

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

October 31, 2012

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
State of Site Meetings	2
Hanford Public Involvement Plan.....	3
Public Involvement for the 300 Area Proposed Plan.....	4
Public Understanding of Cleanup Levels.....	5
April EM-SSAB Meeting	7
Committee Business.....	8
Attachments	9
Attendees	9

<p><i>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.</i></p>
--

Welcome and Introductions

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee Chair, welcomed the committee and led a round of introductions. Liz reviewed the agenda.

The committee adopted the September meeting summary.

The following announcements were made:

- Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues facilitator, reminded PIC members that at the September PIC meeting they had discussed how to review the Tank Closure and Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The FEIS is scheduled to be available in the middle of December. The PIC discussed holding a webinar with Marybeth Burandt, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), to review the changes from the DEIS and then select issue managers to review the FEIS and decide how to proceed. Susan indicated that later in the agenda they will identify the issue managers from PIC. Sharon Braswell, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), added that Marybeth could hold a webinar with HAB members after November 15th.

- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), announced that the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies are working to fill open Public-at-Large seats on the Board in time for the 2013 membership package in January. She asked PIC members to encourage anyone interested to submit an application. She also noted that if an individual submitted an application previously, they would need to submit their application again. PIC members recommended that the TPA agencies clearly communicate that previous applicants must submit a new application.
- Liz reminded PIC members that there would be a party for Susan Leckband on Thursday, November 1, and that even if they had not RSVP'd they should attend.

State of the Site Meetings

TPA Agencies Update

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), gave an overview of the TPA agencies' response to HAB Advice #261: 2013 State of the Site (SOS) Meetings. Dieter expressed that the TPA agencies appreciate the advice and will continue to work with the Board and PIC on identifying opportunities for SOS meetings. He explained that there are a lot of public meetings occurring between February and April (e.g., 300 Area Proposed Plan, budget, etc.) which preempt the opportunity for SOS meetings until possibly fall 2013. SOS meetings require months of advanced planning, and the agencies need to balance resources and the amount of public meetings occurring.

Emy Laija added that discussions with stakeholders are critical to choose potential dates and improve turnout. EPA's priority in the spring is providing effective public involvement for the 300 Area Proposed Plan.

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) agreed with EPA and Ecology. DOE-RL supports SOS meetings but it is important to look at all the activities that are occurring and the given resources when considering holding SOS meetings. DOE-RL is interested in working with the Board to identify if SOS meetings can be held in 2013, but it is unlikely to be during the spring.

Committee Discussion

The following are the key points noted during the Committee discussion:

- The Committee appreciated receiving responses to each advice point with clear reasoning behind the TPA agencies' response.
- The Committee expressed their view that SOS meetings fulfill a specific purpose that is not achieved through regular public meetings. SOS meetings attract different audiences and are an opportunity for the public to ask questions and receive information about the broader Hanford Cleanup. Therefore, project-specific public meetings and workshops should not preempt holding SOS meetings. One Committee member indicated their feelings that the agencies' response did not adequately recognize the value of the SOS meetings.
 - *EPA responded that SOS meetings started because there was a period of time when the TPA agencies had not met with the public, so they created this opportunity. The TPA*

agencies do value the purpose of the SOS meetings but they see the same people attending different meetings and are concerned with overburdening the public.

- One Committee member recommended that in place of SOS meetings, the TPA agencies offer small workshops on specific topics, such as, groundwater, the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) or Double Shell Tanks (DSTs).
 - *DOE-ORP responded that they have been offering topical meetings over the last year on tank farms. These meetings have pulled up to 300 people per meeting but have been local to the Tri-Cities area.*
- The Committee highlighted the need for the TPA agencies to track the success of public meetings. Additionally, if the TPA agencies provided documentation of their meeting evaluations to the PIC, then PIC could make suggestions on how to improve meetings. Additionally, there needs to be an opportunity to debrief after public meetings and workshops to discuss successes that might not appear on the evaluation form so that these successes are not lost.
- The Committee remarked that the TPA agencies tend to overstaff public meetings. Identifying key agency staffers who could answer a large portion of the public's questions rather than sending multiple staff could save costs and be more efficient.
- The Committee adamantly recommended the TPA agencies consider holding SOS meetings in the fall of 2013. Additionally, PIC members are very willing to work with TPA agencies in planning SOS meetings. One possibility is to hold SOS meetings in conjunction with the September 2013 Board meeting when the Board receives annual updates from the agencies.
 - The agencies noted that the annual agency updates for the Board would likely be too technical for general public consumption.

