

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE
June 5, 2013
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Opening.....	1
Results of Recent Hanford Public Involvement Surveys.....	2
Planning for the State of the Site (SOS) Meetings.....	4
Public Understanding of Hanford Cleanup Topics.....	6
Public Involvement Strategic Planning.....	6
Committee Business.....	8
Attachments	10
Attendees	10

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.

Opening¹

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the February meeting summary.

Steve Hudson announced that the Thursday, June 6, 2013 Board meeting will begin at 8:00 a.m.

Liz announced that PIC is starting an ongoing discussion of recent public involvement activities Board members have organized or taken part in and requested that Board and committee members send one or more photos of the event, the name of the event, and the number of members of the public reached through the event to her. The PIC will share these involvement events at upcoming meetings on an ongoing basis.

Susan Leckband noted that photos taken at public meetings have been taken under the assumption that because they were captured in a public setting they are permissible for future use in materials and in support of Board and committee discussion.

Kim Ballinger, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), noted that it would be good to inform members of the media about their opportunities to interact with Board members without disrupting Board meetings. Susan Hayman suggested that it would be helpful to remind Board members that they represent their own personal views, or the view of their sponsoring organization, when talking to the media – only the Board chair speaks on behalf of the Board. The committee agreed that this would be a good topic for future discussion.

¹ Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Results of Recent Hanford Public Involvement Surveys

Introduction

Liz Mattson introduced the topic of recent Hanford Site public involvement surveys. Liz explained that Hanford Challenge and the tri-party (TPA) agencies recently developed and distributed public involvement surveys to understand how to improve awareness of Hanford cleanup. The committee discussed the preliminary results to garner lessons learned for future public involvement and outreach approaches at Hanford Site. Heart of America Northwest also conducted a public involvement survey in 2011, the final results from which supported the discussion.

TPA Public Involvement Survey

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), discussed the TPA agencies public involvement survey and noted that it was distributed electronically to 1,200 people via an email listserv between April 1 and April 30, 2013. Ecology sent three follow-up email reminders and placed an advertisement in the Tri-City Herald. The twenty-three question survey was shorter than those of previous years. Ninety-three people responded to the survey, which was more than twice the number of respondents to the 2012 (thirty-five respondents) and 2011 (twenty-four respondents) surveys.

Dieter said Ecology's next step for the survey is to analyze the results with attention to the open-ended comments. The survey response rate was likely boosted by advertising from Hanford Challenge through Twitter posts. Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that EPA will produce a three-page evaluation report on the results of the TPA public involvement survey that will be short and intended to be easy for members of the public to understand.

Hanford Challenge Public Involvement Survey

Liz discussed the Hanford Challenge Public Involvement Survey, noting that it was a paper survey distributed in-person between August 6, 2012 and May 23, 2013 to 450 people over six events. The survey asked nine questions and had 162 respondents. Survey results are shown in Attachment 2.

Liz highlighted notable response numbers and said that responses had not yet been analyzed in-depth beyond response count. About twice as many respondents (107) reported they had not been to a meeting related to Hanford as the number of respondents who reported they had (55). Of the 55 respondents who reported having attended a Hanford meeting, a workshop to learn about an issue hosted by a public interest group was the most common type respondents specified having attended. When asked what would it take for respondents to attend a meeting about Hanford in the future, the response provided most frequently (40 respondents) was free time and proximity to the meeting location.

Heart of American Northwest Public Involvement Survey

Ryan Strong, intern, Heart of America Northwest, discussed results from the 2011 Heart of America Public Involvement Survey. Ryan noted that the six-question survey was distributed over the phone to the organization's distribution list (approximately 3,000 people). Approximately 300 people participated in the survey. Survey questions and preliminary results based on the first 100 respondents are shown below:

- I feel that the agencies don't listen to what the public has to say, so it isn't worth attending, agree or disagree?

