

LESSONS LEARNED – 200 AREA END STATE WORKSHOP

Participant Comments

August 10 – 11, 2004

PARTICIPATION / DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Public participation improved, but still need better ratio of public to DOE-PNL-contractor employees often with vested interests.
2. Include more retirees with historical knowledge of operations. Most retirees were not aware of these sessions and the value of their input. Their input was very valuable here. Process knowledge common here 20-30 years ago is having to be relearned.
3. Shirley Thanks for your outreach. The participation of retired workers was fantastic. We need to keep them involved.
4. Need evening sessions to bring in more voices from 'Non Site' people.
5. Please clearly state goals, objectives, and process at meeting and breakouts. This will eliminate a lot of confusion at purpose.
6. Groups need to have more diversity – Better mix of Hanford RET. Activist and contractors.
7. The turnout was much better than the 100-area workshop, so good job on recruiting attendees.
8. Good format...Good facility...Good cross-section of folks (i.e.-not all HAB and good current site workers cross-section.
9. Good discussions, but I'm still concerned that almost all participants are current or former Hanford/Regulator/Stakeholder Groups, not General Public.
10. Wish there were more "general public" in the process. (and know and how do you get them involved?)
11. Good exchange of ideas. Try harder to get more of the general public to attend. This was mostly HAB, regulators, and contractors. Do a more aggressive ad campaign.
12. Ability to interact with people with so many different backgrounds, expertise, and perspectives is very useful.

MEETING FORMAT, FACILITATION & PROCESS

1. The operational organization was excellent. Group break out
2. Discussions better organized than 100 Area meeting.
3. Meeting shows major effort by facilitator and meeting team to provide information and useful meeting.
4. Addressed major issues and obtained range of view points.

5. DOE is too defensive of existing programs. Ditto for EPA and Ecology. Need to keep it in the sphere of brainstorming.
6. Excellent meeting good prep; good forward; good building; good attendance – build a 200 exposure area.
7. Appreciate DOE responses to input of participants.
8. Too much domination of agency folks in breakout sessions. Tendency to talk too much instead of eliciting conversation from others.
9. Did not particularly like perceived rudeness/glibness of primary facilitator.
10. Need to better coach presenters/speakers better on how to respond to public comments. A defensive response is not helpful and it makes it appear DOE-RL is not truthfully interested in public input.
11. Second day summary was not facilitated very well – attack on DOE by facilitator inappropriate.
12. There are many potential topics for 200 area. Workshop focused on the key questions.
13. One facilitator does not need to be rude to another facilitator.
14. Real difference between basic science and applied engineering. Not enough in applied engineering funds directed at site problems.
15. Some of the questions were too broad or too vague.
16. Some discussion leaders were too dominating, not allowing or encouraging full discussion, and then too quick to give a rebuttal or their vision to the participants – FRUSTRATING! No wonder there's a lot of spinning of wheels!
17. I appreciate Mike Guddu protecting the public interest, when agency people got their agendas in the way!
18. Overall, I thought the format and discussions were good.
19. I appreciate the work done on this by all involved.
20. Some of the discussions, especially when leaders got their agenda out of the way were fantastic, more of which needs to happen – success depends on discussion leaders.
21. The diversity of source locations and inventories in the 200 areas made it very difficult to answer the rather general questions we were asked to address. As a result, we were often driven to attempting to answer those questions on a site-by-site basis. Thursday, the emphasis on DOE/EPA/Ecology to develop a comprehensive holistic overview of the total problem is strongly encouraged.
22. Meetings emphasized the need for good overview (not piece meal) approach to cleanup AND need to effectively communicate this information to public and workers
23. (Related topic) public needs evidence that its concerns are being heard AND acted upon.
24. This is a worthy model to use for future public meetings e.g., tank waste EIS.
25. It would be helpful to have some of the handout information available on the website ahead of the workshop.

