

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**

*November 3, 2015
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Public Involvement 2
Waste Treatment Plant Communications Approach (joint w/ TWC) 5
Tri-Party Agreement and Milestone Tutorial..... 7
Public Involvement Principles 12
Hanford Advisory Board Member Self –Assessments 13
Committee Business..... 14
Attachments 15
Attendees 16

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

Opening

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Committee members adopted the September 2015 PIC meeting summary with minor edits.

Announcements

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), stated that she would be away from the EPA’s Hanford Project Office until March, 2016. Emy accepted a temporary position at the EPA’s Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office, which oversees all of the U.S. Department of Defense and Manhattan Project cleanup sites.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) chair, noted that there would be an orientation for new Board members on November 4, 2015 at 8:00 a.m., prior to the HAB meeting.

Susan Leckband, HAB vice-chair, encouraged members of the PIC to attend a public meeting hosted by the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies on November 4, 2015 at 5:30 p.m., following the HAB meeting.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Public Involvement

*Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Calendar*¹

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided PIC members with the TPA public involvement calendar, updated for November 2015. Dieter noted that the TPA agencies are planning to update the document every month, and interested members can access the calendar [online](#). Dieter noted that the only ongoing public comment period is for the Central Plateau TPA milestone series change package (including M-015, M-016, M-037, M-085), and he noted that there are upcoming regional public meetings associated with the comment period in Richland, WA (November 4, 2015), Seattle, WA (November 17, 2015), Portland, OR (November 18, 2015), and Hood River, OR (November 19, 2015). Dieter encouraged HAB members to publicize the public meetings to their constituencies and encourage attendance.

Dieter said that the TPA agencies anticipate upcoming public comment periods related to:

- Upgrading ventilation and grouting hot cells A-F at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility
- Class III permit modifications to close parts of T-Plant, Central Waste Complex/Waste Receiving and Processing Facility, and Trenches 31 & 34 (several comment periods)
- River Corridor proposed plans for the 100-D/H and 100-N Areas
- Class III permit modification to place Solid Waste Operating Complex units in final permit conditions

Dieter encouraged HAB members to send any comments on the TPA public involvement calendar to him.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Is there an approximate start date for the public comment periods on upgrades to WESF and partial closures of T-Plant? The public involvement calendar notes that agencies will open both public comment periods in fall 2015.

R. [Ecology] TPA agencies have not yet selected a start date for these comment periods. Both of them may begin in January 2016.

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (November 2015)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Q. There has been talk of potentially conducting regional State of the Site meetings in 2016. Would these regional meetings occur in the spring?

R. [EPA] The 2016 State of the Site meetings will likely occur in the fall.

R. [Ecology] TPA agencies anticipate that the public comment period for the 100-D/H Area Proposed Plan will begin in spring 2016; it is likely that the public will request a meeting on the Proposed Plan in that timeframe, as well. Agency representatives will update HAB members on more specific dates for these comment periods at the December 8, 2015 River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting.

C. HAB members would appreciate it if the agencies scheduled a public meeting later in the comment period. This would provide HAB members and their constituents with more time to prepare questions and comments.

C. The regional public meetings for the Central Plateau milestone series change package will occur during the HAB's November committee meeting placeholder dates. Therefore, committees will not meet in November. RAP will discuss the milestone series change package at the committee's December 8, 2015 meeting.

C. Not all RAP members supported moving November 2015 committee meetings. It is important for agencies to consider all factors when planning regional public meetings, including HAB placeholders. It is important for RAP members to discuss the Central Plateau milestone series change package as soon as possible. The comment period for the Central Plateau milestone change package ends on December 11, 2015, which will not provide the Board with the opportunity to provide feedback.

C. [EPA] It is a fairly informal process to request a public comment period extension. The agencies anticipate that the comment period for the Central Plateau milestone series change package will be extended beyond December 11, 2015.