The Committee decided to continue this discussion in February 2013 and begin working with the TPA agencies on planning SOS meetings in the fall.

Hanford Public Involvement Plan

Introduction

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch, explained that the comments and agency responses on the Hanford Public Involvement Plan are now available online. He noted the comments-response document is 84 pages and he has not had the chance to review it thoroughly. He explained that in his quick review he was surprised at how many comments had nothing to do with the public involvement plan.

Agency perspectives

Emy Laija discussed the high level revisions to the Public Involvement Plan, including an added preface and appendix. She noted that the TPA agencies are working to provide a response to HAB Advice #251 as a formal letter.

Dieter Bohrmann acknowledged Emy for her hard work. He indicated that updating the Public Involvement Plan has taken longer than expected and that the TPA agencies spent many hours reviewing comments and discussing responses.

Committee Discussion

The following are the key points noted during the Committee discussion:

- Some members of the Committee felt the comment-response document was difficult to read and should be re-formatted to improve readability.

The Committee agreed to review and discuss the agencies' response to HAB Advice #251 at the February PIC meeting.

Public Involvement for the 300 Area Proposed Plan

Agency Update

Emy Laija informed the Committee that EPA held a stakeholder call on October 25th to discuss public involvement planning for the 300 Area Proposed Plan. The Proposed Plan is scheduled to be released for comment in February or March of 2013. Larry Gadbois, EPA, noted that EPA wants to use a meeting format that is most effective for the public, and he hopes that they can provide conversations rather than just presentations. Emy reviewed potential public involvement activities identified on the stakeholder call:

1. Information tables
2. Share information at standing meetings (e.g., Rotary Club, Hanford Speakers Bureau, etc.)
3. Informational session in conjunction with the February HAB meeting
4. Workshops with Q&A and educational sharing
5. Advertise comment period and involvement activities on college campuses
6. Use website to provide visual information and answers to question of interest
7. Host a webinar
8. Public meetings with formal public comment

Committee Discussion

The following are the key points noted during the Committee discussion:

- The Committee recognized the importance of offering opportunities for conversational discussion. Additionally, there should be methods to capture key ideas or questions that come from these conversations.

- One Committee member recommended that EPA hold a webinar at the beginning of the comment period. The webinar would provide basic information “overview” about the 300 Area Proposed Plan and identify opportunities for the public to provide comments.
- The Committee noted the importance of providing information on the broader context of the Proposed Plan.
- One Committee member indicated that it is important to provide opportunity for the public to provide comments after they attend a workshop or public meeting. They noted that individuals need to reflect on the information they received before they can provide substantive comments.
- The Committee recommended that EPA consider school spring break schedules when planning dates for workshops and meetings.

Committee members provided the following information about input on potential locations and stakeholders to assist in developing workshops for the 300 Area Proposed Plan:

Location	Date	Potential Groups to Help Plan
Seattle	February	Hanford Challenge, Heart of America Northwest
Portland	March	Hanford Watch, Oregon Department of Energy, Columbia River Keeper
Tri-Cities	Evening in conjunction with February HAB or Committee meetings	Rod & Gun Club, Benton County, Hanford Communities

Public Understanding of Cleanup Levels

Introduction

Liz Mattson noted that PIC has been considering discussing the public understanding of cleanup levels for a long time. Liz believes that the public does not understand cleanup levels enough to provide informed input into cleanup decisions. She added that many in the public believe that cleanup at Hanford means 100% cleanup, without residual contamination. This is an unrealistic and unattainable goal. This discussion is to begin identifying potential approaches to address this problem. Liz provided the Committee with a list of draft questions that might help the public better understand cleanup levels:

1. How do we characterize cleanup levels and how could we make this information more publically accessible?
2. Who plays a role in determining “how clean is clean” or “how dirty is acceptable?”
3. How do different standards apply to protect water, air, and soil?
4. What standards and regulations play a role in setting cleanup levels?
5. How do current and reasonably anticipated future land uses and exposure scenarios play a role in setting cleanup levels?
6. How do we talk about cleanup levels for specific contaminants?