26. I think the public did not have enough information on inventories of contaminants and their associated risks to really answer some of the questions that were posed. The answer in many cases would be “it depends” (on a lot of things we have not been told yet).
27. I have been at Hanford since 1965. For 30 years, I have heard of the need to preserve nuclear knowledge. RIDS are supposed to do this – but they do not!! The long-term memory is disappearing. This was even an IAEA topic in 2001. But nothing is being done. – B04
28. Facilitation was rude to DOE, which is not helpful if we’re trying to facilitate a productive dialogue.
29. The issues are complicated – Job well done on simplifying without over simplification.
30. Mike did a great job as the public’s voice.
31. Workshop was too broad – would have been better to get a better focus of a few questions/issue that would have been most helpful for regulators and DOE.
32. Mike Goddu does an excellent job as facilitator.
33. Presenters in plenary and in breakouts generally did a very good job – issues were reasonable well focused.
34. Handouts were useful – but would have been able to acquire them (via web or e-mail) prior to the workshop.
35. Second day would have preferred to attempt to focus on a handful of key issue/values – rather than spend so much time re-hashing so many thoughts from day one.
36. There should be some type of pre-meeting discussion of the agency presenters about when to clarify or respond to issues. There is an internal conflict on when to respond to a comment that is factually wrong or when to let the comment slide for the sake of the cadence of the meeting. Does lack of response imply agreement?
37. For the informational segment (1st half day) provide a lecture hall format so we have desks for note taking. Then have one “big” breakout group so everyone can hear all the discussion. Would eliminate the need for a ½-day summary.
38. It is hard to see the “big picture” in a two-hour presentation. DOE should put “tutorials” about the entire Hanford site (and each facility) on the internet. So the public can easily access it. Right now, they need to know where to look and go to multiple documents to find it.
39. Would help to have a clearer presentation about where outcomes go – into multiple processes - and what near term follow on activities will be. Too much reliance on “it’ll come up in normal CERCLA process.”
40. Workshop 2 – Great appreciation for openness, candidness and hard work by Mike, Yvonne and Shirley, EPA and Ecology. A very big Thank you.
41. Breakout groups and rotations pretty effective.
42. Would have helped to have some visual(s) of extensive capping used on cocooning in 200 area.
43. Workshop 2 – Please put a glossary of acronyms on the web site. Use of acronyms is a norm. We use about 20-30. It will help and people will not disrupt the meeting for this reason.

44. Unless you are deeply involved in Hanford details, there is no way to have any valuable input.
45. Presentations – Time and detail were appropriate. Would have liked more info on tank remediation. Let me know when tank workshops are scheduled.
46. Agree with general comment that comprehensive central complex plan/strategy needs to be discussed BEFORE making decisions on individual elements, e.g. B/C cribs, canyons, or even Core Area.
47. Outstanding organization of sessions and topics/questions!
48. Comments on meetings – Good format, some opinionated individuals were given too much time on their views, more info (facts) on real risks to public is needed. (Don't spend big bucks on minor risks.)
49. Graphics were very good and very helpful.
50. Although discussions were interesting there was no real value to real regulatory (CERCLA) decision making for cleanup. So why waste the time?
51. Good exchange of ideas and materials.
52. Need to provide a comprehensive overall plan for review, perhaps prior to the workshop.
53. The handouts at the group discussions were helpful. Recommend this continue for future workshops.
54. Need to do a better job on selecting/presenting question to be covered/addressed in the group sessions.
55. Nick's comment relative to comprehensive strategy is very appropriate. I support such an approach for future workshops.
56. I found the entire thing very education/informative.
57. I like that each station had handouts on what they were talking about so everyone had a copy to hold.
58. I still think there was a lot of information to take in if you don't work with the agencies. It makes it hard to come up with solutions when you don't know all the facts.
59. A lot of the information was over my head so it seemed like the session went on and on. If there could be a few more breaks just for us to wake up and maybe ask some questions things might actually move along better so we don't spend the entire session time asking questions instead of coming up with solutions.
60. The questions were very broad. It seemed as if you have already made up your mind on what's going to happen. As an after thought you are asking the public.
61. The public is not completely aware of your DOE terminology. Make it more public friendly. Less acronyms.
62. A concrete end use of the land must be determined to evaluate clean up standard. Who will own the land when DOE gives it up makes a critical pivot point on the decision.
63. The 200 area graphics would be a more helpful visual aid if you predicted an after picture with the before picture for the entire CZ.
64. A greater lead time to become familiar with the topics of discussion would be productive use of the session time.

65. "Old" knowledge needs to be passed to younger generation, encourage universities to restart classes/degrees in nuclear physics, biology, chemistry etc. congrats you stayed on schedule, size of breakout groups good, large room adequate to hear all speakers, presenter very knowledgeable, agenda and all handouts clear and very helpful, Yucca Mountain the impossible dream.
66. This was better than 100 N workshop, information better organized, more public.
67. I initially was concerned that input from the public was limited to just a few outspoken persons. Ultimately, I was led to believe that they carried the banners of significant constituencies.
68. Overall process was effective. I particularly benefited from the Wednesday AM interaction. The rotating group methodology allowed for presenters to modify/improve with subsequent groups to enhance participation that was good.
69. On the process side all the handouts in one folder and grouped by topic would be helpful. I dropped mine once and then it became a mass of unconnected info.
70. Good [unintelligible] used on individual groups. Some of the presenters had to be constantly reminded to speak in non-scientific jargon. Pick your speakers somewhat in their presentation style. Some put me to sleep.

INFORMATION NEEDS

1. Remember to "de-acronym" for the lay, non-employee, non-contractor folks.
2. I know it is a complicated, scientific process, but need to definitely "simple-up" and widely dispense a summary of proceedings.
3. More emphasis is needed on historical preservation of the Manhattan project facilities. (Learn from past.)
4. Oral Histories – A program to capture knowledge and experience on past Hanford practices and their experience is sorely needed.
5. Long day but handouts very good and improved – need more copies available.
6. Would have been helpful to give a mental picture of the surface barriers that are expected to be in place in 2050. The focus could use that as baseline – OR challenge the baseline.
7. Not enough overview of surface contamination, contamination at 5 foot depth, 10 foot, 20 foot, 50 feet, 100 feet, 200 feet to better communicate to the public the nature of the problem in 200 areas.
8. I would like to see a similar workshop on risk assessment - in particular – in foundation and limitations.
9. Provide brief summary documents at each break out so that the public has a clear view of issues and research.
10. Show models, risk assessment, and feasibility analysis. Do not simply refer to them I want to see it! Where possible, use 3-D models and provide documents that talk about the impacts and outcomes of options.
11. Please provide a diagram for the public input a decision making process. (Whole process)
12. Do not use acronyms. It inhibits true public involvement.

13. Provide historical documents and database with specific references for those interested in pre or post research.
14. We (RL and contractors) have an obligation to provide clear and comprehensive depictions of characterization results, anticipated impacts, etc. to educate the public. If the public does not understand the problem, it is our obligation to address their "ignorance." 3-D depiction of GW [groundwater] contamination (vadose zone, too) for large area rather than individual waste site wear could be very illustrative.
15. More background info before workshop or emphasize that some knowledge out. The issue is recommended.
16. As strongly suggested, a more complete near-term plan needs to be developed.

MEETING LOGISTICS - FACILITY & HOSPITALITY

1. Meeting room and style of presentation were great.
2. Facility and facilitators performed well. Good facility.
3. Appreciated all advance work for each session! Poster boards were great.
4. This is a terrible location for these workshops. Putting a group in the hall was unbelievably rude! Not comfortable.
5. Great facility. Should be used more often.
6. Good job on refreshments! The cooler with water was excellent. Please provide water at future meetings.
7. Ask people not to wear colognes, perfumes, after shave, etc. (Many public meetings make this a requirement.)
8. Don't change the process, facility perfect, facilitator (Mike) and groups leader terrific, time/duration on the mark, A/V, handouts great, snacks improved from 100 [Area Workshop] but could be more i.e. (quantity) of the same (quality).
9. Good facility, need better refreshments (no pretzels), good focus by asking specific questions, I'm still a little cynical about the process and DOE's reliance on the input.
10. The facilities are inadequate! Need microphone taken to those making comments. Difficult for those in back to see screen. Need an auditorium for group meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Does info from the workshop indicate a mandate exists to do all of the things discussed by the groups and if so what next?
2. Will be difficult to implement the feedback from this workshop – very diverse.
3. Suggest future sessions address the near term decisions to be made and gather input on these topics/questions/decisions.
4. Please email location of web site to me (location of results of this meeting)