#222 Advice follow up

- Informal evaluation at end of Meetings (could start at S.O.S. meetings)
- Individual could identify how to reach radio station and T.V. effectively
- Send message that advice response was very good and a model for future response.
 - Structure
 - Content (specific)
- Consider response in development of strategic plan

Page 21

Actions/Follow up

1. Susan will resend blue handout with updated definition of successful public involvement (from February) by 4/16
2. TPA liaisons will discuss public meeting proposals and provide feedback on April 22 committee call.
3. Steve to follow up with Pam re: PIC participation at issue managers meeting
4. Steve work with Pam and RAP on NRDWL (May RAP)

Page 22

Actions/Follow up (continued)

5. Susan to distribute TPA change package add to committee members by 4/15 COB
6. TPA liaisons will explore changing TPA/RCRA comment period (answer 4/22 call)
7. Steve to provide feedback on fact sheet by 4/19 7 am to Paula
8. PIC to provide feedback on fact sheets to Steve on Saturday 4/17