7. What health effects are we preventing by having protective cleanup levels? How is this communicated?
8. How are exposure pathways linked together?
9. How are other organisms protected, other than humans, when cleanup levels are set?
10. How do the properties of contaminants; how they move in the environment, uptake in organisms, time-span for damage (how long they stay in or pass through an organism) play into how cleanup levels are set?
11. What are some examples we could look at to explore more effective ways of talking about cleanup levels?
12. How do we get more meaningful input on cleanup levels?
13. What points in decision process allow for input on how cleanup levels are set?
14. What are HAB constituencies saying about cleanup levels?

Liz explained that the purpose of these questions was to start a conversation on how to better communicate about cleanup levels.

Agency perspectives

Larry Gadbois agreed that going to the public and proposing a cleanup level of “50” is pretty meaningless to the public. Instead, providing an idea of what types of future uses a cleanup level supports is more tangible.

Emy Laija echoed Larry’s point that framing cleanup on the land use following cleanup can be more effective in communication. She asked the committee if they were thinking this information should be used to create a fact sheet or just help the TPA agencies in framing their communications on cleanup levels.

Interactive Discussion

The following are the key points noted during the Committee discussion:

- The Committee noted the importance of providing the public with a greater understanding of the health risk of any given contaminant level. The public might also be interested in the impact on organisms and the Columbia River.
- The Committee felt these questions were a useful start but that some might be too in-depth for the general public. The public tends to believe that when you say cleanup it means all contaminants will be removed. It is this incorrect assumption that needs to be the target of communication to better inform the public.
- The Committee recommended the TPA agencies use these questions to develop fact sheets targeted at different elements of cleanup levels.

- One Committee member highlighted the importance of explaining exposure scenarios, as people want to know how cleanup will affect future generations.
- The Committee recommended developing a visual graphic showing the process of setting cleanup levels and highlighting when the public can influence cleanup decisions.
- One Committee member expressed concern that there was no mention of tribes as affected parties. Additionally, they indicated that it might be useful to have the Committee hear about the tribal perspective on cleanup levels.

Susan Hayman reviewed the potential uses for the cleanup levels questions, including:

- To develop fact sheets
- As reference for communication or meetings
- Prepare answers to use at public presentations
- Send the questions and responses to the Board
- Develop the questions as a living document by working with other committees like the River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

The Committee agreed that the next step for this discussion is to bring the questions to RAP for consideration and to follow-up on the conversation in the future.

April EM-SSAB Meeting

Susan Leckband explained that HAB is one of eight Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Boards (EM-SSAB). Twice a year the EM-SSAB chairs and vice-chairs of the local boards meet and discuss national level issues regarding cleanup on DOE Environmental Management sites. The next meeting is the week of April 22nd and will be in the Tri-Cities. The meeting typically includes a site tour, a day and a half meeting, and a social event on Wednesday evening. Susan indicated that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are working to set up the logistics for the meeting and are interested in getting ideas and input from PIC members.

Tiffany Nguyen and Sharon Braswell provided more information about the events logistics. Sharon explained that they are looking into providing a welcome packet that provides basic information about the Tri-Cities. Tiffany discussed the need to identify a “no-host” social event for one evening that will provide a networking opportunity for about 50 people. They shared the following event ideas:

- A social dinner cruise
- A wine tour and dinner
- Salmon dinner hosted by the Yakama Nation

Tiffany asked if there were any PIC members willing to help plan and develop the social event. Susan Leckband is already involved, and Rebecca Holland agreed to help.

Steve Hudson suggested that Susan Hayman distribute the link to the EM-SSAB website. He noted it has useful information about the EM-SSAB and its history.

