

# HAB PIC Lessons Learned from Hanford Live 6-6-17

## Hanford Live

Shannon Cram, Vice Chair, introduced the topic of the Hanford Live. Shannon opened the discussion asking committee members the following questions:

- What do you think worked?
- What didn't work?
- What were the lessons learned for the future?

Members used this opportunity have a lengthy discussion of the Hanford Live event.

Dieter Bohrmann North Wind – supporting DOE Office of River Protection (ORP), provided a recap of the Hanford Live event. Key points from Dieter's presentation:

- Notices were sent via email a month before the event. 175 people pre-registered for the livestream via email.
- The livestream had anywhere between 100 – 110 with 120 viewers at one point.
- Facebook Live had more than 1000 views, 12 shares and 17 questions/comments. 50 questions were received before and during the event.
- The event was posted on Twitter with a hashtag of #hanfordlive2017. One question came through Twitter before the event.
- There was a follow up story in the Tri-City Herald after the event.
- The Hanford Live video was posted on YouTube a week after the event took place. Currently there are 850 views.
- A survey was sent out right after the event. There were 57 responses from the survey.
- We have a map of all the location where people were watching. We had views locally and UK, Washington D.C., and Oregon.

Liz Mattson read the survey questions and results to the HAB members.

### ***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.*

Q: "Did you get any sense of how long the YouTube video was viewed?"

R: "That was the tricky part. If you clicked on the video it was considered a view."

Q: "Do you know if there were a jump in views after the PUREX event?"

R: "I do not know that information."

## HAB PIC Lessons Learned from Hanford Live 6-6-17

C: “We had an issue manager team that consisted of Helen Wheatley, Shannon Cram, Alissa Cornder, and Liz Mattson. We had a call to discuss questions to submit before the Hanford Live event that were not asked during the event. “

*R: “We appreciate the input. Those questions were given consideration. Not all questions could be accepted.”*

C: “It was a positive experience to be on the panel. I think it’s a good start, I do believe this has a place but not to take place of public meetings. I think it’s an opportunity for single subject items or a few subjects to have an educational discussion.”

Q: “How much time did it take to put together?”

*R: “We started to meet 6 to 7 months before Hanford Live. We met an hour or two a month and then an hour or two a week in addition to all the other work we were doing. I would say we put in about 100 hours between the 6 to 8 of us.”*

Q: “How does that compare to an in-person meeting?”

*R: “I think it’s almost apples to orange because it was so different between the technology and the preparation work that went into it. For example, the upcoming public comment period is probably 4 to 5 hours of preparation.”*

Q: “Do you think it will go faster next time?”

*R: “Yes.”*

Q: “Do you have a reflection on why the age gap on the digital format?”

*R: “It was surprising. I am not sure.”*

Q: “Do you think as a committee we should break that down more specifically?”

C: “There were a number of college age students that had pre-registered, or it appeared that way. I don’t know if they ended up watching.”

Q: “How did you figure out who to send the survey too?”

*R: “It went out on Listserv and people who had registered for the event.”*

C: “Each presenter covered enough of the same material. It was not different enough to really make sense of why they were talking about the same thing again.

C: My impression is that each individual presenter did an excellent job, but the problem was that it was static in a way that the moderator had a lot of power so we were listening to the moderator more.”

Q: “How many of you sent out a link to people for the Hanford Live?”

*R: “About ten HAB members raised their hands.”*

## HAB PIC Lessons Learned from Hanford Live 6-6-17

C: "Presentations were not attention grabbing."

C: "The survey results were surprising to see that a majority of the results were local to Richland."

Q: "How much did it cost to put on the State of Site meetings?"

R: "About \$20,000."

Agency Perspective:

- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency, was most skeptical about the Hanford Live event. Dennis stated that overall, the event turned out to be more positive than expected. He agrees that this format would do well with a general meeting, specifically with a single topic that would solicit a public comment. After reviewing the video of the event, he felt the panel participants were quiet and the energy levels were low. Due to being unable to see the public participants during the event, the panel found it difficult to gauge the body language and response to the comments by the public.
- Randy Bradbury, Washington State Department of Ecology, agreed that the Live event was a better forum; however, there was real skepticism in advance. They were gratified after participating in the event and realized it will be a valuable addition to the tools already in place. He stated that people shouldn't lose sight of the fact that doing live event like this (and he hopes that they do more in the future), it adds great value as an additional tool to get more public involvement. On the technology questions, they did talk about different suggestions on how to make it more interactive. As a personal observation to the comments about the event being dull, is now people wonder why journalists do what they do to make their reports more exciting. He stated "I'm not saying that what they do is defensible, but there is nothing worse than dull television, so they are under pressure to not have that happen in their reports."
- Emy Laija, Environmental Protection Agency, stated the main lesson learned from this event, is that when it comes to an in-person meeting or webinar, people really have to be aware of what the goals are for that specific meeting or webinar. People can't reach all audiences. Something for the general public versus the Hanford workforce would be very difficult to combine into a single meeting or webinar. Some of the goals here were to improve awareness of the youth of online tools and increase those interested in Hanford. Know what your goals are and go from there.
- Dieter Bohrmann, ORP, stated that they learned that they can do it. They knew it would be a work in progress and would have a lot of lessons learned. One of the things of concern was would this thing even work and how would this even go down. They were able to pull it off and the production value was good with all things considered. There are some kinks needed to work out for next time. He doesn't know what the answer to this would be, but he found it interesting that this is the first time they have used Facebook Live for the Hanford Live event. He did not recall the agencies using that tool before Hanford Live and then a month later they used it extensively to report on the PUREX tunnel collapse. He did not know if there was a correlation there or if using Facebook Live for Hanford Live made them more likely to use it going forward. Another thing is

## **HAB PIC Lessons Learned from Hanford Live 6-6-17**

the body language responding to comments. Panelists found it difficult to know how to respond and at what level, when the panel was only looking at a box.

Rich Buel, DOE-RL, thanked the members. They got a lot good feedback here at the PIC meeting and a lot of good feedback from the survey. He stated that it is a good tool they can look at in the future