C. If there is consensus, the Board can request a comment period extension through the Board chair.

Tri-Party Agreement Quarterly Public Involvement Planning Meeting

Emy requested that committee members discuss potential strategies for updating the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Planning Meeting format. Emy noted that the TPA agency Public Information Officers (PIO) often schedule quarterly planning meetings prior to PIC meetings; however, Emy recognized that there is often a high level of overlap in subject matter (e.g. reviewing the TPA public involvement calendar twice) when the meetings are held adjacent to one another. She was hopeful that PIC members could provide PIOs with feedback and suggestions that would allow the future quarterly planning meetings to be as effective as possible.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The current strategy of holding a Quarterly Public Involvement Planning Meeting prior to PIC is a good one. The quarterly planning meeting is an excellent way to provide PIC members with an overview of the public involvement calendar. The discussions that then occur during PIC meetings are more nuanced.

C. The subject matter tends to be repetitive between the two meetings because some PIC members are unable to attend the quarterly planning meeting. Also, PIC tends to review some topics from the quarterly planning meetings again so that they can be incorporated into the committee's summary.

C. Holding the quarterly planning meeting prior to the PIC meeting is a good way to sensitize PIC members to upcoming public involvement efforts and public comment opportunities.

C. The PIC discussion is facilitated, while the TPA quarterly planning meeting is agency-directed. There is value in reviewing upcoming involvement efforts as a part of the PIC so that committee members can ask questions and identify upcoming public involvement needs. HAB members can do this more effectively during the PIC meeting.

Q. Could the quarterly planning meeting occur during Board meetings instead of PIC meetings?

R. [Ecology] TPA agencies already provide much of this information to the full Board during the agency updates. The quarterly planning meetings are more focused on public involvement.

R. The TPA public involvement calendar is the most useful tool that agencies present at the quarterly planning meetings. A possible strategy for sharing the calendar with more people could be to hold calendar discussions with PIC members prior to the Board meeting, and then hold a quarterly planning meeting during the Board meeting itself. Agencies could incorporate PIC comments into the calendar between meetings.

Q. Is the TPA quarterly planning meeting related to the HAB?

R. [EPA] No. The quarterly planning meeting is driven by the TPA Hanford Public Involvement Plan.

Q. Is there an administrative reason that the quarterly planning meetings need to be separated from PIC or Board meetings?

R. [EPA] No. The Hanford Public Involvement Plan only notes that these meetings must be open to the public.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

C. An issue with holding the quarterly planning meeting alongside PIC or HAB meetings is that the information is reaching the same audiences each time. Are there any strategies that the TPA agencies could explore that would allow the quarterly planning meetings to reach a broader or more diverse audience? These meetings could be issue-specific and not necessarily related to the TPA public involvement calendar. Agencies could also use these meetings as an opportunity to move out to communities and present updates for regional audiences.

R. [EPA] Travel may be difficult for TPA agency PIOs to manage. However, there may be the opportunity to incorporate additional remote participation strategies (e.g. webinars) into the quarterly planning meetings. The agencies will discuss these potential methods further.

R. [Ecology] Ecology has had limited success using webinars in the past.

C. Funding for PIO travel would likely be very difficult to procure.

Q. What is the intent of the quarterly planning meetings? The HAB represents a diverse group of stakeholders; however, the Board should not be the only group that receives the benefit of public engagement efforts. The TPA agencies should always strive to reach out to new audiences.

R. [EPA] The quarterly planning meeting is a commitment that the TPA agencies have made to share public involvement activities at Hanford.

C. TPA agencies could solicit more diverse feedback on strategies for managing the quarterly planning meetings by creating a survey and distributing it through the TPA listserv.

Agency representatives thanked PIC members for their thoughts and noted that discussion on potential strategies for updating the quarterly planning meeting format would be discussed on an upcoming PIC call.

PIC members also noted that they would review the fact sheets that was distributed for the Central Plateau milestone series change package public comment period and public meetings. Committee members committed to providing feedback on the fact sheets and the public meetings during the agency debrief on the PIC call.