Committee Business

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

Liz Mattson indicated that Hanford Challenge has been working on the following:

- Using Inheriting Hanford brochures to target young individuals.
- Reformatted the Inheriting Hanford blog (<http://inheritinghanfordblog.com/>). The new blog is easier to access and subscribe to. Liz noted that if anyone on the PIC was interested in writing a blog entry they should send it to her.
- Released a fall newsletter with a new section that describes current public comment periods and links to decision documents.
- Holding monthly happy hours and dinner discussion groups.
- Recruiting mentors interested in meeting with individuals about Hanford. So far most mentors have held group activities like happy hours or walks along the river.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) indicated that ODOE has been working on the following:

- Hired a public involvement intern who has been tabling at local markets.
- Established a five week webinar series for college and high school students on specific Hanford topics. They have had about 30 people participating weekly.
- Presenting at Tulane University to an environmental studies class in December (Ken).
- Working on creating a Science Pub series with the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry in March to discuss Hanford.

November Committee Call

The Committee decided to cancel the November Committee call and instead have a call on December 6th at 11:00 a.m.

Susan Hayman reviewed topics for the December call:

- Update 3 month work plan
- Discuss balancing public involvement needs and long term strategies
- Potential joint topic with the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on communication about the Double Shell Tank AY-102 leak

Tank Closure and Waste Management FEIS

The Committee identified Ken Niles to be the PIC issue manager to review the Tank Closure and Waste Management FEIS.

Review follow up items

Susan Hayman reviewed the follow up and action items:

- At the February PIC meeting discuss the opportunity for SOS meetings in Fall 2013
- Emy Laija will send Susan Hayman the link to Hanford Public Involvement Plan response document and Susan Hayman will send to the PIC Committee.
- At the February meeting the Committee will review the response to advice #251 on the Hanford Public Involvement Plan
- Steve Hudson will send Susan Hayman the link to EM-SSAB website to distribute to the Board
- Liz Mattson will talk to RAP about the cleanup level questions

Attachments

- Attachment 1: Excerpts from the Comment and Response Document on the Tri-Party Agreement Hanford Public Involvement Plan
- Attachment 2: TPA Public Involvement Planning
- Attachment 3: The NEPA Process
- Attachment 4: PIC 3 Month Work Plan
- Attachment 5: PIC Meeting Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Sam Dechter	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles
Norma Jean Germond	Susan Leckband	Vince Panesko
Rebecca Holland	Liz Mattson	Jean Vanni

Others

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Daniel Brody, EnviroIssues
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Barb Wise, MSA	
Larry Gadbois, EPA	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC	

Options – Response to SOS Advice

1. Have some smaller topical workshops that don't require agency decision-makers. Still reaching the "new" general audiences
2. Need guidelines/checklist
 - a. How meetings set up, how process worked, etc. → measuring consistently (advice point 3)

Page 1

Options – Response to SOS Advice (continued)

3. (Advice point 3 response) trying to say that for meetings being planned, consider these factors in the planning process, responding to evaluation
4. If cost is a concern, scale back agency/contractor staffing
5. Hold them in the Autumn, if Spring won't work
6. Use evaluations to identify "organic" improvements made at each meeting

Page 2

Options – Response to SOS Advice (continued)

7. Maybe use Sept. agency reports as a form of "SOS" meeting (just a suggestion)
8. Expand Q&A at all public meetings (help capture general Q&A)

Page 3

300 Area Public Involvement Planning

- Be sure someone is "recording" key points of discussion
 - Provide forms for comment at single-staffed tables
- Open activities with webinar
 - Ecology leverage educational contacts
 - Include information on upcoming activities – kick off
- Conversational meeting format would be helpful and would provide opportunity to set larger context (e.g., River Corridor and 2015 Vision meetings)

Page 4

300 Area Public Involvement Planning (continued)

- Have comments provided in writing – "better" than hearing
 - Agencies must provide at least one opportunity for verbal and written input (not at every meeting)
 - "Workshop" versus "meeting"
 - Could provide someone to take verbal comments

Page 5

300 Area Public Involvement Planning (continued)

Locations & Dates

Potential Groups to Help *(parenthesis indicate groups that might be interested, but were not at the PIC meeting)*

Seattle – February

Hanford Challenge. (HOANW)

Portland – March

Hanford Watch, (CRK), (ODOE)

Tri-Cities – evening in conjunction with February HAB or Committee meetings

(Rod & Gun Club), (Benton County), (Hanford Communities)

- Avoid midwinter break and be sensitive to weather/calendar issues

Page 6

300 Area Public Involvement Planning (continued)

Next Steps

- Follow up conversation, once dates and locations picked. More discussion on format, content, etc. on PIC call or stakeholder call in mid-November & mid-December
- Send out day before reminders

Page 7

Understanding Cleanup Levels

1. Biological/health risk may be of greatest public concern
2. Need to be clearer that “cleanup” doesn’t mean it’s all gone
3. To answer these questions, it might be at a level too high for most people. E.g., don’t identify specific levels, but that standards exist.