- 29% of respondents disagree, and 17% agree or strongly agree
- On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being the least trust and 5 being the highest trust, if you have attended a meeting in the past, please describe the level of trust you had in the background information presented by various people at the meeting.
 - State of Oregon was noted as having the highest level of respondents' trust
- Was there enough time for everyone to voice their concerns?
 - As many respondents felt that there was not adequate time to present the public's concerns as felt there was
- Did you feel that your voice was heard?
 - 33% of respondents indicated they felt their voice has little impact, and 13% indicated they felt their voice had a somewhat significant impact
- Do you remember receiving a written response to your comments?
 - 48% of respondents indicated they did not remember receiving a written response to their comments.
- How important is it to you to receive a written response to the comments you sent in writing or gave at a meeting or hearing?
 - 30% of respondents indicated it is very important, and 9% indicated it is not important

Ryan noted that the final survey results were shared with the PIC previously and that he can work with Gerry Pollet to share the final results with the group again.

Committee discussion

The committee discussed ideas for next steps for the public involvement surveys, how the surveys might inform public involvement at Hanford Site, and noted the following key points and suggestions:

- It could be helpful to revisit the survey later and see if people interpreted questions differently in design. Questions worded in different ways could yield different responses; there may be questions that can be removed from future surveys. Asking one or two members of the public to volunteer to look at and talk about the results will help provide perspective on interpretations of questions.
- Hanford Challenge has been working to get more input from younger populations. Social media including YouTube, Facebook, and email updates are promising tools for engaging younger populations. Email updates have also been effective. While some people may ignore information or events sent to them through social media, others become more interested in a topic or upcoming event if it is shared with them by a friend or someone they know. It is important to engage people based on their preferred communication style.
- Hanford Challenge will continue to administer the paper survey, as it is a time-effective way to inform members of the public of upcoming events. Hanford Challenge is interested in hearing any feedback and if anyone thinks the survey needs to be tweaked. If there is a question that the agencies would like to add get input on, Hanford Challenge can add it to their paper survey that is handed out at events.
- People are more likely to take a survey if approached with, "please fill out this survey," than if asked, "will you take this survey?" Surveys can be distributed at event entrances to establish that

the survey is something that is done as part of the event. Incentivizing surveys with giveaways (e.g. ice cream) is also a good way to encourage participation. Furthermore, surveys distributed in-person tend to garner more participation than surveys distributed electronically.

- It would be interesting to compare responses from people of different age groups.
- Designating a theme for each year with five associated questions could be a good way to collect input on one topic across all of the survey distributors' stakeholder groups. The committee could designate a theme for the year and develop three-five associated questions that could go on each activity's survey. It would be interesting to compare survey responses across the different surveys' distribution pools.
- Translating surveys into other languages could bridge the gap of language barriers that exist in the region. Committee members did not all agree on whether or not translations are a good idea. While translations could be beneficial for reaching a wider audience, it may be difficult to draw the line at which languages to have materials translated into and how many languages are too many. One option would be to put a translated note on communications asking if people would like more information about the survey and provide an email address to request translated material. Another alternative would be to create an FAQ translated in Spanish.

The group discussed public involvement at public meetings and agreed that it is important to make sure members of the public feel their input is valued and will be taken into consideration. If the agencies cite at least one example of comments received from members of the public at the Board meetings that were implemented, it would reinforce this notion of valued public comment. Liz noted that it might be helpful to create a chart that is accessible and can be brought to any public meeting that would show the public involvement process and include a moveable sticker to indicate "we are here" in the process at a given meeting. The committee agreed to have issue managers continue this discussion outside of the committee meeting.

Planning for the State of the Site (SOS) Meetings

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, provided an introduction on planning for the state of the site (SOS) meetings and noted that the purpose of this agenda item is to discuss options for meeting format. The group referenced the Prior HAB Advice Points – State of the Site Meetings (Attachment 3) and Excerpt from Steve Hudson's Summary (Attachment 4) handouts to support the discussion. The purposes of the SOS meeting are to provide members of the public with an opportunity to learn about what is currently happening at the site and provide public comment.

Emy noted that meeting dates have been selected for October to correspond with the HAB committee week and will be held from 6:00 – 9:00 p.m. as follows:

- Thursday, October 10 – Kennewick, Three Rivers Convention Center
- Tuesday, October 15 – Seattle, venue TBD
- Wednesday, October 16 – Portland, venue TBD
- Thursday, October 17 – Hood River, venue TBD

Kim said that a DOE intern is helping to research venues, and Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch, noted that venues are very important to set the tone of the meeting.