Waste Treatment Plant Communications Approach (joint w/ TWC)

Liz provided PIC members with a brief background on the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) communications approach. She noted that discussion on the communications approach has been ongoing throughout fiscal year (FY) 2015 and that the approach is a joint effort between the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) and the PIC. Liz recognized that the primary goal of the WTP communications approach is to convey strategies for sharing information about the treatment of high-level waste (HLW) and Direct Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) to both general and technical audiences. Bob Suyama, issue manager, also noted that the communications approach would examine WTP communication

strategies and audiences at a high level, and he reminded Board members that the final HAB product would not constitute a comprehensive communication plan.

Sharon Braswell, North Wind/U.S. Department of Energy—Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), noted that recent TWC discussions were very productive and very helpful in clarifying the purpose of the WTP communications approach. She thanked issues managers and committee members for their efforts, and reminded them to contact her if they needed additional information as they worked to construct a draft of the document.

Liz encouraged PIC members to discuss the communications approach, identify potential information needs, and review next steps.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The Board should be very cautious about creating and releasing this communications approach. As a consensus Board product, this could come across as Board support for proposed WTP decisions.

R. Several Board members raised this point at past committee meetings, and issue managers addressed it extensively at the September 2015 TWC discussion. The communications approach is not a detailed plan for outreach efforts and messaging regarding WTP progress; it will be a basic strategy for the outreach process.

Q. How could regional public involvement groups use this communications approach?

R. Public involvement groups that are a part of the Board (e.g. Hanford Challenge) have the opportunity to provide information and input as the communications approach is created. It is an opportunity to share concerns with DOE-ORP as the agency plots the course for future outreach.

C. Discussions on the communications approach at past TWC meetings identified that DFLAW treatment is more clear to Board members than HLW treatment. TWC will receive additional information on HLW treatment at the committee's December 2015 meeting. The communications approach could recommend that DOE-ORP provide information about alternative strategies for treating HLW in the agency's outreach efforts.

Q. Will HAB members have the opportunity to read the white paper once it is completed?

R. Yes. The white paper will be a Board product, and it will require HAB consensus before it is released.

Q. Will the WTP communications approach cover messages, communication strategies, or both?

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. [North Wind/DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP would like to better understand what different audiences need and what types of information technical organizations would like to hear. The agency would like to know how to best communicate information relating to DFLAW and HLW to a variety of different audiences.

R. Issues managers and agency representatives would like to see the approach recognize the barriers that DOE-ORP is facing once they begin to discuss WTP progress again, following the resolution of Consent Decree arbitration. DOE-ORP will build their own communications strategies at that time. For this effort, issue managers are looking into background information and proposing methods to DOE-ORP for setting up their communications approach.

R. There are a variety of ways to frame discussion about WTP topics. DFLAW, for example, can be framed in such a way that audiences understand the technical strategies incorporated into the process. However, the overall goal of DFLAW is to remove some of the low-level waste from Hanford Site tanks and create additional space. Noting that the goal of DFLAW is to free up tank space may be all of the detail that some audiences require. The communications approach should tell DOE-ORP what groups will be interested in what level of detail and recommend strategies for effectively communicating this to them.

C. Members of the HAB and the general public do not currently have access to much of the information pertaining to planned WTP construction and operation due to Consent Decree arbitration. As such, it will be difficult to approach technical and financial issues from a non-hypothetical perspective. Issue managers will need to keep this in mind as they work to construct a draft communications approach.

Liz and Bob thanked agency representatives and PIC members for their comments. Bob noted that TWC and PIC members would discuss the communications approach further at the upcoming TWC meeting on December 9, 2015. Bob committed to incorporating all of the committee discussion into a draft white paper by this time in the hopes that it would promote additional discussion. He encouraged any TWC or PIC member interested in assisting with the drafting process to contact him.

