November 22, 2021

Sent via email: 5YearPlan@rl.gov

RE: Oregon Feedback and Comment on the Hanford 5-year Plan

Oregon appreciates the ability to comment on Hanford 5-year Plan document and how it was presented to the public. We are encouraged and supportive of the US DOE’s expanded public outreach early in the planning process. The third iteration of the Hanford 5-year plan “placemat” serves as an effective continuation of the conversation, and we acknowledge and appreciate the document’s availability in Spanish as well as English. Below, we provide feedback and comment on both the specific cleanup actions and priorities described in the 5-year plan, and on the public engagement aspect of the 5-year plan as a tool for outreach:

- We recognize that it is difficult to find the right level of information to present to all audiences engaged in the Hanford cleanup; some parties may find that the placemat is too simple for those with experience reviewing Hanford data, and others may find it not simple or descriptive enough for those approaching Hanford for the first time. The fact sheet links at https://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/5-YearPlan provide good supplemental information, but this page is not integrated with a digital copy of the placemat itself or referenced on the document. We think there is a good opportunity here to couple the visual “high level” overview of the placemat with a website that represents the “Digital Hanford,” where in addition to overviews/fact sheets of the sites and projects, a user can also find associated milestones and links to pertinent Administrative Record documentation with a brief description of the document on the Administrative Record. Links to the virtual site tour could also be included (where appropriate). This companion website could also provide a chart that includes critical path items in the lifecycle report and the associated budget needed to complete the mission. The website could also depict what has changed in the overlapping years between the current and prior revision. This may help provide the right balance of information to multiple audiences.

- It would be helpful if the companion website to the placemat contained a “questions and answers” section where members of the public could submit comments for agency representatives to respond to. This record of questions and answers could be made available to subsequent site visitors and provide a portal to direct engagement outside of normal comment periods.

- As an alternate method of outreach, we recommend that DOE consider distributing physical copies of the placemat to local businesses and restaurants around the community and region to help spread awareness of the Hanford cleanup plans to the public. It would be helpful to include on the placemat a QR code or easily accessible web address that would take interested people to the collection of fact sheets, the virtual tour, the public engagement calendar, and other easy entry points for further information.

- The placemat reports when projects already announced or underway will be finished, but it does not present what work will be started (such as, central plateau investigation and
remediation, tank farm retrievals, etc). This update on what is known is helpful, but presenting the decision points and work starts which may fall in the 5-year timeframe may allow for increased meaningful public engagement. A small “on the horizon” box that lists upcoming dates such as “2028- Shipments to WIPP resume” may be helpful to include as well.

- The Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan for the 200-CW-5, 200-PW-1, 200-PW-3, and 200-PW-6 Operable Units (DOE/RL-2015-23) lists the start date for waste site 216-Z-9 as 2025 (Table 7-1). If that work has been delayed, perhaps it should also be listed in the “on the horizon” box.

- While we recognize that the window for Hanford TRU waste to be accepted at WIPP is out of the local DOE offices control, to ensure that wastes are quantified and ready for shipment, investigation and remediation of those waste sites containing suspect TRU waste should be well underway in this 5-year period. These investigations and remediation activities should be reflected in the site’s 5-year vision; shipments to WIPP are always a topic of high-interest to the public.

- Consider including a reference to continued support of the Natural Resources Damage Assessment process on the placemat or the companion website.

- There seems to be inconsistency with how budget assumptions are described. On one hand, the placemat describes flat funding, while at the same time there is discussion of additional funding commitments to resume construction of the Waste Treatment Plant in 2025. A 5-year budget projection graph in the corner of the placemat might be useful to show the overall picture.

- We recommend a reconsideration of the survey questions associated with the 5-year plan to more effectively engage the public and gather the feedback the plan seems intended to solicit. We also recommend that DOE and its contractors work with the HAB Public Involvement and Communications committee to review surveys prior to their release to the public.

- The recorded public meeting is a welcome addition to the rollout. DOE should consider evening meetings to increase the number of real-time attendees, perhaps after the placemat has been distributed for review.

Since the placemat was first introduced three years ago, Oregon appreciates that DOE has made smart improvements regarding how it is presented to the public. The inclusion of a recorded meeting and a formal request for input on the draft in this year’s revision are examples of the increased public outreach, which Oregon supports. In the provided comments, we suggest that DOE could further improve the placemat as a multi-media communication tool, and use a more engaging roll-out and outreach process. If you have any questions, please contact Tom Sicilia ([tom.sicilia@energy.oregon.gov](mailto:tom.sicilia@energy.oregon.gov)) of my staff.

Sincerely,

Maxwell Woods
Assistant Director for Nuclear Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Oregon Department of Energy
maxwell.woods@energy.oregon.gov
Oregon Department of Energy

Cc: David Bowen, Washington Department of Ecology
    Dave Einan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
    Matt Johnson, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
    Jack Bell, Nez Perce Tribe
    Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation
    Stephen Wiegman, Hanford Advisory Board
    Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board