



Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) Stakeholder Involvement Activity

At the January 18, 2006 Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) meeting, Jeff Perry from the Department of Energy-Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) provided an overview of the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) stakeholder involvement program and explained that DOE-ID was seeking advice from the CAB. He explained that they were looking for a broad range of ideas from the CAB members regarding stakeholder involvement for the RWMC cleanup program. Perry told the CAB that their ideas would be reviewed and used in the overall planning process.

Lori Isenberg, the support services facilitator, explained a group process that was developed specifically for these situations which—while it takes longer than some other information gathering processes—provides the following benefits:

- Individuals are able to record their thoughts prior to any group discussion.
- Through the “share and compare” process, the group discovers their commonality of thinking, as well as their broad range of thoughts.
- It provides opportunity for CAB members to share ideas in a less structured format.

DOE-ID also requested that the CAB take the process one step further and prioritize their responses, which was done.

DOE-ID provided three questions for the CAB to answer. For each question the CAB went through the process outlined above, including prioritization. Then the individual responses were then analyzed and a recommendation was developed and agreed to by the CAB on a consensus basis.

The format of the information for each question is as follows:

- First, the question from DOE (A, B, or C).
- Next, an overall recommendation responding to the question.
- The group went through a prioritization process on the topics they had identified at the January meeting. After discussing each item enough to make sure everyone understood what it meant, the CAB members individually ranked each item as high, medium or low as to how effective they thought it was. High received 3 points, medium 2 points, and low 1 point. Then combined the score for each item, in order of priority. *These points are part of the recommendation.*
- Following each detailed point is a compilation of the initial responses to the question. These responses are *not part of the recommendation* but are provided to help explain the meaning of the detailed points. For the most part, they are framed as questions because that is the format of response that most participants preferred.

(A) What information does the public need to understand about this project?

The CAB recommends that the following information be provided regarding the project (in a manner that is easily understood by the public with examples of acceptable levels of risk). These are listed in the order of importance by individuals.

1. Risk to humans	30
2. Risk to environment, aquifer	28
3. Effect on community (economic, livability, etc.)	24
4. Solution options (what solutions were researched and why)	21
5. Technical information, facts, data	20
6. Proposed end state	16
7. Cost life cycle	15
8. History of project	11

(1) *Risks to Human Health, Especially Workers*

Is it life or health threatening? / What are risks to workers? / What is the risk to human health from contamination?

(2) *Risks to the Aquifer and the Environment*

What are the risks from contamination to the environment? / How serious is the threat to water quality in the aquifer? / What risks do you take digging it up versus waiting to develop other technologies? / Summary of the risk assessment. / What would be left behind?

(3) *How the Project Affects the Community*

How does the problem affect me? / What is the impact on the community? / What are the economic benefits to the community? / Why is the project required? / If it is such a big issue, why isn't it being taken care of on the fast track? / How is my input going to be used and will it make a difference? / Why should I be interested? / Why do you want my opinion?

(4) *Options and Alternatives for a Solution*

What are the alternatives for a solution? / What are the consequences of doing or not doing this project? / What are the alternatives for caring for or for disposition of the buried waste? / Why are there such different approaches to cleanup?

(5) *Technical Information about the Project—Facts and Data*

What are the actual facts of this issue (nature and extent of problem)? / How sure are you that you know what's out there? / Is there adequate acceptable knowledge? / What is the information pool? / What do you need to know? / What is the volume and characteristic of buried waste? / Where is Waste Area Group7 relative to the rest of the site? / What are the deadlines?

(6) *Proposed End State*

Is the solution permanent? / Is it compatible with the end state?

(7) *Cost Information*

What are the costs? / Is there funding?

(8) *History of the Project*

Historical background. / What caused the problem? / Who was responsible then and now? / Have lessons been learned? / What has been done in the past?

(B) What is the best way for the public to receive information about this project?

The CAB recommends that the following media and information dissemination techniques be used to provide information for this project. These are listed in the order of importance by individuals.

1. Media-TV, newspaper	28
2. Presentations (sit down meeting) to community groups and the general public	25
3. Education System	24
4. Informal workshops, open houses	20
5. Third party information through their newsletters, etc.	17
6. Personal mailings (interested parties)	16
7. Web sites	15
8. E-mail to interest parties (signed-up)	12

(1) *General Interest Media*

Local cable television, documentary. / News articles, print. / Public radio.

(2) *Community and Civic Programs*

Community programs. / Civic group's presentations. / Small group discussion with "expert" present. / CAB presentation. / Small group meetings (CAB).

(3) *Through the Education System*

(4) *Informal Workshops*

Educational round tables. / Workshops (informal, posters, people).

(5) *Third Party Information*

Newsletter from a credible third party. / "Factual" newsletters developed by a consortium of agencies. / Third party presentation thru media.

(6) *Personal Mailings*

Personal mailing. / Focused executive summary. / Fact sheets (maps, tables, summary).

(7) *Use of the Internet*

DOE web site. / INL web site (detailed documents, summary). / Fact sheets. / Website blogs.

(8) *Use of E-mail*

E-mail / Fact sheets (maps, tables, summary).

(C) How can the agencies build trust with the public?

The CAB recommends that DOE-ID take the following actions to build trust with the public. These are listed in the order of importance by individuals.

1. Be honest / tell all sides of story	29
2. Be transparent	27
3. Perform quality work	27
4. Communicate clearly (lay person language and examples)	25
5. Listen	24
6. Keep commitments	23
7. Seek third party review	14

(1) *Be Honest*

Be honest-good or bad news. / Tell the whole story. / Give complete answers to questions. / Accept responsibility for mistakes. / Acknowledge and be prepared to deal with uncertainty and contrary ideas. / Share information. / No surprises.

(2) *Be Transparent*

Make decision process transparent. / Make management information open to the community. / Provide consistent information across agencies (EPA, State, and DOE) or explain the differences. / Report issues using self regulation.

(3) *Perform Quality Work*

Finish the cleanup projects on schedule and within budget / Deliver quality and cost effective products / Have impeccable safety record (work force, public, and environment) / Communicate success stories and comments from satisfied citizens.

(4) *Communicate Clearly*

Communicate clearly and often. / Use language the “average” person understands, in non-legal terms. / Keep presentation in an understandable format. / Back up statements with credible sources. / Follow through. / Answer questions clearly. / Don’t avoid questions, communicate what you can and can’t answer.

(5) *Listen to What People Say*

Actually pay attention to public comment. / Interactive process: receive input, incorporate ideas, and refine. / Explain what happened to input. / Listen to people who do the work. / Be willing to listen to alternatives from outside the agency.

(6) *Keep Commitments*

Keep commitments. / Stop continually adjusting milestones.

(7) *Seek Third Party Review*

Don’t show favoritism. / Seek independent third party review and/or endorsement (League of Women Voters, etc.). / Seek critical independent academic review.