Tri-Party Agreement and Milestone Tutorial

Regulator Presentation

John Price, Ecology, provided PIC members with a presentation on the general structure and tenants of the TPA and associated cleanup milestones. Key points from John's presentation³ included:

- Hanford cleanup is governed by three documents: (1) The Federal Facility Agreement, (2) the Consent Order, and (3) a three-party agreement on integrating the Federal Facility Agreement and the Consent Order. The Federal Facility Agreement is between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and EPA, and the Consent Order is between DOE and Ecology. The three-party agreement is also known as the TPA, and it is between DOE, EPA, and Ecology.

Attachment 3: Tri-Party Agreement and Milestone Tutorial (Ecology presentation)

- The Federal Facility Agreement is a result of the 1986 Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, Section 120, which applied the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act to federal facilities.
- The Consent Order relates to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), a law that works to manage hazardous waste from cradle to grave. In 1992, Congress identified that there was unchecked management of hazardous wastes at federal facilities. The resulting legislative action, the Federal Facility Compliance Act, required federal facilities to either comply with RCRA or create a plan to get into compliance with RCRA. The Consent Order between DOE and Ecology works to fulfill this requirement.
- The TPA includes both attachments and appendices. Notable sections include:
 - Attachment 2, Action Plan Sections 1-14 describe strategies for conducting TPA business.
 - Attachment 2, Appendix C lists individual cleanup locations at the Hanford Site.
 - Attachment 2, Appendix D lists the schedules for cleaning up soil and groundwater contamination at the Hanford Site, as well as schedules for permitting and closing units that store, treat, or dispose of hazardous waste. Appendix D is where TPA milestones are noted.
- TPA milestones are divided into three categories: (1) major milestones, (2) interim milestones, and (3) target dates.
 - Major milestones (also known as series) are large cleanup efforts at the Hanford Site. Major milestones contain many interim milestones. Milestone series are approved by signatories (U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations [DOE-RL] and DOE-ORP Site Managers, the EPA Regional Administrator, and the Ecology Department Director).
 - Interim milestones generally require measurable progress every year. Interim milestones are approved by DOE Assistant Managers, the EPA Hanford Project Office Manager, and the Ecology Nuclear Waste Program Manager.
- Milestones are changed whenever DOE is going to miss a cleanup milestone. This is not always DOE, EPA, or Ecology's fault. The TPA includes "good cause" reasons for milestone changes, including "insufficient availability of appropriated funds."
- TPA milestones inform funding requests. The TPA requires DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to identify and request the amount of funding needed to complete all milestones due in a given FY. The Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) considers these requests when developing the President's Budget. The President's Budget, however, is not required to request all needed money to complete cleanup milestones. Spending bills passed by the U.S. Congress do not have to request all needed funding amounts, and federal courts cannot require Congress to provide

additional funding. Federal managers are unable to spend more money than the U.S. Congress allocates; therefore, this shortfall may cause cleanup delays.

- Work plans are important factors that contribute to the creation and update of interim milestones. DOE conducts cleanup work based on work plans and writes reports, while regulators review work plans and reports. As DOE-RL and DOE-ORP produce these products, EPA and Ecology request interim milestones.
- There are monthly project manager meetings for each of the milestones and the hazardous waste management areas, and senior managers for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP review all milestones once every quarter. At these meetings, milestones can be classified as “on schedule,” “at risk,” or “to be missed.” DOE offices must submit requests for changes to milestones categorized as “to be missed” at least 90-days in advance of the milestone date to avoid fines. EPA and Ecology may also request milestone changes.
- If EPA or Ecology deny a submitted milestone change, then a milestone is considered to be in dispute. Regulators must justify why they disapprove a milestone change. There are progressively escalating conversations between DOE and the regulator following a disputed milestone.
- Each TPA agency’s position on milestones and milestone changes is influenced by community input.
 - Public comments received during announced comment periods influence TPA changes. However, the relationship that regulators have with the public is not limited to comment period windows.
 - The TPA Action Plan recognizes that tribal nations have rights and responsibilities distinct from the general public. TPA agencies have individual relationships with tribal nations. Ecology is not a federal agency; therefore, it interacts with tribal governments through the 1989 Centennial Accord.
- Following a public comment period for a milestone change:
 - TPA agencies develop a responsiveness summary to all comments received. Agencies may then renegotiate milestone wording, schedule, or both.
 - Each agency’s legal counsel reviews milestone changes. This may result in additional updates to the milestone.
 - Revised milestones are signed and incorporated into the TPA.
- The Hanford Administrative Record and Public Information Repository has a comprehensive list of all past milestone changes.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Do changes to interim milestones need to be agreed upon by all of the TPA agencies?