Committee discussion

Emy said past SOS meeting format consisted of an hour of open house, followed by agency presentations (including DOE, regulators, and local perspectives), question and answer sessions, and ending with a formal public comment period. Kim said that announcing goals and expectations up front is useful for being clear at the beginning of the meeting about when people will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide comment.

The committee discussed meeting format and noted the following key points:

- Holding the open house portion at the end of the meeting would allow people to learn about the topic at the beginning and have a chance to ask questions at the end. With a question and answer session at the end of the meeting, people would not have to end their conversations once the presentation starts. Holding the open house portion at the beginning of the meeting, however, would allow people to walk around, look at the materials, and formulate questions before the presentations. A second open house session at the end of the meeting would allow for further interactions between agency representatives and members of the public to exchange questions and answers. Meeting format options discussed include:

A. Open house Presentations Q & A	B. Presentations Q & A Open house	C. Brief open house – 5:30 p.m. Presentations – 6:00 p.m. Q & A Open house – breakout groups – 8:00 – 9:00 p.m.
--	--	---

- Presentation length is important. Some committee members felt that presentation time should be limited, while others felt that there is too much information for agency representatives to convey than would be possible in a twenty-minute presentation. Board meeting updates generally take at least twenty minutes, and a similar presentation would require additional background information in the context of a SOS meeting.
- Liz said that opening the meeting with an engaging exercise could be helpful to capture interest and get attendees involved at the outset. She explained that she helped a class organize a public meeting and worked to develop a multiple-choice quiz that each table worked on together. The class was able to engage participants while orienting them to background information on the site.
- Steve referenced Jane Hedges', Ecology, talk at the 2012 SOS meetings as a great example of a dynamic presentation. Attendees were provided with the speakers' cards and contact information so that if more information or a more detailed explanation was desired on a specific topic, attendees could request it. Steve noted that starting the meeting with trivia questions has been an effective approach to set the tone of the presentation and get people engaged.
- The earlier the Tribes can be informed and reminded of meeting dates, the more likely they are to be involved.

The committee agreed that a modified version of option C would be a good balance to accommodate aforementioned concerns. Rather than an hour-long open house at the start, the recommended format includes opening up the doors of the meeting space at 5:30 p.m. before the meeting officially begins at 6:00 p.m. to allow people to wander in and look at the informational displays. The event information would need to specify that the event technically does not start until 6:00 p.m., and agency representatives

will be available to answer questions after that time. Following the presentations and an opportunity for Q&A, breakout discussion groups on specific topics would be engaged. Further updates will follow as the meeting venues are secured and logistics coordinated.

Public Understanding of Hanford Cleanup Topics

Liz provided an introduction to the topic of public understanding of Hanford cleanup topics. Liz noted that she created the Public Understanding of Cleanup Levels DRAFT FAQ (Attachment 5) document to address commonly asked questions in one document. The purpose of the FAQ is to help members of the public better understand cleanup at Hanford Site and how they can provide input in the process. Liz said that while the answers shown are by no means finalized, they are important to spark conversation and understand where the agencies differ in order to communicate to the public just how complicated these issues are.

The committee reviewed and discussed the purpose of the FAQ and noted the following key points:

- This FAQ differs from what Ecology and EPA provide on their websites because it combines it into one succinct document.
- Because the FAQ is not owned by any of the agencies, they have not all contributed agreed-upon answers, and for this reason, it may need to go through the HAB consensus review process. Specifically, Emy said that EPA is uncomfortable with the notion that cleanup levels are negotiated and that EPA would do anything less than what is safe for the public.
- The committee noted the following recommendations for improving the FAQ:
 - Add a glossary of acronyms
 - Include a list of all of the laws that regulate cleanup levels to demonstrate the many things to take into consideration as part of the cleanup process
 - For the question ‘how can the public give meaningful input on cleanup levels?’, change ‘meaningful’ to ‘successful’ so that everyone is on the same level and mitigate for any potential confusion of people thinking they need to be a subject matter expert in order to provide input
- Initial ideas for how to tie in questions from the public involvement surveys to the FAQ include asking people after they take the survey if there should have been different survey questions and if after the discussion they have a better understanding of the process necessary to accomplish the cleanup.