Page 8

Understanding Cleanup Levels (continued)

4. When the site is “cleaned up” there will still be contamination left in place
 - a. And what will be done with this
5. Questions mirror CERCLA requirements for proposed plans
6. Exposure scenarios important → effects on future generations/future land use

Page 9

Understanding Cleanup Levels (continued)

7. Question #13 – very useful
 - a. When is public input useful

- b. When is it too late for public influence
 - c. Other documents (e.g., work plans, etc.)
8. High level → what is actually going to occur to ensure actions are proactive (e.g. monitoring)
9. Ability to “predict use” as a means to establish cleanup levels → use of “cautionary tales” (e.g., love canal)

Page 10

Understanding Cleanup Levels (continued)

- 10. Be sure tribes are included in affected parties (#2)
- 11. Communicate the tribal perspective about cleanup levels
- 12. Where and how scenarios were developed
- 13. How clean is the river – who is responsible for cleaning up contaminants from Hanford? When they get to the river

Page 11

Understanding Cleanup Levels – Fact Sheet

- 1. Take some of questions in outline and create fact sheet
- 2. Elements that go into decisions
- 3. Comparison of this site to background levels

Page 12

Understanding Cleanup Levels – Possible Outcomes

- 1. Develop into question “checklist” of questions to consider when developing information for public meetings and materials
- 2. Fact sheets (high level, less technical)
 - a. Videos
- 3. Flow diagram – where decisions and public opportunities exist (#13)
- 4. HAB resource

Page 13

Understanding Cleanup Level – Next Steps

- 1. Refine from PIC input
- 2. Nov. 6 ask RAP to help improve questions [and answers] → some HAB members might want to do this
 - a. Agencies need to be involved in answering questions
 - i. Iterative with HAB
- 3. Identify people interested in different questions to work together with agencies

EM-SSAB

- Logistics:
 - Week of April 22
 - About 50 people
 - 1. Provide casual, informal social opportunity
 - 2. Welcome packet at hotel – basic info, restaurants, places of interest, etc.
 - a. Souvenirs <\$20 total
 - 3. Visitor Convention Bureau (“Welcome to the Tri-Cities”)
 - 4. Dinner cruise or wine tour – Wednesday
 - 5. Eric Roberts facilitates meeting
 - 6. Website for meeting
 - 7. Check on HAB members ability to attend tour (Tuesday) social (Wednesday) – if space is available
 - 8. Regulator welcome at beginning (TPA relationship)
 - 9. Note: don’t do budget workshop the same week of SSAB meeting
- Susan Leckband and Becky Holland will work with Sharon Braswell

Round Robin

Hanford Challenge

1. Reformatted “Inheriting Hanford” blog
2. Fall newsletter
 - a. New public comment periods information with hyperlinks
3. Monthly happy hours and discussion groups

ODOE

1. Public involvement intern
 - a. Table at markets
2. Evening webinar series (5 webinars)
 - a. High school and college (about 30 people per meeting)
3. Tulane University in December
4. Science pub series

Round Robin (continued)

Hanford Watch

1. Trying to tie in with ODOE's webinars and Portland Community College

Page 17

Follow Up

1. Revisit SOS meeting opportunity – Fall 2013 (discuss at February meeting?)
2. Emy Laija will send Susan Hayman the link to Public Involvement Plan response document – Susan Hayman will send to the PIC Committee.
3. February meeting → review advice reasons to #251 (letter and “cliff notes” will be formally provided)
4. Steve Hudson to send Susan Hayman link to EM-SSAB to distribute to the Board
5. Liz Mattson to talk to RAP about cleanup level questions

Page 18