R. [Ecology] No. Interim milestones changes only need to be approved by DOE and the lead regulatory agency.

Q. Why do the agencies not put milestone changes out for additional public comment as they are revised?

R. [Ecology] If changes are significant enough, milestone changes would likely move into additional rounds of public comment. If TPA agencies go to the public with a series of milestone changes, but only one of those milestones are altered following public comment, the agencies may take that single milestone back for additional public review.

Q. Why do budget requests identified by DOE-RL and DOE-ORP not go directly to Congress?

R. [Ecology] The OMB is responsible for preparing the budget and forwarding it to the U.S. Congress. In the past, Ecology has discussed appropriations with legislators, but not OMB.

Q. Is there a milestone that governs the WTP, and, if so, can EPA and Ecology push for WTP funds to be moved to other cleanup efforts at the Hanford Site?

R. [Ecology] The Consent Decree governs the WTP, and it has its own associated milestones. The Consent Decree stipulates funding for the WTP; therefore, DOE cannot move this funding to other cleanup efforts.

Q. Will regulators ensure that no more cleanup milestones change?

R. [EPA] It is likely that additional milestones will change in the future.

Q. When DOE recognizes that it will miss a milestone, will DOE propose a new deadline for regulator review?

R. [EPA] It is possible. Milestone change negotiations are not an entirely prescriptive process.

Q. What information do agencies use to determine schedule changes for milestones? Do agencies take risk into account?

R. [EPA] It is important to remember that DOE has already addressed many of the most urgent cleanup needs at the Hanford Site. At this point in the cleanup process, TPA agencies work together to determine which agency's definition of risk and priority will take into account as milestones are updated. There is no hard formula that goes into the schedule change process.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. [Ecology] Due to funding realities, there are often tradeoffs that TPA agencies need to consider. For example, Ecology has preferred that other work at the Hanford Site take precedence over removal of canyon buildings. However, the canyon buildings are aging, and DOE will now need to invest in infrastructure updates prior to their demolition. Agencies work to be mindful of all factors as new cleanup schedules are proposed.

Q. How does the Consent Decree fit into this discussion?

R. [Ecology] The Consent Decree is largely separate. In 2005, Ecology was not pleased with the timeline that DOE proposed relating to the treatment of Hanford Site tank wastes. Therefore, Ecology put a case together and threatened arbitration against DOE. As an alternative to moving the disagreement to court, DOE settled with Ecology and created the Consent Decree.

Q. How do tank vapors relate to the TPA?

R. [Ecology] The TPA does not cover tank vapors.

C. This topic should be brought forward to an upcoming Board meeting. Additional time should be allowed for more presentation and discussion regarding the Consent Decree.

Q. How do reports such as the Hanford Site-wide Risk Review Project inform cleanup schedules?

R. [EPA] Regulators do not use reports such as these when making cleanup decisions.

Q. How could public comments influence milestone changes?

R. [Ecology] Public comments that prioritize cleanup are especially helpful.

Q. How much will it cost to clean up the entire Hanford Site?

R. [EPA] EPA is very cautious about assigning a number for overall Hanford cleanup, as it would pre-suppose cleanup remedies for many waste sites.