The committee decided to use the issue manager process (Liz, Becky, Shannon) to coordinate with agency leads and move forward creating a work plan to develop the FAQ. The issue manager team will involve the technical committees and agency representatives in these discussions as appropriate. Initially, the current topics listed will provide a good starting point, and eventually other topics to consider could include restoration, how to know when cleanup is complete, decision-making process at Hanford Site, and long-term stewardship.

Public Involvement Strategic Planning

Introduction and committee discussion

Liz introduced the topic of public involvement strategic planning and noted that the purpose of this agenda item is to reinvigorate the topic and ultimately understand how committee members' experiences in public involvement can be applied to improve public involvement at Hanford Site. The committee discussed how they currently feel about the topic of public involvement at Hanford Site and noted the following key points:

- Agency presentations at committee and Board meetings are greatly appreciated, very informative, and well-planned.
- There are different levels of public involvement on behalf of Board members, ranging from very involved to no involvement engaging community members.
- Public involvement strategies have advanced over the last fifteen years, and the public involvement survey results presented indicate increased participation from previous years. The use of social media has helped to increase awareness about the project overall, but not enough. Many people are unaware that Hanford Site exists. A group of university students at the University of Washington, for example, signed up for a class on Hanford, and no one had heard of the site prior to the class. Providing people with the opportunity to learn about the site is important, as people may not be aware otherwise that the site exists and that cleanup is taking place.
- Many people feel disillusioned by the immensity of the cleanup process and are skeptical that their contribution or involvement could make a difference.
- Members of the public are interested in taking the Hanford Site tour because they care about the site and want to learn about what has and is going on there. The Hanford Site tour did not touch on controversial topics, such as the recent news with the tank farms or the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP).
- While it was in circulation, a worker-distributed Hanford news source called *The Reach* discussed what was going on across the site. It would be a morale boost for workers if this resource were reinvigorated.
 - Note: A DOE-distributed Hanford Site news item distributed electronically called *Hanford Forward* has recently been established. Emy noted EPA was not aware of this publication before it was distributed, and EPA is not involved in the content of the stories.
- Public involvement can be defined as making sure the public is actively engaged in cleanup decisions. There are indications that currently people do not feel involved in cleanup decisions. People may feel like they are actively engaged but that no one is listening. Without an action to request or something tangible to work towards (e.g. "we want new tanks"), it is difficult to find an energizing angle. The SOS meetings are helpful to provide a venue at which people can voice their concerns directly to agency representatives in person.

Liz noted that that while there is acknowledgement that committee members are somewhat dissatisfied with public involvement at Hanford Site, this is helpful to know in order to be able to make changes and improvements. The public is generally not hopeful about cleanup due to delays and cost overruns. Liz said this conversation is a good start to the discussion.

Framing further discussion for September 2014 work plan

The agency liaisons and committee members identified the following public involvement activities anticipated in 2014, noting that there may be fewer decision documents given the reduced budget situation:

- 100 F area Proposed Plan 2014
- 100 D/H Proposed Plan could be shortly after around 2014
- 2014 State of the Site meetings (next year)
- Draft land conveyance EA (non-TPA event)
- Natural Gas Pipeline EIS (early 2014) (non-TPA event)
- 2014 Budget meeting (TPA requirement)
 - There was a question about when the public would be apprised of delayed work that will not move forward because of the budget. Agency liaisons said the change packages are out and final and available on the Hanford.gov website with response to comments. The agencies do not have a plan for a specific meeting or a public forum. Committee members said this topic would likely come up at the SOS meetings.
- Statewide Permit (non-TPA event)
- NEPA ROD for TC&WM EIS (non-TPA event)

The committee agreed to follow up with planning for this topic in September and will touch on other potential topics, including what the agencies are planning for in terms of government-to-government consultation, agency planning for public involvement and timing of public involvement, and different tools and techniques to engage different audiences.