Q. Why do TPA agencies negotiate milestone change so silently? The public should be involved in every step of the process, not only during identified comment periods.

R. [Ecology] It would be very difficult to effectively manage public comments if they were accepted on an ongoing basis. Many times, changes can occur at several points within a negotiation process. These changes would be very difficult for members of the public to track.

R. [EPA] Legal review is also a consideration that the TPA agencies must take into account.

PIC members thanked John and Emy for the information that they provided. Members indicated interest in working with John to receive an enhanced version of the TPA briefing at an upcoming Board meeting. Liz noted that PIC members could work on framing this discussion during an upcoming committee call.

Public Involvement Principles

Liz introduced the topic of public involvement principles, recognizing that the topic was a continuation of a conversation that began at the September 2015 PIC meeting ⁴. Liz noted that discussion on public involvement principles covered general TPA agency public involvement strategies, including public comment periods and public meetings. Liz encouraged PIC members and agency representatives to discuss and strategize for potential upcoming 2016 public meetings (these may include the release of the 100-D/H Area Work Plan and regional State of the Site Meetings).

Committee Questions and Responses ²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. The FY always ends on September 30, and many DOE contracts end on that date, as well. This means that contractors deliver many documents to DOE at the end of September. Agencies will review these documents for approximately 45-days, with public comment periods following this review. The result is that public comment periods for major documents regularly fall within the holiday season. If agencies delay comment periods to account for the holiday season, then TPA agencies run into the bad weather that January and February bring. The timing and planning of these comment periods is something to keep in mind as the HAB discusses potential updates to public involvement strategies.

C. The HAB could advise DOE to arrange their contracts to ensure that all public comment commitments are met by the end of the calendar FY. This would mean that DOE would need to plan contracts to have documents delivered in June.

R. The federal budget cycle is such that fund authorization cannot occur before or after the FY.

R. [EPA] It is not possible to split contracts between FYs. EPA always encourages the Board to pursue advice that is practical. On this matter, the TPA agencies have little control or flexibility.

C. A persistent difficulty with TPA agency public comment periods is that they rarely match up to the HAB schedule, and that hinders the Board's opportunity to provide consensus advice or input on many issues. It is a frustrating dynamic that presents itself repeatedly.

C. The TPA agencies often approach the Hanford Public Involvement Plan like it is a set of guidelines as opposed to a set of rules. The Board has endorsed many of the notification and engagement principles included within the plan in past advice. Would it be helpful to agency PIOs for the Board to give advice requesting that TPA agencies provide members of the public with at least 30-days' notice in advance of public meetings?

R. [EPA] The TPA agencies already strive to do this. Agencies schedule and publicize public meetings with as much notice as possible.

Attachment 4: Transcribed flipchart notes (PIC, September 2015)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

C. [EPA] The TPA public involvement calendar is a tool that the agencies use to plan comment periods in conjunction with the PIC as far in advance as possible. Another difficulty associated with planning comment periods and associated public meetings involves the agencies' obligations to milestones and headquarter offices.

C. The TPA agencies need to look ahead at upcoming milestones and consider how and when to schedule public comments that will best take into account the needs of the public as well as the schedule for Board meetings.

R. [EPA] For the Central Plateau milestone series change package, the agencies worked to propose new dates that took into account many factors, including public comment considerations.

C. For upcoming public meetings related to the Central Plateau milestone series change package, the public will not have adequate time to prepare. Are there any ideas or strategies that the agencies can incorporate into these upcoming meetings that will allow for more fruitful public involvement?

R. [DOE-RL] DOE-RL will record the initial public meeting in Richland, WA on November 4. The comments and discussion that occur at this meeting may allow public engagement groups to plan for upcoming meetings in Seattle, Portland, and Hood River that will occur during the week of November 16.

PIC members thanked agency PIOs for the information and detail they provided. Liz noted that the upcoming PIC call would be an opportunity for committee members and agency representatives to create framing questions for future discussions on the topic of public involvement principles. Sharon noted that agency PIOs could work to lay out the general schedule considerations that go into scheduling a public comment period and associated public meetings. Sharon was hopeful that this could provide PIC members with additional depth that could assist in their understanding and for future committee discussions.

Hanford Advisory Board Member Self –Assessments

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, noted that her organization hosted Dr. Kate Brown, Professor of History at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and author of *Plutocracy*, in September 2015. Liz noted that Dr. Brown hosted an engaging discussion on the history of the Hanford Site. In October, members of Hanford Challenge joined in Seattle's Climate Justice March, and they explored strategies for linking Hanford cleanup with climate justice and encouraged attendees to think about nuclear waste issues in Washington. Liz also noted that Hanford Challenge worked with Heart of America Northwest (HoANW) to provide middle-school students with a public health workshop on Hanford Site cleanup issues. Liz closed by noting that Seattle's Northwest African American Museum would host an exhibition called *The Atomic Frontier: Black Life in Hanford, WA* until March 6, 2016, and she encouraged PIC members to look forward to Hanford Challenge's annual Hanford and Gingerbread activity in December.

Rachel Baran and Gerry Pollet, HoANW, said that their organization has been involved in several community efforts, including the Saturday morning public health workshops mentioned by Liz. Gerry

noted that DOE-ORP recently provided support for a tour of the Hanford Site for University of Washington students enrolled in the Masters of Public Health Program. He noted that this tour encouraged students to look at careers related to nuclear cleanup.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, noted that Pam Larsen and Hanford Communities recently coordinated a conversation between Kevin Smith, DOE-ORP, and Jane Hedges, Ecology, about the One System and DFLAW. The conversation included a question and answer portion, and Hanford Communities will release a video of the conversation soon.

Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, noted that he and his colleagues are in the process of conducting 17 presentations on cleanup progress and challenges at the Hanford Site for civic groups throughout the region.

Sharon Braswell, North Wind/DOE-ORP, said that Kevin Smith and Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL, have been visiting tribal representatives to discuss Hanford Site cleanup.

Committee Business

*PIC 3-Month Work Plan*²⁵

PIC will plan to hold a committee meeting prior to the February 2016 Board meeting. To prepare for this upcoming discussion, committee leadership will have a committee call in December 2015. On the call, committee members plan to:

- Debrief proposed changes to the Central Plateau TPA milestone series change package and examine agency fact sheets and meeting strategies associated with the proposed changes
- Review progress on the WTP communications approach
- Discuss and frame a potential TPA and Milestone tutorial for the full Board
- Discuss the potential for a full Board discussion on TPA public involvement efforts
- Debrief potential updates to the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Planning Meeting format
- Discuss next steps for Gary Garnant's summary documents
- Discuss HAB youth involvement strategies
- Finalize February 2016 PIC meeting agenda

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart notes

Attachment 5: PIC 3-Month Work Plan

Attachments

Attachment 1: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016
(November 2015)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Attachment 3: Tri-Party Agreement and Milestone Tutorial (Ecology presentation)

Attachment 4: Transcribed flipchart notes (PIC, September 2015)

Attachment 5: PIC 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

David Bernhard	Dirk Dunning	Liz Mattson
Richard Bloom	Gary Garnant	Gerry Pollet
Don Bouchey	Becky Holland	Bob Suyama
Jan Catrell	John Howieson	Jean Vanni
Shelley Cimon	Steve Hudson	Steve White
Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	

Others:

Rana Evans, DOE-ORP	Emy Laija, EPA	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Joanne Grindstaff, DOE-ORP	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
Kris Holmes, DOR-RL	John Price, Ecology	Sarah Freeman, Hanford Challenge
Ben Vannah, DOE-RL		Emily Peterson, Hanford Challenge
		Rachel Baran, HoANW
		Jen Copeland, MSA
		Jennifer Colborn, MSA
		Sharon Braswell, North Wind/DOE-ORP