Committee Business

Monthly update on HAB public involvement activities/contacts (round robin)

Steve Hudson noted that he served on a panel with Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), Pam Larsen, Al Boldt and Russell Jim at a U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board panel to discuss high level waste in Richland. Steve noted his other recent engagement work including discussing Hanford Site at a community college poetry session and a report out at a library advisory board meeting.

Ryan Strong indicated that Heart of America Northwest is working to rally constituents behind the issue of leaking tanks and is seeking public comment on next steps.

Shannon Cram said that she has been working with students at University of California, Berkeley discussing Hanford Site cleanup and will be giving talks on managing nuclear cleanup at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, as well as in Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco (March), and Ohio State University (September).

Laura Hanses said that she attended the budget workshop and provided comment regarding the sequestration. The comment focused on the impact of the budget cuts to workers in the field, and that impacts should instead be focused at the programmatic level.

Liz shared photos of the following additional public involvement events Board members have been involved in:

- Ken and Dirk reached 160 people in Portland through a presentation at Science Pub, which was effectively started using trivia questions to engage the audience.
- Hanford Challenge engaged 140 people through the Hanford Tanks in Trouble (University of Washington-sponsored) public meeting. At the start of the meeting participants formed small groups and worked together to complete a quiz orienting them to Hanford Site background information. The meeting format was tailored to the material and was as follows:
 - Welcome, food, refreshments, music
 - Hanford background information quiz
 - Presentations: agency representatives, worker perspectives, student perspectives on cleanup, tribal representatives, and a representative from Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR)

The meeting was very successful, and the professor coordinating the public meeting with Hanford Challenge would like to work with the organization again to organize another public meeting next year.

- Hanford Challenge hosts an on-going series of happy hours at the Hanford Challenge office. Between thirty and forty people attended the last happy hour, at which the group distributed informational materials, including the Simple Guide to the Hanford Budget Process and ‘Say What’ guides directing people to more information about comment periods, notes from HAB meetings, DOE presentations and HAB comments.
- Becky Rubenstrunk said that PSR coordinated a Particles on the Wall multi-disciplinary exhibit featuring ‘Hanford: What Now?’ on Wednesday, June 12, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. The exhibit focuses on Hanford cleanup issues through visual art, poetry, and essays to explore ways people can get involved.

3 Month Work Plan

The committee updated their 3 Month Work Plan based on interest level, timing, and work load. The updated work plan is provided as Attachment 6.

The committee decided not to have a Committee call in July.

Review follow up items

Susan Hayman reviewed the follow up and action items:

- PIC members will provide photos of round robin activities to Liz for the September PIC meeting round robin discussion
- The committee will discuss media interactions in the future with regard to including a reminder about HAB guidelines
- Gerry Pollet will follow up with Susan Hayman about the number of survey respondents in the Heart of American Northwest Public Involvement Survey
- Hanford Challenge and Heart of America Northwest will provide recommendations based on their survey results to the TPA agencies

- The TPA agencies, Hanford Challenge, and Heart of American Northwest will send Susan Hayman the survey results digitally
- Barbara Harper will share the SOS presentation with the Hanford Natural Resources Trustee Council (NRTC) Chair
- Steve Hudson will ask the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) if an FAQ-type document for cleanup levels exists at another site.
- Susan Hayman will share Hanford Forward e-magazine with the Board
- The committee will take a strategic look at the public involvement work plan in September, specifically with regard to agency planning for public involvement (timing and sequence), broadening the audience, and agency strategic thinking

Attachments

- Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes
- Attachment 2: Hanford Challenge Public Involvement survey results
- Attachment 3: Prior HAB Advice Points – State of the Site Meetings
- Attachment 4: Excerpt from Steve Hudson’s Summary
- Attachment 5: Public Understanding of Cleanup Levels DRAFT FAQ
- Attachment 6: 3 Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Shannon Cram	Steve Hudson	Liz Mattson
Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	Ed Revell
Laura Hanses	Barbara Harper (phone)	Becky Rubenstrunk (phone)

Others

Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP	Emy Laija, EPA	Michael Turner, MSA
Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL		Chris Carol Arthur, Guardian of the Columbia
		Ryan Strong, Heart of America Northwest
		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues