

Report on Community Interviews

Community Concerns and Preferences for Public Participation in Cleanup of Area IV Santa Susana Field Laboratory

February 2009

Prepared for
The U.S. Department of Energy
Santa Susana Field Laboratory

Prepared by
P2 Solutions
Idaho Falls, ID



SUMMARY

DOE contracted with P2 Solutions, a firm specializing in public participation services, to evaluate the relationship with the community and develop recommendations for conducting public participation activities to support development of the EIS. P2 Solutions interviewed key stakeholders regarding their concerns about DOE's plans to prepare the EIS and preferences for being involved during development of the EIS. This report explains the methodology used to conduct the interviews, summarizes the responses to the questions asked, and presents recommendations for DOE's consideration.

50 interviews were conducted with a total of 59 people. Interviewees included agency representatives, current and former employees, elected officials, the local business community, neighbors, people with environmental or health concerns, and Native Americans. Most were completed in under two hours. Interviews were conducted at the interviewees' homes or places of work, over the telephone, and in public places.

Participants were asked about their concerns related to DOE's plans to prepare an EIS for the Area IV cleanup. Concerns focused on the nature and extent of contamination at SSFL and the effects of that contamination on the environment and the nearby community, the appropriateness of using a NEPA document to make decisions related to cleanup, and DOE's relationship with the community.

Interviewees were invited to provide recommendations for sources of information that DOE should use during preparation of the EIS. Participants suggested that DOE consider the entire inventory of available documentation and begin by conducting a thorough evaluation of the contamination that must be cleaned up. In addition, it was suggested that DOE consider sources of information that might otherwise be overlooked, including former employees and knowledgeable members of the community.

Interviewees were asked to offer observations about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past. Most responses were simple and fairly negative. Interviewees commented on their perceptions about DOE's attitudes towards the public and made suggestions for improving relationships with the public. Many observed that DOE has failed to demonstrate responsiveness to the public's concerns and has not done a good job of conducting public participation in the past.

Participants were invited to make suggestions about DOE's objectives for involving the public while developing the EIS. Suggestions included objectives for the public participation effort, attributes of an effective public participation program, and suggestions for how DOE should decide which public(s) to involve and respond to questions from the public.

When asked about the role the public should play in framing the alternatives for evaluation in the EIS, some expressed doubts that the public was qualified to serve in that capacity. Most thought the public should be consulted during development of alternatives, however, and suggested that DOE explain alternatives that have already been identified and then invite suggestions for additional alternatives. Some participants suggested that DOE screen alternatives suggested by the public before including them in the full analysis.

Regarding the role that the public should have in developing the issues that will be evaluated in the EIS, most were confident that the public would be able to provide valuable input. Some people provided suggestions for issues to be addressed in the EIS.

Essentially everyone supported an extensive public comment period on the draft EIS. Many suggested that DOE should plan to involve the public throughout the entire decision-making process as well as during the implementation of the cleanup program.

Participants were invited to react to a variety of public participation activities that DOE could choose to employ in the public participation program to support decision-making related to the cleanup of Area IV at Santa Susana Field Laboratory. Respondents were supportive of internet tools, informational fact sheets, and information repositories for sharing information. Formal public meetings, periodic briefings, and public tours were also widely supported. There was little support for information kiosks, detailed technical presentations, and ongoing citizen advisory groups.

After obtaining reactions to the possible public participation activities, interviewees were asked which three to five possible activities would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS. Interviewees indicated the most support for the Internet, public tours, formal public meetings, public open houses, and workshops. A telephone hotline, periodic review of technical documents, detailed technical presentations, and information kiosks were mentioned by less than five of the interviewees as being important activities to include in the public participation program.

Participants were asked for any other advice they would provide to DOE for involving the public in the development of the EIS. Responses included suggestions that DOE make every effort to be honest and open with the public, try harder to communicate well with the public, acknowledge past mistakes, be forthcoming with information, make a genuine effort to involve the public and to be responsive to the public's concerns, avoid allowing the activist community to control information that is available to the public, and try harder to reach out to a broader community while conducting public participation. A small number of people cautioned against going overboard with public participation activities.

The final question provided one final opportunity for interviewees to bring up any additional issues or concerns. Many people had nothing more to add. Unique comments included reflections that the history of the site is significant and should be preserved and observations that previous site operations should not be judged harshly as most followed standard practices at the time. One person closed with the observation that DOE's success or failure will turn on DOE's commitment to engaging the public in its decision-making.

Recommendations based on the interviews focus on developing a clear explanation of how the investigation and cleanup of the entire SSFL and surrounding areas will be accomplished and development of a meaningful role for the public within that decision making process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	1
<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	1
<i>RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS</i>	2
1. What concerns do you have about the Department of Energy (DOE)'s plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL)?	2
2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?	10
3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?	14
4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?	18
5. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?	21
6. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?	24
7. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?	25
8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective?.....	28
9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?	44
10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?	47
11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?	50
12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?	50
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	51

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Interview Template	A-1
Appendix B. Interview Notes.....	B-1
Appendix C. Preliminary Recommendations for Public Participation Activities to Support Development of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Remediation of Area IV at Santa Susana Field Laboratory	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of Interviews Conducted by Category of Participant 1

Table 2. Locations Where Interviews Took Place 2

Table 3. Number of Interviewees who Supported each of the 14 Public Participation
Activities 44

Table 4. Number of Interviewees who Mentioned each Public Participation Activity as
One of the Most Appropriate 45

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is in the early stages of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to consider alternatives for cleanup of radioactive and hazardous contamination located in Area IV of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) near Los Angeles, California. DOE staff working on the EIS are fairly new to the site and inherited a less than positive relationship with the public in the vicinity of SSFL. DOE contracted with P2 Solutions, a firm specializing in public participation services, to evaluate the relationship with the community and develop recommendations for conducting public participation activities to support development of the EIS.

As a first task in this contract, P2 Solutions was asked to interview key stakeholders regarding their concerns about DOE's plans to prepare the EIS and preferences for being involved during development of the EIS.

This report explains the methodology used to conduct the interviews, summarizes the responses to the questions asked, and presents recommendations for DOE's consideration.

METHODOLOGY

The interview was designed to solicit input on concerns about DOE's plans to prepare an EIS and preferences for public participation in the development of the document. Questions focused on the information that would be needed to develop the document, perceptions of DOE's prior experience conducting public participation activities, and possible objectives for engaging the community. The interview was designed to take approximately one hour, depending on how much time individuals were interested in spending responding to the various questions. The Interview Template is included as Attachment A.

The sample of individuals to be interviewed was not designed to include everyone; rather I sought to find a range of perspectives. An initial list of names was generated following a quick search of the Internet and each person interviewed was invited to identify additional people to be interviewed. Most of the people who were recommended by more than a few interviewees were invited to participate. Eventually, 50 interviews were conducted with a total of 59 people. Four people did not agree to be interviewed, but everyone else was accommodating of the request. Table 1 presents the categories of the interviewees.

Category of Interviewee	Interviews Conducted (People)
Agency representatives (federal, state, and local agencies)	10 (11)
Current employees	5
Elected officials/staff of elected officials	6 (8)
Former employees	4
Local business community	3
Native Americans	2

Table 1. Number of Interviews Conducted by Category of Interviewee	
Category of Interviewee	Interviews Conducted (People)
Neighbors	7 (9)
Other	1
People with environmental or health concerns	12 (16)
Total	50 (59)

The interviews actually took between thirty minutes and seven hours to conduct; most were completed in under two hours.

Table 2 presents the locations where interviews took place. In general, the telephone interviews were shorter than the in-person interviews.

Table 2. Locations Where Interviews Took Place	
Location of Interview	Interviews Conducted (People)
At the interviewee's home	10 (16)
At the interviewee's place of work	19 (22)
Over the telephone	16
Public place (i.e., restaurant)	5
Total	50 (59)

Following each interview, I transcribed my notes and forwarded those notes to the interviewee(s) for review and approval. All but three of the interview summaries were approved. Only those that were approved are discussed in the summary of responses.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

All responses to the interview scripts that were approved are included as attachment B. They are numbered sequentially, but all other identifying information has been removed.

The following summarizes the responses to each question.

1. What concerns do you have about the Department of Energy (DOE)'s plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL)?

The first question asked participants about their concerns related to DOE's plans to prepare an EIS for the Area IV cleanup. Responses to this question were generally lengthy.

A large number of the people interviewed expressed concerns about the nature and extent of contamination at SSFL. Respondents provided detailed descriptions of contamination they believe to exist at the site and their understanding of the operations that resulted in the contamination.

- One person explained, “In 1959, a sodium-cooled nuclear reactor at SSFL had a partial melt down. It released more radioactivity than the Three Mile Island incident.” He went on to explain that “Rocketdyne tested rocket engines at SSFL for over 60 years. The hazardous chemical trichloroethylene (TCE) was used to clean the rocket engines after the testing. It was allowed to go into the subsurface of the site. A Boeing engineer estimated there was 800,000 gallons of TCE in the subsurface of the facility. I believe that TCE has migrated down to the Centex property, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power’s (LADW&P) Chatsworth Reservoir, and other areas in West Hills.”
- Another person reported, “There was way more contamination released than they have ever been willing to admit. They tell us there is nothing to worry about. But they can’t show us any documentation of what they did with the contamination that occurred. If they can’t prove that it was dealt with, we can’t believe they have taken care of it.”

Some people who reported concerns about contamination at SSFL also related stories of site workers illegally dumping contaminated equipment and materials outside site boundaries and/or showed pictures they had taken of debris dumped in nearby canyons. Their foremost concern was that the EIS will not adequately address all of the contamination that they believe can be blamed on SSFL operations.

Many people interviewed believe that onsite contamination has resulted in contaminated surface water runoff (spreading the contamination beyond the site boundaries) and contaminated groundwater below the site.

- One person explained, “There are fault lines through SSFL that provide a conduit for contamination away from SSFL into Chatsworth Reservoir and other surface water bodies. There are diversion tunnels and channels leading from the SSFL into and around the Chatsworth Reservoir. The reservoir had to be completely drained in 1969 and it has never been used for drinking water since. The claim was that the contamination was caused by a 1971 earthquake. But they drained the reservoir two year BEFORE the earthquake! The Department of Water and Power owns and operates the reservoir and they have never been able to provide an explanation of how the contamination got into the reservoir.”

Some who expressed concern about site contamination went on to express concerns about the threat posed by the contamination to site workers, the environment, and the communities surrounding the site. Some focused on health effects suffered by site workers.

- One said, “I was diagnosed with bladder cancer and I am certain that the cancer was caused by exposures I experienced when I worked at SSFL.”

Others focused on potential health impacts on nearby residents.

- One person reported that “A health risk assessment carried out by a team of scientists from UCLA and the University of Michigan found that the people in neighborhoods within a two mile radius of the SSFL experienced a higher rate of cancer than people living further away.”
- Another said, “I have done a lot of research into the health effects of SSFL and I remain very concerned. There are elevated levels of all kinds of cancer in this community, along with thyroid problems.”

Many people expressed frustration that DOE has not acknowledged the public's concerns about health issues. Numerous individuals reported that DOE has never accepted responsibility for health problems that the public blames on past operations at SSFL.

- As one individual stated, "There has been an abundance of health problems throughout the many years that cleanup has not been instituted. Many people without the specific markers for specific cancers have fallen victim to devastating cancers and, of course, question their proximity to the site." This individual went on to say, "We pushed them to do a study of the impacts on public health. DOE didn't want to do the study, so they said they would study the former employees first and then assess the community only if they found problems in the employees. UCLA did the study and their findings demonstrated that there were health effects among the employees. Then Rockwell/Rocketdyne spent \$9 million on their own epidemiological study to refute the UCLA study. They could have spent the \$9 million to clean something up, but they spent it just to make themselves look better. No one at DOE has ever admitted to doing anything wrong."

Not everyone who thinks the EIS will fail to address all contamination believes that DOE is covering up relevant information. Some think DOE doesn't know how much contamination exists.

- One person reported, "During discussions with a representative from Boeing, he said over and over, that he had no idea where the contaminant detected at elevated concentrations in the storm water runoff could be coming from here. Then a cleanup document for a nearby (upstream) area of contamination was submitted for public comment and that contaminant (that had been detected at elevated concentrations during storm water monitoring) was listed as a contaminant of concern at the cleanup site. The technical people from the various facilities/organizations (Boeing NPDES permitting personnel, Boeing site assessment and cleanup personnel and DOE personnel) don't appear to talk to each other. The folks with knowledge of the NPDES monitoring historically did not consider the data collected during assessments and cleanup operations." This individual went on to suggest that all available information must be considered to prepare a thorough EIS based on a more thorough understanding of site contamination.

Among those who expressed concern about environmental contamination and the risks posed by that contamination, many believe that if the EIS does not address all of the contamination, then the resulting cleanup will not be thorough enough, leaving the community at risk.

Others expressed concern about the scope of the EIS. Many people are concerned about DOE's plans to restrict the analysis to Area IV. These people believe that some contamination that originated in Area IV has migrated beyond that area.

- As one person expressed, "The scope of the EIS is to look at the cleanup of Area IV, yet there was treatment and/or disposal of materials generated in Area IV that went into other areas. An example: the Area I Burn Pit was used to burn some things that were originally from Area IV. Another example: the Area IV pipes and drainage system drain into Areas II and III and the Buffer Zone."
- Another individual said, "My biggest concern is that DOE will only be looking at Area IV. In previous years, the site owners didn't care what belonged to whom, and, as a consequence, things were dumped and buried all over the place, very haphazardly, without regard for where they were supposed to go. Two people were killed disposing of materials awhile back. They are now finding ordnance all over the place. There needs to be a full site characterization of the entire SSFL."

- One interviewee said, “There does seem to be some confusion about the scope of the EIS and there seem to be several opinions. It appears that in general the scope of the EIS is Area IV, however if DOE contamination has migrated outside of Area IV, it will be included. The scope will need to be explained.”
- Another person recommended, “If they are going to restrict the analysis to Area IV, they need to explain why in a manner that addresses the public’s concerns.”

Some are concerned that the EIS will not address all contamination.

- For example, one individual said, “The public defines ‘contamination’ as the presence of something harmful that didn’t use to be there that is potentially harmful. DOE doesn’t use the word ‘contamination’ unless it exceeds their cleanup standards. DOE denies that it exists, which enrages the public.”

One unique concern expressed by a current site employee related to the fact that DOE does not own any land at SSFL.

- This individual observed, “Boeing owns Area IV. DOE only occupied a portion of Area IV. What impacts might DOE’s decisions about cleanup have on Boeing and our property? DOE was only a tenant. We may have issues and concerns that will not be considered. This could unduly influence the way that Boeing is able to use the property in the future.” This individual went on to observe, “SSFL is a 3,000 acre site and the regulators see it as one contiguous site. Area IV is only a small portion of entire site. Making decisions for Area IV in isolation has the potential to dictate how things will be done on a much larger portion of the site. I am concerned that DOE will make decisions that will be inconsistent with Boeing’s intentions for the rest of SSFL. It could impact how the regulators work with Boeing.”

Some individuals expressed concern about the appropriateness of using a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document to make decisions related to cleanup.

- One said, “... the NEPA process is fundamentally unsuitable for the situation at SSFL. The purpose of an EIS is to provide information and analysis to inform a decision. EISs are designed for situations where negative impacts might result from a project. If an agency is considering building a facility, for example, where there is nothing there, they describe the proposed project, analyze the possible ways it will negatively impact the environment, evaluate alternative ways to build it and how those alternatives might negatively impact the environment, and they identify ways to mitigate the impacts. At SSFL, we have the opposite situation; DOE is considering positive impacts and the question is ‘How clean is clean?’ not ‘Is this impact too great?’ The NEPA process does not fit this situation.”

Another individual observed that DOE has no alternatives to consider in the EIS.

- This person stated, “I think I understand why DOE must prepare an EIS – but recent events make me wonder if it’s really appropriate. Boeing has made a commitment to release the site to the State of California’s Department of Parks and Recreation. This land transfer would prevent the potential that the land will ever be used for residential purposes. This land use scenario would greatly reduce the potential for human health impacts from any residual contamination. In addition, Senate Bill 990 dictates the cleanup standard that must be achieved. These two developments mean that the cleanup standard has been established and the future use of the site has been set. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider reasonable alternatives. Boeing and

Senate Bill 990 have effectively eliminated most of the alternatives. These pre-set conclusions radically restrict what the EIS can evaluate.”

Some people interviewed expressed the belief that DOE is only preparing an EIS because it has been ordered to by a federal judge. They went on to suggest that DOE is overlooking the opportunities afforded by NEPA to consider a variety of alternative courses of action and/or provide an opportunity for the public to be involved in decision-making.

- One person stated, “It is so vital to the cleanup effort that a full-site EIS be addressed that we don’t understand why DOE has been so unwilling to do one. Now they are forced into doing this belated assessment because of the lawsuit.”
- Another person observed, “DOE sees preparation of an EIS as jumping through the hoops.”

Others expressed the opinion that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) or Superfund Program would provide a more appropriate regulatory framework for decision-making related to cleanup of contamination at SSFL. They believe that program would be preferable as it would give the U.S. EPA a position of regulatory oversight related to radiological cleanup decisions and that EPA would use a more protective risk assessment approach than DOE would.

Other individuals expressed concern about potential inconsistencies that may result as the site makes cleanup decisions under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. One person suggested it might be more appropriate to prepare an EIS after all of the remedial investigations have been conducted (on the schedule that was negotiated with DTSC).

Some people observed that DOE doesn’t really use NEPA documentation to support its decision-making processes.

- As one expressed, “DOE doesn’t use NEPA to make decisions. DOE says that they use the results of NEPA (environmental documents) to make decisions, but consider other factors, which are not explained to the public. Actually, DOE has another process for making decisions that is not explained to the public. This makes it almost impossible for DOE to explain how it made any decision. This erodes public trust and confidence. The NEPA process needs to be better integrated with how DOE will actually make the decisions about cleanup.”

Several interviewees expressed concern about how DOE will conduct the EIS process.

- For example, one person said, “We have heard that they want to be done by the end of 2008.”
- Another said, “It appears that DOE wants to get out fast instead of focusing on getting out properly. We would prefer they not rush and do this right. For example, if they are taking down a building in order to sample what’s under the building, they may not be taking down the building in a manner that is protective.”

Others believe that those responsible for preparing the EIS won’t conduct a thorough review of all relevant historical documents.

- As one person suggested, “DOE needs to fully consider all of the operations and all of the problems they have had over the years. They need to do a thorough review of all of the historical documents. They need to present everything they learn to the public so that the public has a good, solid understanding of the information considered and the current condition. The public needs to have a good understanding of what DOE is dealing with. Honesty is crucial to building trust.”

Some people expressed the belief that the EIS will be inadequate to support decision-making about cleanup because DOE will determine how much cleanup is needed based on an inappropriate assessment of how much contamination is attributable to background.

- One person said, “They think as long as the radiation levels in our communities are lower than at SSFL, we should be happy. But we shouldn’t be compared to SSFL; we should be compared to similar communities. They want to claim that there are high levels of radiation naturally found at SSFL that result from the sandstone formations. It doesn’t take a rocket scientist to know that ionizing radiation is bad.”

Many others expressed a concern that DOE won’t set appropriate cleanup standards.

- For example, one individual suggested that DOE “...should set reasonable cleanup standards. They need to use the same cleanup standards as EPA, 10^{-6} not the 10^{-4} that DOE seems to think is appropriate.”
- Another person observed “...it appears that DOE is violating the agreement they have with the EPA regarding how risks are supposed to be calculated. It was my understanding that DOE would use methodology under CERCLA for evaluating risks in conducting cleanup, but they are not doing that. The upshot is that there will be less ‘dig and haul.’ The less material that is removed, the less comfortable the public will be with the cleanup. That posture is not responsive to the public’s concerns.”
- Yet another observed that “In addition, DOE expects to decide how clean the site should be (after the cleanup) in a vacuum, without engaging the public in that determination.

According to some people interviewed, DOE could address a perceived lack of public confidence in DOE by having the EIS prepared by a credible, independent contractor.

- One said, “I think the EIS needs to be prepared by an independent company that has no connections to Rocketdyne. The report should be developed in an inclusive manner. The quantitative data should be fully disclosed. Every hazardous material that has been released in the environment should be fully disclosed, along with warnings as to the environmental impacts and health impacts of those materials.”

Some people were concerned that the preparation of the EIS will take too long and delay implementation of the cleanup program.

- For example, one person stated, “My biggest concern is that the cleanup will take way too long now that the feds are involved. I don’t think the EIS is necessary. The public perception seems to be that the federal government needs to be involved and I don’t agree.”
- Another said, “It is unfortunate that DOE was not able to do the cleanup work based on the Environmental Assessment. It would have been good to continue the cleanup on an aggressive schedule and get the site closed down.”
- Yet another said, “The concerns that I have include the time, cost, and the resources to complete the EIS. It is contaminated and no one disagrees about that. DOE already had a plan to clean it up; it’s a shame that they are not being allowed to implement that plan. The longer this drags out, the more resources will be spent on it. DOE should go as quickly as they can so they can then focus on getting the place cleaned up.”
- And another said, “I don’t think DOE needed to use taxpayers’ money to do this EIS. It’s a waste of taxpayers’ money. DOE has already thoroughly studied and planned the clean-up at the SSFL.”

Some expressed concern about what they expect to be the results of the environmental analysis that will be presented in the EIS. Some believe, for example, that DOE won't design the cleanup program to offer long-term protectiveness.

- One individual stated, "DOE doesn't see the need to assure long-term protectiveness. They want to clean only enough to meet the standards, and then walk away."
- Another observed, "In the past, DOE seems to have been more concerned about minimizing costs than about doing what is right, necessary, and protective of public health." This individual went on to suggest, "DOE's primary purpose in conducting the cleanup of Area IV should be to protect public health."
- Another interviewee observed, "DOE wants to leave 90% of the contamination behind, but this will cause problems downhill now and in the future. Although burning was done at night to avoid harming their employees, residents nearby were harmed. Water flows down and through residential yards."

A large number of people expressed concerns about DOE's relationship with the community. Some people who were interviewed observed that DOE has not always been forthcoming with information and the agency has a reputation for failing to disclose information to the public.

- For example, one person reported, "Until now, DOE has hidden behind a legacy of cold-war secrecy to obfuscate, obstruct, and fail to respond to public concerns. There have been four accidents in the hot Lab, they had a uranium fire that lasted three days, they put it out with liquid nitrogen. The public has been told nothing about this. There is a long history of lying to the public, a pattern of lying to the public."
- Another person stated that "DOE has a reputation of not fully disclosing information as well as spinning information ("torturing the data") to serve its own purposes. DOE needs to be mindful of its bad reputation and take steps to avoid reinforcing it. I would encourage DOE to be forthcoming, respond to questions, and provide early notice of its plans."
- Another person stated, "DOE is a corrupt agency. They have a history of ignoring the public and of breaking environmental laws. They are hostile towards the community. I have no confidence that an honest Environmental Impact Statement will be completed." This person went on to observe that, "They already know what alternative they are going to use for the cleanup and it is based on political considerations."

A related concern is that DOE will cover up any problems that are identified.

- One person observed, "They have planted grass on top of the burn pit. Someone could come along in years to come and never know what had taken place there. The public asked how they were getting the grass to grow and they admitted they were watering the grass. Where do they think the water is going to go? It will run downhill and bring the contamination to residential areas beneath the site."
- Another person stated, "There is a perception that DOE has tried to cover-up what has gone on there in the past, and it is probably time to put everything out on the table. This is the time for complete honesty and openness."
- Yet another suggested, "DOE needs to be honest, open, and forthright in its decision-making and in the performance of its work to overcome the difficulties it has had in the past. They should not be so concerned about costs. They should be more concerned about keeping the public well-informed and telling the truth."

Others expressed concern that DOE will fail to proceed in a transparent manner and/or fail to be responsive to public concerns.

- One person said, “I am concerned about DOE willingness to be responsive to the public concerns. The public is the constituent base, but I have not seen DOE be responsive to the public in the past.”
- Another said, “My primary concern would be that DOE won’t be transparent or inclusive.”
- Yet another interviewee observed, “People have been suspicious about SSFL for years. News came out about accidents and mistakes many years after the fact and it made people very suspicious. Some people will probably never feel satisfied that they know what they need to know. There is a perception that DOE has lied to the public and that has made the public distrust them. The EIS should address all current and future impacts on public health and the environment.”

Some individuals commented on DOE’s perceived failure to deliver on promises.

- For example, one person stated, “DOE and the EPA promised the public that there would be a ground survey of radiation, but it has never been conducted. Funding for the survey was provided in Feinstein’s Appropriations Bill. An aerial radiation survey was done in 1979, but no ground survey has ever been done. It found radiation all over the place. They later claimed it was because the radioactive material had been moving around on the site the day the survey was done.”

One person admonished DOE for allowing the activist community to alarm their neighbors:

- “As a Simi Valley resident, my biggest concern is that the DOE will have to overcome the misleading information that is already out there. There are activists who have been involved with the clean-up issues at SSFL for some time who have effectively painted a picture that SSFL is currently posing an imminent threat to the community. Unfortunately, their attempts to influence land-use decisions and/or public policy have resulted in slandering the reputation of safety and clean living in my community and needlessly threatened property values. I know of instances where it has harmed the community’s ability to attract new residents and employees. DOE has not done a good job of educating the public regarding the extent and types of contamination at SSFL and how that contamination does, or does not, impact on the health of the surrounding community.”

Several people expressed frustration about the turnover in agency staff that frequently occurs at SSFL.

- One person observed, “It is frustrating that there is a revolving door of agency personnel. The public has been concerned throughout all of the personnel changes and they are frustrated that answers are never forthcoming, but the new personnel go back over old ground. When questions are asked, the public is told they will get answers, but the public is always kept in the dark and have lost patience.”
- One person observed, “A lot of the newer employees just plain don’t know what happened before their time.”

The lack of trust in DOE compounds concerns about the scope of the EIS and the eventual cleanup.

- As one individual observed, “DOE will always be fighting the trust factor. They just recently found radionuclides in the Area I Burn Pit. How did they get there? Some contamination has migrated to other areas of SSFL or even off-site. DOE says that no

contamination has migrated off-site. They should be willing to do the sampling necessary to prove that assertion. Some things have been dumped where they don't belong. There wasn't supposed to be asbestos and antimony in a creek bed. There is a long history of finding stuff where it wasn't supposed to be. If they want us to believe that there is no contamination left at SSFL, they should be willing to share their records of where that contamination went, how it was cleaned up, and where it is now. Final disposition of all contamination that was ever generated on the SSFL should be documented so that the public knows where it went."

One concern focused on the skills and knowledge that will be needed to conduct the cleanup once the EIS has been completed.

- For example, one individual observed that when "DOE issued the stop work order, it meant that Boeing couldn't hold onto the folks who would have been the best choices for doing the cleanup – those that had been there a long time, knew what had happened and had the training to deal with it. SSFL has lost a lot of institutional knowledge. DOE's attempts to out-source work (to save money) will mean that the contractor hired to do the cleanup will not have adequate knowledge to do good job. This may not be the job for the lowest bidder!"

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

The second question was designed to invite stakeholders to make recommendations for sources of information that might otherwise be overlooked during preparation of the EIS.

Many people responded by saying that DOE should consider the entire inventory of the available documentation. Some people recommended that DOE should begin with a thorough review of all relevant documents.

- One person said, "All of the available information must be considered. Review of historical documents will provide a more thorough understanding. Many of the newer employees just plain don't know what happened before their time. All documents related to a particular area or facility should be kept together."
- Another person said, "There are thousands upon thousands of documents about SSFL. DOE should be very thorough. Of course, they will need to look at all historical information they can find. The current employees need to search all old documents for information that is pertinent to Area IV."
- In addition, another said, "Laura Rainey (a geologist with the California Department of Toxic Substances and Control [DTSC]) has reviewed a lot of documents. She has found information buried in appendices that is not referenced in the body of reports. DOE would have to read every single document to do a thorough review."
- One interviewee reported reviewing a 1991 document that stated "...several reference documents were not used because they did not contain references to specific locations that would confirm they were relevant to SSFL. Ignoring information for this reason makes no sense at all. DOE should at least consider/review all of its own reports and historical documentation."

Numerous people interviewed do not feel that DOE has adequate information available at this time. Responses included:

- "It is disconcerting that DOE doesn't appear to know what is there. There is a facility on the maps, ESADA, that DOE can't explain what the facility was used for. Since they

don't know, they assume it is safe. We can't make that same assumption. We are still going to be living here when they call it done and go away."

- "There is another site, an open pit that is full of water. DOE says the water came from groundwater. The pit was dug to house a new reactor. When the water seeped in, they abandoned plans for the reactor. A lot of money went into excavating the pit. Is there contamination in the pit? Why haven't they filled it in again?"

Some people made suggestions about where DOE could find relevant documents. Some indicated confidence that DTSC has accumulated a good inventory of documents about SSFL.

- One person suggested that DOE should make itself aware of all available information, observing, "Many of the stakeholders have websites that are packed with publications. DOE should be familiar with all the information that is out there in the public domain."

Some interviewees listed specific documents/information that they felt should be reviewed; recommendations included:

- The U.S. EPA's comments on the previous Draft and Final Environmental Assessment for the cleanup of Area IV.
- Storm-water runoff data from the Water Board outfalls, outfalls 3-7, and any other surface water sampling that has been done.
- "Groundwater data for all three watersheds. TCE has apparently leached from the soils and has percolated into deep groundwater. So, all three watersheds need to be considered."
- The findings of the expert panel that has been convened to oversee surface water runoff at Outfalls 8 and 9.
- Information about the cultural resources on the SSFL. As one person stated, "I don't have confidence that anyone knows everything that needs to be done (before they start work) about the cultural resources on the site. They have prevented the Native people from accessing the site for several decades and I would not be comfortable with them proceeding without an assessment to learn if cultural resources are there. If there is an assessment done of cultural resources on the site, a Native American should be involved in that assessment."
- Another person suggested that DOE review "...official correspondence between members of Congress, the EPA, and DOE. There is a paper trail and they need to be aware of what's in the paper trail. They need to look at every promise they have made, every assurance they have made. They should also review the press coverage."

A few people observed that there is almost too much information available.

- As one stated, "I don't think they will look at everything that they should; hopefully they will. There are 17,000 documents that pertain to the Sodium Burn Pit alone! They will need to cooperate/coordinate with everyone else up there (NASA, DTSC, Boeing). They need to consider the entire site."

Other people interviewed stressed the need for DOE to begin with a thorough evaluation of the contamination that must be cleaned up.

- For example, one person responded by saying "If they are going to clean up, they need to know where all of the contamination is before they can decide the best way to clean it up."

Specific suggestions for where DOE should test for contamination included:

- The entire northern drainage
- Water Board outfalls
- Chatsworth Reservoir
- In the vicinity of Buildings 29, AE6, and 621
- Area I Burn Pit.

Another source of potentially valuable information mentioned was legal settlements and court documents.

- As one person explained, “The most important thing to look at would be the court documents related to the many lawsuits have been settled, including the Capello and the Brandeis-Bardin lawsuits. The information presented by the parties in those lawsuits has been sealed, but DOE should release that information.”

Other folks made recommendations about where DOE might look to find relevant information. Recommendations included:

- DTSC’s website
- Activists’ websites (suggestions included websites operated by Rocketdynewatch.org and cleanuprocketdyne.org)
- Anecdotal and other information
- Information other than that which is provided by Boeing. As one individual observed, DOE staff “need to understand that the public won’t trust the information if the only source of information is Boeing.”

Still other interviewees responded by suggesting that DOE consider sources of information that might otherwise be overlooked.

- One person observed that anecdotal information should be considered; this person explained, “They should be talking to the stakeholders who have been involved for a very long time. They know a lot.”
- Another suggestion was that the DOE review logbooks kept by employees over the years.

Numerous interviewees recommended that DOE talk with former employees.

- As one individual suggested, “Former employees are another good source of information. We have talked to some former workers who describe caverns where contaminated material was dumped. The retirees know a lot, can remember where things were dumped, what existing facilities were used for before their most recent uses. We have heard stories about employees clocking-in in one area and then working in another. They might have reported to work on one project but then be needed elsewhere. Their stories do not always corroborate the official reports/reference documents. DOE should be conducting oral histories with them before they die and the knowledge is permanently lost.”
- Another interviewee said that “DOE needs to talk to the former site workers, like Bonnie Klee. These people have paid the price through their own health for working there. They have been denied their claims for compensation. DOE at least needs to listen to what they have to say so that other people’s health can be protected.”
- Another former site worker that was mentioned as a good source of historical information was Dan Parks. One individual reported that “Mr. Parks talks about off-loading ‘bird

cages' full of enriched uranium. Metal shavings were falling out of the cages. They were tested and found to be enriched uranium. If this stuff was handled on SSFL, there needs to be an assumption that the place is still contaminated."

- Another individual suggested that "DOE should also talk to retired employees. They have first-hand knowledge, institutional knowledge about what happened. DOE should be overly cautious and thorough."
- Another individual observed that the reason for talking with former employees is simple – "They need to get testimony from former employees because a lot of their knowledge has not been documented."

A few people recommended that DOE also consult with knowledgeable members of the community.

- For example, one person observed that "The other thing about SSFL is that so many community members know so much about the site. There are a number of people who have historical documents, photos, and who know former employees. They have a very thorough understanding of the site."
- One person explained, "These individuals may know more than DOE staff, for example. Knowledgeable individuals may be able to help ensure that no relevant information is overlooked."
- Another noted, "It would be a shame if DOE didn't take advantage of the Workgroup members' knowledge."

One interviewee used this question to provide advice about the information that should be considered during development of the EIS.

- This individual noted that "The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act cleanup has divided up the entire SSFL into specific areas. This segmentation is of concern as 1) some known contamination sites are not in areas that are scheduled for assessment and cleanup, and 2) in some cases, the contamination in one segment may be related to contamination being investigated in another segment. Dividing things up in this manner may result in overlooking something important. The RCRA area boundaries may make sense, but they have not been well explained."

There seemed to be a direct correlation between the degree of trust that people felt in DOE and the degree of confidence that they expressed that DOE would use all relevant information.

- One person said, "There are tons of documents that they should be looking at. Most of the documents are their own documents. These include documents that they have suppressed and documents that they never acknowledged." This person went on to say, "The decisions about how DOE will clean up the SSFL will be political decisions. They will adopt a lax cleanup standard. They will violate the law. They will not cleanup the site. Accomplishing any more than that would require a complete change in attitude and that isn't going to happen."
- Another person reported, "DOE has taken a lot of shortcuts in the past. They don't dig deeply enough for information and they rely too heavily on their contractor. They take their contractor's word for it."
- Another person was concerned about the information that it is believed DOE has, but chooses not to share. This individual stated, "A lot is not known about what happened at SSFL from the 1950s through the early 1970s. Logbooks and memos have never

surfaced. By many accounts, all shift supervisors maintained detailed logbooks. Where are the logbooks for the SRE accident? We think DOE has it and won't release it because DOE wants to protect itself from legal liability. DOE is a government agency, but they act like they are a private entity. A public agency's primary interest should be the protection of the public interest. This hiding of information is inconsistent with the concept of 'good government.' DOE is afraid it will be sued, but they can't hide from the truth forever. The agency needs to get over its paranoia. It should make the information available that would allow the public to know and understand the true nature and extent of the contamination that has occurred at the SSFL and let us all deal with the real problems."

Other interviewees expressed concerns about how DOE has shared information in the past.

- As one individual reported, "The problem in the past has been that they have not been willing to share the information with anyone else. It took forever for DOE to release the meteorological data related to the SRE accident – they sat on it for years. This information was important to help the public understand where the contamination went after the accident. Keeping the information from the public all those years just damaged DOE's reputation."

Several individuals responded to this question with surprise and went on to explain that they believe DOE has adequate information on which to base the EIS.

- One person said, "I am sure they have most of the information that they will need."
- Another said, "DOE has the information. Indeed, they have more information than anyone else."
- One person expressed confidence that the EIS process will reveal the adequacy of information. He said, "The process that DOE must use to complete as EIS is so transparent. It isn't even an option to hide information any more, to keep secrets. I trust that they want to make a good decision and that they will use all of the information they have to support that decision. DOE is completely capable and competent. They understand what they are dealing with, more than anyone else does because they actually have experience at it."

Some people even cautioned against taking too much time to gather more information.

- As one said, "DOE should prepare the EIS as quickly as possible. They should protect the public safety. They should let science guide their decisions, not a hysterical public reaction."
- Another responded by saying, "DOE has all the documentation and a qualified contractor. They do have a very short timeframe in which the EIS must be developed. The situation is pretty complex. There is a possibility that they will make some mistakes in interpreting the data given the schedule, but there will be an opportunity for internal review and we should be able to catch any inadvertent mistakes."

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

The third question provided an opportunity for interviewees to offer observations about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past.

Most comments from interviewees were simple and fairly negative. These included:

- “DOE has failed miserably and spectacularly.”
- “They haven’t done any public participation. They have lied and stonewalled the public. They have not responded to questions or public concerns.”
- “The way that DOE has conducted public participation in the past has been a complete fraud. DOE does not listen to the community. It is all one-way communication. They are dishonest. They misrepresent the facts for their own benefit.”
- “There has been a resistance to involve stakeholders in the past.”
- “DOE typically does only what is required, nothing more. They let the public rant and then they ignore what has been said. DOE’s real decision-making is not transparent and it is not inclusive. The public’s concerns are not integrated into DOE’s decisions.”

Some interviewees commented on their perceptions about DOE’s attitudes towards the public.

- For example, one person stated that “They have thoroughly alienated the community by treating individuals and the community in general with disdain and in a patronizing way.”
- Another observed “They don’t seem fully engaged with the public. The information they produce isn’t perceived as being trustworthy. They don’t give direct answers. DOE’s approach continues to feel deceptive, like they have something to hide.”
- Yet another said “At their meetings, DOE is condescending and they don’t tell the truth. They never say anything new. They say the same thing over and over and there is never any progress. Its always we are planning to do something but they never get around to doing the cleanup. Their meetings are not meetings - there is no discussion - they are just road shows for DOE to tell their story. It’s easier for the community to just have to go to one meeting, the Workgroup meeting. The DOE meetings are a waste of time. The only reason to go is they always have good cookies.”
- Another person reflected that “In the past, DOE underestimated the community’s knowledge and the community’s passion. DOE’s actions have left the impression that they do not take the community’s concerns and interests to heart. The community is not just interested in the data, but how the data was collected, the sampling methods, who did the sampling, and the standards that they are using for background, for both chemical and radiological contamination.”

One person offered suggestions for improving relationships with the public:

- “DOE should avoid trying to spin information. At a minimum, it makes them appear to be insincere.” This individual also suggested that “DOE needs to learn how to treat the public respectfully. Many people who attend these meetings have suffered health effects that they attribute to SSFL. DOE should be responsive to their concerns.”

Many people suggested that DOE’s participation in SSFL Workgroup meetings was inconsistent.

- One person said, “DOE’s presence in the public eye has not been consistent.”
- Another observed that “When they were absent, it left a horrible, gaping hole. It was easy to blame them when they weren’t there to defend themselves. It was suspicious, just the fact that they weren’t there.”

Several people reported being glad to see DOE in attendance at Workgroup meetings again.

- One said simply, “It is good that DOE has come back to the Workgroup.”

- Another said, “DOE has gotten better. They have started showing up again.”
- And another said, “DOE was active in the Workgroup and then, for whatever reason, they stopped going. I am glad to see that they have rejoined the Workgroup and I am glad to see that the other members of the Workgroup were receptive to allowing them a seat at the table again.”

Not everyone expressed optimism about DOE’s return to the Workgroup meetings, however.

- One person said “They are sending a very nice guy to attend the Workgroup meetings now, but he has no authority. That is a standard DOE tactic. They send someone to do public relations rather than someone who has authority.”

Some people believe that DOE has failed to demonstrate responsiveness to the public’s concerns.

- One said simply, “They haven’t listened to the public.”
- Another responded that “DOE has not been responsive to public comments in the past.”
- One person reflected on DOE’s responsiveness to questions from the public by saying “... they need to answer questions that are asked. They are always saying “we don’t know, we’ll need to get back to you” but they never do. The DOE staff don’t know anything. They are always changing and we know more than they do. Dan Hirsch knows a lot more than any DOE folks do.”

There were both positive and negative reactions to DOE’s efforts to keep the public informed.

- One observed that “DOE has a website that is pretty good. They should keep that up and the information on the website should be even more complete.” This individual went on to suggest that “They should not hide anything. When DOE is hiding information, it is hard not to suspect the agency.”

Others were not as complimentary of DOE’s information.

- For example, one said “DOE does reasonably well at informing the public. However, they usually try to make themselves look as good as they can. They often use specialized words that the public doesn’t understand. They often appear defensive. They come off as being disingenuous.”
- Another person said “In the past, DOE has hidden behind specialized lingo, acronyms, and jargon that the general public doesn’t understand. They haven’t learned not to use words to try to reduce concerns. They need to be more honest and forthcoming.” This same individual went on to report that “DOE often uses strange wording to obfuscate information. For example, one report said that the nuclear rods were parted. What does parted mean? The way DOE explains information can affect how people understand what is being said.”

Some interviewees focused on specific issues related to how DOE has conducted public participation in the past. Examples include:

- “In the past, DOE has done a poor job of advertising public meetings by putting a legal ad in the classified pages of the paper rather than a larger, more noticeable ad in a more well-read section of the newspaper.”
- “DOE does not always give the public enough time to review documents during public comment periods. We remember one meeting where public comments were sought, but the document wasn’t available until we walked into the public comment meeting.

Documents should be made available in time to allow public review before the comment meeting. They can be made available on the Internet using URLs that are easy to find and remember.”

- “One thing that DOE used to do is schedule their meetings on the same day (same time) as Workgroup meetings. The public had to choose which meeting to attend. It was atrocious.”
- “DOE could benefit from additional training in communicating with the public.” This person went on to observe that “Sometimes DOE is asked a question and the DOE staff/representatives who are present seem to hesitate. They appear to not be sure about what they can say and who should say it. The resulting impression is that they have something to hide.”

Other people focused on the format DOE uses to conduct public meetings. Comments included:

- “In the past, DOE has conducted meetings in a manner that didn’t provide an opportunity for everyone to hear what everyone else has to say. These open house type meetings don’t work when there is low trust.”
- “Even NASA does a better job engaging the public. They took us on a site tour around Areas 1 and 2 and let us take pictures of anything we wanted to (except one thing that was wrapped up in a big tarp). They operate with transparency.”
- “Many public officials are used to going out in the public and getting beat up in front of crowds. DOE hasn’t demonstrated that ability. They have been confrontational, well perhaps that’s not the right word. They have been aggressive in expressing their viewpoints, in arguing with those that don’t agree with them. They take it too personally. They should understand that not everyone is going to agree with them and learn how to take their lumps and go back to their work.”
- “DOE has some good messages, but they do not necessarily know how to communicate with the public. Just because someone has the technical expertise does not mean they have the communication skills. Often, there is a mismatch of skills. It might not be a good idea to have a spokesperson if that person does not have good communication skills. Some people are better than others in the context of a hostile crowd. Some people are better than others at thinking on their feet.”

Several people specifically mentioned the meeting format being employed for recent meetings hosted by DTSC.

- One person suggested that “DOE should follow the example being set by DTSC. DTSC is hosting meetings that are fabulous. The meetings are by invitation only – they are not inviting everyone under the sun. Sue Callery facilitates them, creating an opportunity for dialogue.”
- Another said, “DOE might learn from DTSC. DTSC has had some success in conducting less formal discussions in their community work group. They host informal meetings where people work together. A lot of information is disclosed, communication is more open, and the meetings are less confrontational. The setting is more focused on dialogue and less formally structured. DTSC was interested in having the opportunity to work with the public in a more collaborative manner. Susan Callery has done a wonderful job of getting people together. DTSC often has 3 or even 4 public participation specialists in the room for the meetings and they go smoothly. My

observation is that trust is increasing and a working relationship is emerging. Some of the activists are providing real, helpful information to the agencies.”

Some complaints about DOE public meetings were not directed at DOE:

- “... the loudest voices are the activists. The general public does not participate. The general public chooses not to participate. Maybe they don’t care. Maybe they don’t believe the stories about the contamination. Maybe they don’t want to attend the public meetings because they don’t want to be around the activists.”
- “I think DOE has a tendency to be overly influenced by the more radical activists. They think those activists are the public. They give the activists too much deference.”

Not all people interviewed criticized DOE’s public participation experience at SSFL.

- One person reported that “I think looking ahead is more important (than remembering what has been done wrong in the past). DOE does appear to be making progress.”
- Another observed that “The only activities I have witnessed are the public meetings conducted in support of the two most recent Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analyses. DOE did the ‘right things’ but the audience/public had another agenda. Their agenda was to discredit DOE and support the perpetuation of misinformation. DOE followed the CERCLA process, including the public participation activities that are included in that process, but the meetings were attended by an audience that was extremely antagonistic towards DOE. DOE was simply not able to overcome this antagonism to provide information in a way that the public trusted. The EE/CAs provided valid information, but no one believed that the information was valid.”

Some people were complimentary of DOE’s public participation efforts.

- One said, “I think DOE does an outstanding job. I am impressed with their patience. It’s a no-win situation and they manage to keep going.”
- Another said, “They have been sending information to me, and I appreciate that.”
- Yet another said, “They have done an excellent job. They have jumped through more hoops than they should have had to. They have been here for at least two decades and they have put up with a lot.”

Some interviewees complimented specific aspects of the public effort:

- DOE has a website that is pretty good. They should keep that up and the information on the website should be even more complete.
- “I am heartened that they hired you to help them do a better job of public participation.”
- “Thomas Johnson appears to be very good and very positive for improving public relations.”

4. What do you think DOE’s objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

The fourth question asked participants to make suggestions about DOE’s objectives for involving the public while developing the EIS.

- One person responded with the opinion that DOE needs to conduct public participation activities focused beyond the EIS, “I think the EIS and the way it is prepared should be tied to the end objective. I don’t know if DOE knows what their end objective is. Some people think SSFL should be a safe reserve of public land. Others think that is should

be used for commercial or even residential purposes. The final objective needs to be carefully explained. The timing, schedule, and total cost of the cleanup should be determined only after the final objective has been clarified and agreed upon by all parties.”

Some interviewees offered suggestions for objectives for the public participation effort, including:

- Provide a connection between the public participation process and the actual decision-making process. As one person stated, “DOE should genuinely attempt to hear the public. They should listen to the community and do what the community says. They should do genuine public participation.”
- Provide an opportunity for the public to contribute to real decision making. As one person explained, “DOE should recognize the potential value of public knowledge. The public has a lot of information that hasn’t been written down, particularly former employees. They know lots of things that haven’t been documented. Some of what I have heard is probably hearsay. Some have gotten sick or lost someone and they blame it on SSFL. And some of the former employees are loyal to Boeing and may not disagree with the party line. So DOE should value the knowledge they find in the public, but they will have to sift through all of it to find what is useful.
- Provide full disclosure of all relevant information in a competent and thorough manner
- Provide an accurate picture of what’s there and what needs to be cleaned up. For example, one person explained, “DOE should try to provide the full and honest explanation of what has happened and the location of potential contaminants. They need to thoroughly review all historical documents. Once the public feels that DOE has disclosed the full extent of the problem, they will feel included, and they will feel like they are being given an opportunity to help decide how to clean up. When the public is confident that their input will be considered, that DOE will consider what is good for the community, the situation will improve.
- Provide a periodic opportunity for the public to review and comment on the document as it is developed.
- Educate the public on the true nature and extent of contamination.
- Seek to understand and address public concerns.

Some people made specific suggestions for public participation objectives:

- “DOE should make every effort to be inclusive of all bands of the Chumash, Ventura, and maybe other tribes, along with our tribe.”
- “They should try to inform (provide accurate information to) neighborhood councils and the newspapers. **The Acorn** is a good local newspaper that a lot of people read because it is free and usually delivered to them once a week.”
- “They should put the document on compact disks and make them widely available. They should do a good job of announcing the document and distributing it. They should do a nice job of presenting the information, a professional job.”

Others offered suggestions for particular attributes of an effective public participation program, including:

- Early and meaningful
- Inclusive

- Transparent - One person said, “DOE should proceed in...plain view of the scrutinizing public.”
- On-going
- Regular - One person recommended that DOE should “... communicate regularly; they should not make people wait. It takes a long time to prepare an EIS, but people will lose interest if they don’t hear something every so often. I would suggest that DOE provide an update on the project every 30 days. If people knew that on the 29th of every month that they could check on the website and get the latest information, they would stop worrying about whether something had happened that they had missed out on something. They could post a list of everything that is new to the website so people can get caught up quickly and easily.
- Honest
- Forthcoming - One person offered this advice to DOE: “There is a concept from the legal field – it is called ‘drawing the sting.’ The concept is that if someone is guilty of something, that if they just come out and admit that, get it out in the open as soon as possible, then they aren’t as guilty as if they hide what they have done. Said more simply – ‘draw the sting of unpleasant facts by reporting them yourself.’ If DOE could approach the EIS by being blatantly truthful, providing full disclosure of what they have done, it would be better in the long run. The public might start to trust them again. The impression that everyone has right now is that DOE has hidden a lot of what went on up there. That just makes people angry and upset.”
- Thorough - One interviewee suggested, “DOE needs to be willing to go beyond the minimum requirements.” Another said, “They will have to go the extra mile. They will need to really involve the community. People will want to have, expect to have an opportunity to be involved, to review all relevant documents and have the opportunity to provide comments. They will expect to see evidence that DOE understood their comments and took them to heart.”
- Respectful.
- Another person suggested what the public participation program should avoid being condescending or paternalistic.
- One person noted the possibility that the public might perceive a conflict of interest related to the EIS. “Environmental Impact Reports, required by California EPA, are paid for by the proponent for a project and prepared by the regulatory agency – which means that generally there are two parties in an EIR. DOE is in both roles for the EIS, meaning that they are paying for and preparing the EIS. That gives an appearance of a conflict on interest.”
- Another person spoke specifically about DOE’s efforts to build trust within the community. This individual shared this thought “As my father used to say, respect is gained by ten, lost by one. Trust is the same way. They have lost the community’s trust and it will take a lot to gain it back.”

A few people focused on how DOE should decide which public(s) to involve.

- One person responded that DOE should “Involve the entire community, not just the activists. Try to get input from a breadth of the community.”
- Another person explained, “I suppose they could do a random sample survey if they really wanted to get a reflection of the community. Most of the community reads the

newspaper and the papers want headlines. The public that attends meetings don't really reflect the whole community. I don't think the general public agrees with the activists. A lot of people who live near me know someone who worked up there and I think they are not very worried about it.

Other focused on how DOE responds to questions from the public.

- As one interviewee explained, "It will be time-consuming. But the public has many questions that have never been answered. Turning its back on the public's need to know will only heighten suspicion and fear."
- Another interviewee explained, "When people ask questions, DOE should answer those questions. If DOE can't answer a question, they should follow-up personally and specifically. Everyone that head them say, "I don't know and will get back to you" will also wonder what the answer was. So DOE needs to share their responses widely, so everyone knows the question was answered."

5. *What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?*

The fifth question asked participants to reflect on the role that the public should play in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE in the EIS.

- One person expressed concern that DOE really has no flexibility to consider alternatives: "The alternatives have already been determined if DOE accepts Boeing's commitment to the state of California and Senate Bill 990. Getting the site so that it was spotless would take a huge amount of work. The pre-determined levels of cleanup are achievable, but would require a lot of material to be removed and a lot of backfill. The only sources after the buildings have been removed would be the soil and the groundwater. Remediation of the soil would entail hauling a lot of material away."

Not everyone perceived the question in that manner, however. **Almost everyone thought that the public should have a role in developing the list of alternatives to be evaluated.**

- As one person responded, "DOE should work with the public to define alternatives that are driven by the public. They should follow the law."
- Another said, "It is worthwhile to provide an opportunity for the public to make suggestions."
- And yet other said, "Of course the public needs an opportunity to comment and their comments should be given serious consideration."

The method for soliciting the public's ideas was recognized by many as being challenging, however.

- Many described a process that was articulated by one person this way "I think DOE should develop a reasonable range of alternatives, alternatives that are technically feasible. They should present those alternatives and let the public react to them. Then they should incorporate the public's comments into the alternatives to the extent that they are able to. If they let the public develop the alternatives, there is very little chance that those alternatives would actually be workable."
- Another person said, "Unfortunately, the public may not know enough to suggest alternatives. It would probably be best for DOE to share the alternatives that they have already identified and then provide an opportunity for the public to react to those alternatives."

Some people offered reasons why it would be desirable for the public to help identify alternatives.

- “It’s possible that someone might come up with a good idea they haven’t considered.”
- Another person observed that “... sometimes people who don’t know much can identify a new, creative idea that no one else has thought of before.”

Some people expressed doubts that members of the public are qualified to develop alternatives.

- As one interviewee explained, “Frankly, the public isn’t qualified to opine about the alternatives that should be considered. The experts and policy makers should decide which alternatives make the most sense. They should then present the menu to the public and ask for reactions. The menu should ‘book-end’ the range of alternatives that are considered, and define the range that DOE considers reasonable. Giving the public a sense of the range of alternatives that will be evaluated will inspire the public’s confidence. If someone suggests something that is way out there (beyond the bookends), they can explain that they will not be evaluating alternatives that are not reasonable.”

Some interviewees commented about the list of alternatives that DOE might use to initiate the discussion.

- As one person stated, “In the past, DOE has evaluated a limited set of alternatives. Typically, one that is a no-action alternative, which is not acceptable. Then they will evaluate one that is outrageous. The result is that only one alternative is really viable, and the public doesn’t really feel like they have an opportunity to choose. DOE should use public input to identify four or five real options, alternatives that really represent a range of approaches that are viable. If the public has an opportunity to help identify those alternatives, they will feel truly involved.”

Some people expressed the belief that DOE should screen alternatives suggested by the public before including them in the full analysis.

- As one person observed, “They could evaluate an absurd number of alternatives. The potential cost of evaluating all those alternatives doesn’t make sense. It would be common sense to define an alternative at either end of the spectrum and define a reasonable approach somewhere between... There needs to be a project manager or some individual who has responsibility to keep the EIS project under control and within budget and schedule.”
- Another person suggested that, “I think the biologists, the environmental engineers, everyone and anyone who has subject matter expertise about any aspect of the contamination and the potential effects on humans and other species of that contamination should consider carefully how to reduce the risks. There should not be any disruption in the ecosystem. The public should have a voice, but the experts need to focus on minimizing harm to people and the ecosystem.”

It was suggested that DOE could screen possible alternatives by first considering whether they would address the public’s concerns.

- As one person explained, “The public could provide input to what is of greatest concern to them and alternatives could be formulated to address those concerns.”

- Another said, “The public should share their concerns and DOE should figure out how to address those concerns. They need to analyze alternatives that would address the public’s concerns.”

Some people felt other organizations (besides DOE) should be involved in screening the suggested alternatives.

- For example, one suggested that, “The state and federal regulators should be involved in developing the alternatives that will be evaluated. The Air Pollution Control Board should be involved.”
- Another person suggested DOE consult with Dan Hirsch. “He should be invited to help frame the alternatives that will be evaluated. He is very technically astute, and by the way, very well connected politically. The public that attends the Workgroup meetings trust Dan Hirsch.”
- Another person agreed with that suggestion, saying that “Experts such as Bridge the Gap President, Dan Hirsch and others with scientific expertise should be included by both the DOE and the DTSC in discussions of planning and policy making so that they can share their views and not be excluded or ignored as has been the practice up to this point.”

Some interviewees had different suggestions for screening the list of alternatives.

- One said, “The public should be able to have a say in the overall list of possible alternatives, and should have the opportunity to review the alternatives recommended by the technical experts and weigh in on them. However, it seems that it would be best to let the experts select the most appropriate technology.”
- Yet another said, “The rationale for all alternatives to be considered should be fully explained... DOE should not evaluate technologies without demonstrating that they might be viable at SSFL.”

Some people made suggestions about how DOE should select its preferred alternative.

- One person said, “DOE should review all reasonable alternatives that would accomplish the cleanup standards that are established. The preferred alternative should be the most comprehensive, most protective alternative. If DOE were to prepare the EIS without the benefit of public participation, they would likely select the least protective, as it would be the least costly. Frankly, the EIS should not even consider alternatives that are not protective.”
- Another echoed that sentiment by saying, “The preferred alternative should be the most comprehensive, most protective alternative.”
- Another said simply, “The preferred alternative should not be preferred simply because it is the least costly alternative.”
- One final specific suggestion made by a Native American was that “We would like to help identify future land use as well as how clean the site should be as a result of the cleanup effort. We would be concerned if any of the cleanup actions could result in damage to on-site cultural resources. Maybe DOE should form a small advisory body, a Tribal Advisory Board. The Advisory Board could help identify all on-site cultural resources before work begins and then help design the alternatives to ensure that they will all minimize potential damage to cultural resources.”

6. *What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?*

The sixth question asked about the role that the public should have in developing the issues that will be evaluated in the EIS.

A small number of people expressed concern that the public might not have the qualifications to develop the list of issues to be evaluated.

- One person said, “We don’t know enough to participate in that discussion.”

Most interviewees were confident that the public would be able to provide valuable input. Having discussed the role of the public in framing the alternatives to be evaluated (in the fifth question), many people referred to their prior answer. They suggested that DOE present the list of issues that has already been identified and then solicit input from the public for additional issues.

- As one person said, “I am not an expert on NEPA – but I am guessing DOE already knows the issues that they will need to consider based on the laws. However, NEPA is supposed to allow the public an opportunity to help identify the issues, which means they won’t really be satisfied if it feels like the list of issues has already been determined.” Another said, “The public has the capacity to provide good ideas. Public participation activities should be designed to provide an opportunity for these good ideas to surface.”
- And another said, “The whole point of scoping is to provide this opportunity to the public. The public should be the primary source in developing the list of issues that will be evaluated.”
- Another said simply, “DOE should genuinely attempt to hear the public. They should listen to the community and do what the community says. They should do genuine public participation.”
- And one more said, “The public should have an opportunity to review the list of issues that will be evaluated and respond to that list. Scoping is the best time to identify the list of issues for evaluation.”
- One person cautioned that providing the opportunity to suggest issues for consideration is just the first step. This individual said, “One thing DOE should avoid doing is giving the impression that they have already made up their minds. If they are going to ask the public for input, they should be prepared to get input and give it due consideration.”

Some people responded to this question by providing suggestions for issues to be addressed in the EIS. These suggestions included:

- Impacts on natural resources
- Impacts on public health and the cancer cluster
- The long-term protectiveness of the remedy
- “...disruptions to the community and other impacts the cleanup might have on the neighbors”
- “Who will do the cleanup, who will get those jobs? How will it be determined who will do the work? Can they be trusted to do things correctly? What if they drive away from the site and dump the waste wherever they can get away with it.”
- “The public will say they are concerned about potential traffic impacts. There will be thousands of truckloads of nasty stuff going up and down the road. Some of the

truckloads won't be covered. It will be dangerous. We already know they don't care about us. There are perhaps 1,100 people who live along this road. They don't care about us."

- Potential off-site impacts.
- One person expressed concern about the perception that all impacts can be avoided. This individual explained that, "If the public prefers cleanup to a higher standard, that will mean that more material will have to be removed. The public cannot demand cleanup to higher standards, then object to the material having to be transported off-site. The public can't have it both ways."

7. *What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?*

The seventh question focused on the role of the public after the publication of the draft EIS. In particular, the interview was designed to understand whether interviewees thought DOE should provide additional public participation opportunities beyond those that are mandated under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Some people made suggestions about the Draft EIS itself. They focused particular attention on the way the document will be written.

- As one said, "DOE should write the EIS so the public can read it, understand it. If an average person, who is not a scientist and not a bureaucrat, can't read it, we won't be able to understand it. Maybe DOE should prepare two versions of the EIS, one for the technical people and the other for the rest of us. Both versions should be made available to everyone. People could request the version they want. The one for the public should not include any jargon or bureaucratic language."
- Another person made a similar suggestion, "DOE should prepare a summary of the EIS – no more than 10 pages in length. It should present the relevant data and communicate in a broad way that is understandable to the general public. DOE should print them like business cards and pass them out like business cards."

Many people affirmed the requirement under NEPA for the federal agency to provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the draft document. Most people suggested that DOE should give serious consideration to all comments received during the comment period and/or that all comments should be responded to.

Many people responded with suggestions about how DOE should conduct the public comment period following the release of the Draft EIS.

- One person stated simply, "DOE should listen to the public and do what the public says."
- Some suggested that DOE host a much longer comment period than is typically provided (more than 60 or even 90 days), including well announced public comment meetings.
- One suggested, "DOE should also tell people ahead of time for every document that will go out for public review. This will give people heads up, the Draft EIS is coming, I should be on the look-out for it."
- Another person said simply, "DOE should go above and beyond the minimum requirements."

- Yet another suggested, “The comment period should be extended if someone requests more time. They should announce the opportunities to comment in the media, even the national media as some people who used to live here may be dying of cancer somewhere else.”
- Another person disagreed with that sentiment, and urged DOE not to “...drag this out forever. They need to get the place cleaned up, not delay.”
- It was suggested by a few people that the public might need to ask questions about the document before they will be able to formulate comments.
- Other people suggested that DOE choose more innovative meeting designs (than traditional public hearings) to allow for dialogue among meeting participants.
- Several others suggested that DOE present the Draft EIS to community groups (like city councils, homeowners associations, and activist groups) and provide an opportunity for folks in attendance to ask questions.
- One suggested that DOE “DOE should also make this information and comment opportunity available via the Internet for people who cannot come to a public meeting.”

At least one person suggested that soliciting public comment on the Draft EIS will be challenging. One said, “This will not be easy. Some of the folks that have been involved for years do not know how to behave. Some will be fearful and some will vent their frustrations. It will be hard to convince the public that DOE really means to do things differently than in the past. DOE should anticipate the difficulties it will face in conducting public participation activities.”

Not everyone agreed that an extensive public comment period would be appropriate.

- One person said, “DOE should do no more than they are required to do by law. DOE will never be able to satisfy the activists any way.”
- Another person said, “The public should have no role after the public comment period ends.”
- Yet another said, “DOE should provide the public an opportunity to comment, and then move on. The activists won’t be helpful.”
- And another said, “DOE should do whatever is required and nothing more. Extra activities cost extra tax dollars.”
- One individual reflected on the length of the public comment period and the urgency to move along with the actual cleanup by observing, “There is a fine line – DOE should not allow the EIS to become a circus. They need to move on with the actual cleanup, but they can’t move so fast that the public has no opportunity to be involved in the decision making process. A lot of people will get involved right away, as soon as they can. But there are always a few people who don’t hear about it right away. If it feels to them that the decision has been pre-determined, it won’t be very satisfying.”

Some interviewees focused on DOE’s response to comments on the Draft EIS.

- One person stated that, “DOE should communicate back to the public what it has done in response to the comments and to communicate the resulting decisions.”
- Another person said, “DOE should provide an explanation of how they address all public comments. They should not expect someone to review the entire document to see if DOE “heard” their comment. The comment response document should provide a tour of

where changes were made in the document for each comment. Then people can look in the final EIS and see, yes, they made the change I suggested.”

- Another interviewee said, “The public participation process should involve frequent, iterative opportunities to participate. For this to be effective, however, DOE will have to demonstrate that they are listening. They must demonstrate the ability to be responsive to public concerns.”
- Another suggestion was that “DOE should have a public meeting later to share what comments they received and what they did with the comments. Some comments will be off scope and some will be absurd. DOE will accept some comments and incorporate them into the document. At a public meeting they could explain all of the comments they got and how they responded to them. The process should be open and transparent. But DOE should also be scientifically honest. They need to demonstrate some backbone.”
- The “...final response back to the public should explain how the cleanup will be performed to achieve the final objective. The public will want assurances that the cleanup will be implemented as intended. DOE will also need to clearly explain financial considerations, including the timing and availability of the necessary funding and personnel.”

Many people suggested that DOE host additional public participation opportunities later in the decision making process.

- One person suggested, “They should have two public meetings every month. The meetings should be well publicized. They should have meetings at various times, including daytime, evenings, and weekends to allow people with different work schedules attend.”
- Another suggested, “DOE should hold a public meeting after the decision has been made to explain their decision. They should present their decision and its rationale.”
- Another said, “The public would probably appreciate an opportunity to comment on a draft Record of Decision, if possible – a last chance to weigh in before the decision is final. The issues are so complex and people are so emotional that having a chance to comment on a draft Record of Decision may make it easier for everyone to accept the final decision.”

Many people expressed the opinion that public participation activities should continue throughout implementation of the environmental cleanup. Suggestions included:

- “DOE should continue regular communication through the publication of the Record of Decision.”
- “I think that the public needs to be greatly involved. For example, the companies CDM and SAIC are new to the site. They do not know the site history as well as some community members. Employees of the DOE are not even as familiar with the site as many community members. Boeing, Rocketdyne, and the DOE have created a situation in which the community does not trust them to do an effective cleanup. Therefore the whole cleanup process needs to be highly transparent, and the process needs to include all members of the community that choose to participate.”
- “The public could be very helpful to DOE in deciding which remedial technologies to use in implementing the cleanup. In that manner, the public can help make sure that the technologies are acceptable to the public.”

- DOE should tell the public what will be done with the waste that is removed... and local residents need to be informed as to how their property values will be affected as a result of the cleanup.”

Several interviewees suggested that DOE establish a mechanism for citizen oversight of the cleanup program and/or monitoring the effectiveness of the cleanup. Responses included:

- “It might not be a bad idea to give the public a role in watching the cleanup to avoid creating a temptation to them to trespass (because they may not trust DOE to implement the cleanup). They will want to make sure that the cleanup is being implemented properly.”
- “DOE will need to be able to answer questions that come up as the cleanup is implemented. The public would likely want to know more about shipments that leave the site, like when and how DOE will be moving contamination, how it will be covered, and the dangers the shipments will pose to the community. ”
- “Someone independent and trustworthy should do environmental monitoring and share their results with the public.”
- “... DOE could convene an oversight committee. There are a lot of very interested people surrounding SSFL, who could be very helpful. This group could watch over the implementation of the cleanup program. They could help keep the public informed, explain things in a way that the public would understand. They could act as a liaison between the public and DOE.”
- “DOE might want to consider setting up a citizen environmental monitoring team, maybe 5-7 people, who can keep an eye on the cleanup for the broader community.”
- One person acknowledged that the public might be interested in overseeing the cleanup, but warned about the risks of allowing the public onto the SSFL. This individual said, “There are other hazards at SSFL than the chemical and radiological contaminants. We have rattlesnakes and poison oak, for example.”
- One individual was concerned about the possibility of re-contaminating the site during cleanup. “DOE should not plan to conduct on-going operations while conducting cleanup. There is no point to cleaning the site up if they are simultaneously re-contaminating the place. They should remove anything that poses national security concerns and then wait to finish cleanup until after the site is ready to shut down all operations.”

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective?

The eighth question solicited reactions to a variety of public participation activities that DOE could choose to employ in the public participation program to support decision-making related to the cleanup of Area IV at Santa Susana Field Laboratory.

Telephone hotline. A telephone hotline was described as a telephone line established to provide a direct link for information about the EIS. It could be set up to allow people to call any time to request copies of documents, ask questions, or even to provide comments. A total of 33 people indicated that a telephone hotline would be worthwhile. Fifteen people responded with comments about telephone hotlines, offering mostly positive reactions including:

- That might be helpful, especially if someone wants to know something right now.

- This would be good for elderly people and former site workers.
- I think that would be good but it would have to be well publicized. Use will probably vary tremendously and it will be difficult to staff.
- People may want to share what they know.

Only two people offered less favorable reactions, including:

- That seems like a pretty inefficient way to do things. I could see the benefit it is helped people to understand things, though.
- Probably less effective than other methods.

A number of people expressed concern about how such a telephone line would be staffed:

- Unless it is well staffed, this would fall short of the potential.
- If they do this, it should be staffed by a real person.
- It would only be worthwhile if it were answered by a real person.
- It must be staffed by someone who can answer questions; it would be less helpful if the person answering the telephone had to get back to the caller.
- As long as it is clear to everyone that the person answering the phone won't be able to answer every question.

Information kiosks in public settings. Information kiosks were described as stand-alone, unstaffed booths with informational materials about the project, placed in public settings like libraries, shopping malls, or government buildings. Only fourteen people thought information kiosks would be worthwhile and sixteen offered verbal comments on the possible technique. Among the expressed reactions, there were more negative comments than for any other possible activities.

Positive reactions included:

- That's an interesting idea. They could put information in shopping centers, at fairs, at the farmers market.
- One good location might be at the bottom of the hill.
- We might want some public information for our own park kiosk.
- Not unless you mean a billboard that everyone driving by would see.

Less favorable reactions included:

- The area surrounding the site is very large and it would be very difficult to figure out where to put the kiosks.
- The information that needs to be provided is too technical for this idea to work.
- I don't know. This doesn't seem important enough to do something. I suppose it might reach a few more people.
- Not enough people are interested to justify this
- These likely wouldn't be that useful.
- I don't see any value in this.

A few people made suggestions where kiosks might be helpful, including:

- Tribal offices.
- Chamber of Commerce information centers.
- Shopping centers, at fairs, and at the farmers market.

Information repositories/public reading rooms. Information repositories were described as locations where all relevant documents can be placed for public use. There are currently three information repositories located throughout the communities surrounding SSFL. A total of 39 people thought DOE should continue to use the information repositories.

Nineteen people offered comments about the information repositories, most of which were favorable, including:

- We already have these and it would not make sense not to continue using them.
- These are already in place. They may not be convenient locations for everyone.
- DOE should establish these in many more libraries, including Thousand Oaks, Agoura Hills, the Oak Park area, Ventura County Government Center, Westlake Village, Simi Valley, Calabasas, West Hills or Chatsworth.
- It might be nice to have one in Simi Valley and one on the other side. Don't overdo. Most people prefer to see documents on the Internet now.
- Absolutely.
- I haven't used those myself, but I suppose it helps make the documents available.

Some people wondered about the utility of the information repositories, including:

- I wonder how much these are really used by the public
- There are three of these already – but they are underutilized.
- It can be hard to find things at the reading rooms. It might be better to post documents on-line.
- They are already doing this but most of the information is too complicated for us.
- To tell the truth, I do not know anyone who has ever used one. I only know one person who does not have email. I think the Internet would be a better way to distribute information.

Some people supported continued use of the information repositories, but urged DOE to consider ways to enhance those that are in use. Suggestions included:

- DOE has resisted putting some documents there in the past. They have short hours, sometimes the documents are hard to find or missing. It is hard to make copies of the documents. DOE should consider making copies of the more important documents for the most interested/involved member of the public
- All documents in the repositories should be available on line as well
- That's a very good idea. The challenge will be making sure that people know about them, their inventory, and their accessibility.

Periodic informational briefings. Periodic information briefings were described as short progress briefings delivered by DOE staff on a periodic basis. They could be hosted by DOE as stand-alone events, or provided upon request for the benefit of existing organizations during

regularly scheduled meetings. A total of 36 people thought such briefings would be worthwhile. Eighteen people offered comments on the concept, including these favorable reactions:

- Quarterly, perhaps, but only if there really is something to say.
- These could be very helpful.
- The public would likely appreciate these.
- These should be face to face.
- Absolutely, but don't just do the usual periodic public meetings. Conduct as outreach by going to various community groups (like Neighborhood Councils, Chamber of Commerce, schools, hospitals, churches, service organizations).
- That would be very important. Every month or two, tell the public the status of the project.

Less positive comments included:

- Not too frequently, and only if there is something to report
- It will depend a lot on who presents the information. They could be worthwhile if the person is perceived as being objective and trustworthy. Otherwise, this could become a "public relations nightmare."
- If DOE does this, it should be on a set schedule so that people can plan around it.

Specific suggestions for settings where briefings could occur included:

- Tribal Senate meetings
- SSFL Workgroup meetings
- West Hills Neighborhood Council meetings.

Informational fact sheets. Informational fact sheets required no description and were well received; 40 people thought they would be worthwhile. Only 17 people provided comments in reacting to the idea of fact sheets. Most of those comments were favorable, including:

- These are not a lot of work. They can be expensive but the money will be well spent.
- These are good for people who won't go to public meetings.
- As long as they are short and written in lay terms.
- Maybe that would be helpful. They could help people come up to speed.

Specific advice provided by the interviewees, should DOE decide to utilize informational fact sheets, included:

- Distribute upon request, otherwise, these will just end up in the trash.
- Distribute electronically, so as not to waste paper.
- Post them on the project website and provide hard copies upon request.
- Maybe this idea could be combined with newsletters that provide the status of the overall project on a periodic basis.
- These should be simple and readable for the general public.

Periodic newsletters. Periodic newsletters did not require description. Only 29 people thought a project newsletter would be helpful. Nineteen people responded with comments, including:

- Don't do both these and fact sheets.
- These could help explain things so that people would have a better understanding.
- This would be the best method of information distribution. They should be concise, have connections to additional information, and have easy e-mail response capability. Nearly everyone has e-mail now. They would have to sign up with their e-mail address. Perhaps there could be an initial mailing and people could provide their e-mail address on-line. Those not signing up could be reached and provided the opportunity to sign up by providing copies of the newsletters to local libraries and neighborhood councils. These could include a graphic that shows the status of the project.

Those people who responded favorably made the following suggestions:

- Only if there is something to report.
- This would be a good way to keep the public informed of progress, but should be developed in conjunction with all the players (National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], DTSC, Boeing).
- They should be distributed electronically so as not to waste paper.
- These could be posted on the website, with a hard copy for those who request them.
- Maybe this concept could be combined with fact sheets.

People who responded negatively to the idea of periodic newsletters offered the following reasons:

- These are just fluff.
- They would be wasteful, as they would probably end up in the trash.

Public tours of Area IV. A total of 35 people thought tours would be worthwhile. Twenty-five people added their reactions, which were almost all favorable to the idea of sites tours. Those in favor of the idea commented:

- I would like to see what is there now, and I would like to know what was there before.
- That's the best idea yet. The tours should drive by the locations that are known to contain some radioactivity so people see that they look no different than the rest of the Area IV.
- Yes – but these must be well done.
- Absolutely
- These could be used to raise awareness.
- There is considerable interest on the part of the public in doing this – but it would be challenging.
- If DOE were willing to allow these, they would be well received.
- These would be very helpful, people are afraid of what they can't see and seeing is believing.
- The retirees are really interested to see what has been accomplished.

- I went on a tour and I am glad I did. It made me feel safer.
- That wouldn't be a bad idea.
- That might be a good idea. If people see things, they might have a better idea of what is up there.
- Those could be helpful.

Some people made specific suggestions for how tours could be conducted, including:

- Maybe quarterly during implementation of the cleanup so people can watch the progress.
- The tours should not take people to Native American cultural sites.
- They could do an open house up there, but it would be a big chore to explain the current physical status versus what has already been removed. But it might be helpful to have people see what's still there.

Some interviewees were receptive to the idea, but concerned about how the health and safety of tour participants would be protected. These individuals said:

- These could be good if they could be run without jeopardy to people's health, if people could be protected.
- Only if the tour participants are safe/protected.
- These should be optional; some people wouldn't want to take the risk.

Not everyone was in favor of the idea of tours. Negative reactions included:

- That's an interesting idea. Why would anyone want to go up there?
- These might be risky, if someone sees something they don't understand, it will just scare them.
- I don't think that would be necessary.
- People should not go up there – it is too hazardous.

Internet tools for sharing information. This broad category required no explanation. Almost everyone interviewed responded favorably to the use of the Internet for sharing information. A total of 43 people thought the use of the Internet to share information would be worthwhile. Seventeen people provided comments, including:

- Absolutely.
- Everything should be available on the Internet.
- A given. Put as much as possible on here, including reference documents in pdf format.
- DOE should have a good website providing access to all technical documents.
- Of course.
- This is a great idea as it can easily be updated and changed.
- That's a good way to make information available.
- This is good because people can find information whenever they want it (day or night).
- The Internet is vital for people who cannot attend public meetings.

Specific suggestions for managing a project website included:

- DOE should consider providing a dedicated portal for SSFL cleanup instead of making people navigate through a complicated website. Everything possible (reference documents, etc.) should be provided.
- Include pictures. Pictures tell more than a thousand words. DOE should show the worst problems, it will enhance their credibility.
- All reference documents should be available on the Internet.
- A website should be structured so that someone who wants to know more can follow links and dig more deeply.
- A blog might be a good idea but it would require a full-time manager to control off-color language and outrageous personal attacks.

One individual offered a more complete reaction to the concept of using the Internet to share information with the public. This person explained that there are too many websites related to SSFL and went on to say, "Looking for documents is much like watching the first Harry Potter movie when envelopes are falling out of the sky. Each agency website has information of value. I rarely use the community members' websites anymore. I tend to search the agency sites or use Google if I want to find information on a particular topic. The agencies should not rely on the community members who have websites to accurately post calendar or other information in a timely manner. The agencies should send email messages directly to all community members when there is a new post of information."

Of course, not everyone has access to the Internet. Only one interviewee made that observation in the responding to this idea, however.

Detailed technical presentations. Detailed technical presentations were described as opportunities for DOE to present information that is more technical in nature to audiences that are better informed than might attend a typical public meeting. This idea was included in response to the understanding that some of the interested public around SSFL are very well informed. Only 23 people thought this would be worthwhile. Twenty-seven provided reactions. Those in favor of the idea of detailed technical presentations said:

- These would be good for the folks who are more well informed.
- Only for folks with a more technical (better informed) background.
- Only for those who would understand them.
- Some people are surprisingly knowledgeable about SSFL and they would probably appreciate having more detailed information and an opportunity to ask questions of experts.
- Maybe for a small segment of the public.

Many people were critical of this concept, however, and responded:

- These tend to be condescending by talking over people's heads.
- Not many people would be interested.
- Be careful not to talk over the heads of the public, their eyes will glaze over.
- The activists would probably appreciate these, but the general public wouldn't (their eyes would glaze over).

- In the past, technical presentations were usually given at technical meetings, not public meetings.
- It might not be a good idea to do this in a public meeting, not everyone would understand the information. Maybe it would be better to post this information on the website.
- That wouldn't work for me.

Suggestions for how such presentations could be handled included:

- These could be incorporated into the periodic briefings.
- Perhaps these could be presented like a debate. The problem is that Dan Hirsch has been the only source of information for so long. DOE never presents their own side of the story. If the presentations could be controlled so that both sides of the story are presented to the public, then it could be very informative.
- These would be helpful if they were focused on specific problem areas in Area IV. What is really needed is general education for the public on radiation, health physics, and nuclear materials. Education like the old Atomic Energy Commission did so well.

One of the biggest objections to this idea related to concerns that not everyone would have access to the same information. Some people thought it would be appropriate for DOE to provide detailed technical presentations to specific audiences. Suggestions included:

- For the Workgroup.
- Not everyone should be invited to these – but they should be made available for people who are interested and with a more sophisticated understanding of the technical issues who can understand the information presented.
- These might be good for people who already know a lot, for a very focused audience.

A few objected strenuously to the idea of not everyone being invited.

- For example, one person said, "Everyone should have access to the same information. Some people think it is a waste of time to listen to basic presentations. I have been asking a lot of basic questions. Some members would probably like to have a more technical presentation in a smaller group, but if I do not have the opportunity to hear the same information, I will never catch up. Everyone should be invited to attend every presentation."

Formal public meetings. Formal public meetings were described as formal meetings that are presided over by a meeting moderator and where a court reporter prepares a verbatim transcript of the proceedings. A total of 36 people indicated that they thought formal public meetings would be worthwhile and 27 people offered reactions. Comments included:

- Absolutely.
- These should be held on a regular basis, like quarterly.
- As needed, perhaps quarterly or semi-annually.
- Only as needed.
- Those could be helpful.
- That's not a bad idea.
- One or two, maybe three at the most over the duration of the EIS.

- They have to have these – although they can turn into an absolute circus.

Not everyone responded favorably. Those who didn't like the idea of formal public meetings said:

- These are not appealing to me.
- That sounds like overkill.
- These are not particularly useful. DOE should use them only as required, but conduct them as creatively as possible.
- Only to meet the requirements. Formal public meetings don't provide an opportunity for people to ask questions. The public can't provide good comments if they don't have answers to their questions.
- These can be intimidating. More interactive set-ups are better.
- These are a waste of time.

Suggestions for conducting formal public meetings included:

- As long as DOE doesn't use PowerPoint to make presentations.
- A moderator is really necessary. Public meetings can really get out of control. I have seen meetings that last for hours, that never stick to the agenda. A strong moderator can help keep things on track. I don't know about the court reporter and transcript these days – everyone brings a video camera anyway.
- These can be good if they are well controlled – there should be time limits for commenters.
- The transcript provides a record. Knowing that a court reporter is there makes everyone tell the truth.
- Public meetings are good in general depending how they are conducted. Use a court reporter ONLY if they are required (people behave differently in this sort of setting). All of the DOE personnel who participate need to be trained in more effective communication, including risk communication. DOE needs to have a person at meetings and interacting with the public who is trained, comfortable, and empowered to speak for the organization. The DOE team needs to commit some time to being better prepared for interacting with the community, including thinking about tough questions and appropriate answers before being in the public eye. Just because someone knows the technical answers, doesn't mean they should be presenting in public, or be the point person.
- The transcripts need to be made available in the reading rooms.
- DOE should consider the Brown Act – there is a specific definition of a formal public meeting in California. This should be chaired by someone who is skilled in parliamentary procedure.
- A transcript is very important. We can all review it later to remember who said what. For every public meeting, DOE should give a presentation, then answer questions, then provide an opportunity to comment. Two minutes is too short. Five minutes would be better. DOE always has their meetings in Simi Valley. More people live on the other side. They should have their meetings in Chatsworth. The time of the meetings also matters. They should have a major informational meeting at a large venue on a Saturday or an evening. It would be great if California EPA, DOE, DTSC, the federal

EPA - everyone was present. Once they figure out who the lead agency will be for the cleanup of the whole site there should be a meeting like a conference open to everyone in the area. It should be advertised. It should include the government officials, all of the agencies, and the community. We all need to be in the room at one time.

Public open houses. Public open houses were described as more informal than public meetings where the public can come and go at their convenience and information is shared around a large room. They might entail informational displays and might be staffed by people with technical expertise about specific subjects.

Public open houses had both favorable and negative reactions. Twenty-nine people thought public open houses would be worthwhile and 30 people provided comments in reaction to the idea.

Responses included:

- That seems like a better idea than formal public meetings. They could be in public settings, like a mall. That way maybe people would stop in to learn more.
- That's an interesting idea. Maybe they could be done at the beginning of the public meetings, or in the lobby.
- DOE has been doing those and I think they work as well as can be expected.
- These are better than the formal public meetings.
- Those might be doable. DOE should provide cookies to get people to come. Most people won't come, they have other or more important things to do.
- Those can work under certain circumstances, perhaps at specific milestones in the process so that DOE can share information with the public.
- Those would be even better than the formal public meetings. They would provide an opportunity to open dialogue.
- Our agency has used these successfully. They are particularly good for people who don't have a lot of history with the site.
- That might be helpful, it would provide more of an opportunity for people to learn about the site and how safe they are.
- If combined with the formal public meetings.
- These could tie into the quarterly meetings.

Some people had negative reactions to the open house concept. Reactions included:

- We don't like these. They are just dog and pony shows for DOE, they belittle the public, they try to create a false sense of security.
- Those do not go over well in this community. People can't hear what others are saying and they can't learn together. This community likes to learn together, to share what they have learned.
- These do not work here. I have seen the idea fail too many times. People just don't trust the folks presenting information and they don't like that they can't hear everything being said.
- I have never liked that meeting format. They don't tell the truth and we can't hear what's being said around the room.

- Not unless they are going to be responsive to the public's requests. Usually these are designed to be self-serving (help DOE tell their side of the story).
- I am not sure I could support these because, in my experience, the true public wouldn't show up, just the activists and they will just try to refute whatever is being presented.
- These are a waste of time.

Suggestions for conducting open houses included:

- At the site.
- In combination with the formal public meetings.
- These could be done as part of the formal public meetings.
- Only if these would be open to everyone.
- These would not work on their own but could be a nice addition to a formal public meeting – provide an opportunity for people to get answers to their questions before they make their formal comments.

Other comments on open houses included:

- The potential value of open houses decline if DOE is doing a lot of the other activities mentioned.
- These could be helpful but not as helpful as workshops.

Workshops. Workshops were described as special type of public meetings that are formatted to provide an opportunity for members of the public to work with DOE staff to complete a task that is needed to support the analysis or decision-making process. A total of 32 people thought that workshops would be worthwhile. Twenty-seven people responded with comments, most of which were favorable.

Favorable reactions included:

- This is the best idea. Give the public something real to do, with a product that would be helpful to DOE, and then reflect their work in the decision-making process.
- I support this idea 110%. Carefully designed, these would be very good. This sounds similar to what DTSC has been doing lately. A retired nuclear physicist could come and really have some great insight.
- This would depend on who participates. I wouldn't want to participate if people were going to react from an emotional basis.
- That might work, although I have never heard of that before.
- If they have something real to do, this would be good.
- That's an interesting idea.
- This is what DTSC has been doing and it's working really well.
- These could be done whenever there might be a real opportunity for the public to help make a decision.
- These would probably go over really well with the general public, the community members, particularly if they were focused on the impacts on the community.

- That might be a good idea, but if only the activists participated, it would not serve DOE well.
- If the assignments are truly appropriate. It wouldn't be appropriate to make all decisions this way.
- Those could really help. They have been asking for a place at the table for so many years. It would be great if DOE could sit down and ask for help, really listen to folks. They would like to help figure out where sampling should occur, for example.
- This might be good to get everyone on the same page.
- With real tasks – some of the very interested folks would probably really appreciate any opportunity to do something that would be helpful. Our agency has used workshops a lot. We get people together, give a presentation, allow questions and answers, and then just talk. A lot of people are very knowledgeable. Smaller, more frequent meetings. This approach can be very time consuming, however, open communication is the result.

Not everyone liked the idea of workshops. Negative reactions included:

- These just turn into pissing contests.
- I don't think that would work very well. Given who would probably participate, the workshop could be very lengthy and the results could be biased.
- Most members of the public don't really know enough to really be helpful. I suppose it's possible, if DOE asked for help on things they could really use help on.
- Those might work under certain circumstances if DOE can identify what it could use public input for.

Suggestions for conducting workshops included:

- These could be done in conjunction with the public meetings as well.
- These would work for folks with a more technical (better informed) background and if people were required to make a commitment ahead of time to participate (make the time commitment and do their homework ahead of time).
- The pro of this idea is that people could have a say early on in the decision-making process. The con is that DOE shouldn't imply that the public can have a say unless they can follow through on the promise.
- But not if these are designed to try and change people's minds,
- Only if DOE really intends to use what people do.

Periodic review of supporting documents. This option was described as providing the public with an opportunity to review supporting technical reference documents that are developed during the preparation of the EIS. A total of 33 people indicated that they thought this option would be worthwhile. Positive reactions included:

- For those with technical expertise
- All documents should be available to the public, even if they don't want to read them. The process should be wide open.
- In the interest of openness, this isn't a bad idea.
- That might be good for the technically oriented people.

- For those well informed activists.
- This would not work for the general public, but some people might be interested.
- The public should have access to everything. Nothing should be hidden.
- These documents should be available on the Internet and in the reading rooms.

The only negative reaction to this idea related to the perception that “only a handful of people would even be interested.”

Suggestions for public review of supporting documents included:

- The website could be used to accomplish this.
- Every document related to the EIS should be available on the Internet. It would be nice to have an opportunity to ask questions about some documents as well.
- If DOE does this, the documents need to be provided in advance and they need to give the public enough time to review them and to come prepared to ask questions – and DOE needs to be able to provide answers.
- These should be made available on line or in the libraries.
- Only if there is an opportunity to ask questions too.
- Maybe by appointment, if people are interested.
- These could also be done in the same venue as the public meetings or open houses.
- The supporting documents should be put in the information repositories rather than presented.
- These could be put on the Internet website. Maybe DOE could set it up so that people could click on a button to submit comments (if they wanted comments on the document). If they had questions about the document, they could call the toll-free telephone line.
- If the documents have been written by Boeing, they cannot be trusted.
- This would only be worthwhile if someone was available who could explain the information to the public.

An ongoing citizen advisory group. Citizen advisory groups were described as a body of citizens chosen to represent diverse perspectives that would provide focused advice to DOE related to the cleanup of Area IV. DOE would typically charter an advisory group under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The U.S. EPA has a panel, called the SSFL Workgroup, with its own purpose.

This idea generated a lot of reactions, both favorable and unfavorable. A total of 24 people indicated support for the idea. Thirty-eight people responded with comments on this technique, which was more than for any other suggestion.

Favorable reactions included:

- This might be a good idea. I can see how that might be valuable for DOE.
- If DOE could find the right people – people without an agenda.
- If it was possible to get a good cross-section of the community, set ground rules, give them specific assignments, not give them the opportunity to stand on their soapbox, and then listen to what they say.

- People have been asking for this all along.
- This would be worthwhile if it were really composed of citizens, not activists.
- DOE could convene an advisory group to provide advice that they need.
- For this to work, the group must be truly independent. Otherwise they wouldn't be trusted.
- DOE might want to offer to do this, see if anyone is interested.
- I would like to be on one of these. The Workgroup may have run its course. Maybe a more fluid, less formal discussion would be more helpful.
- The existing Workgroup does not provide an effective vehicle to accomplish anything substantive and positive.
- This would only work if it was designed very well, meaning that it would be composed of real members of the public and not just the activists.
- The Workgroup is really just a few people. DOE might want their own group so they can get a broader cross-section of the community.
- That would be very labor intensive. This might be a good way to build public trust. Given the level of controversy at SSFL, it might be a way to get buy-in for the clean-up plans.
- EPA's Workgroup provides a format for those members of the public that have been beating their own drum for years. It does not provide a broad cross-section of the community. This idea might be worthwhile if DOE could convene their own and include a broader cross-section of the community.
- If DOE could find enough people to serve on it.
- It would be good if they could get a real cross section of the community. They could maybe take some of the heat off DOE. Another idea might be a technical advisory committee.
- This is a positive idea. It would provide a mechanism for DOE to get routine input from citizens. Members would make a commitment to participate, spend time to learn, and then they would be routinely informed about the status, engaged throughout the development of the EIS. There might be problems with the existing Workgroup – but they could be invited to apply for membership. This could motivate the Workgroup to be more effective.
- This would be wonderful. The more citizen involvement, the better.
- This is a terrific idea. The advisory group could really help DOE. They should be supported without compromising their independence.
- This should not be composed of citizens but people with technical knowledge. If this group was composed of experts with credentials that would study documents independently, members should be chosen (like a jury). DOE could reject the fellow from the University of California for example. Both sides should get so many opportunities to veto a possible member – opportunities to reject the other side's suggestions. That would screen out the people who can't work with others. The group should be involved throughout the entire process. The group should be balanced and represent all sides or perspectives.

Unfavorable reactions to citizen advisory groups included:

- This would politicize the issue even more. The advice wouldn't be based on science. The activists would use the opportunity to get up on their soapbox. The idea of an advisory group sounds good on the surface, but advisory groups have no authority, responsibility, or accountability, so they become outlets for grandstanding.
- This is a good idea in theory, but it would be very difficult to select a group that would be helpful to DOE. If people didn't want to be constructive, it wouldn't be worthwhile.
- DOE tried that before and it got contentious.
- That wouldn't go over well. The community would see this as an affront to the Workgroup. If DOE wants to ask citizens for advice, they should ask the Workgroup.
- It sounds like a reasonable idea, but the SSFL Workgroup might get offended.
- This is just a "PR" thing, populated by quasi credentials – it cannot be balanced.
- It can be challenging to get membership that represents a full spectrum of expertise/biases.
- This idea has very limited potential because of the already existing SSFL Workgroup.

Some people were interested in the concept, but unsure whether it would be a good idea or not. Their reactions included:

- It depends on how it was configured and if it could be constructive or not.
- There are already too many going on. This could create the potential that not everyone will have the same information.
- The design would be difficult. Who would choose who would sit on the group? People in this community don't like the idea of any meetings being held in secret or behind closed doors. This idea might have potential but it might be ill advised. This would not be well received after the many years that the Workgroup members have been attending those meetings.

Some people wondered why such a panel is needed given the presence of the SSFL Workgroup and/or about the potential for conflict between the two bodies. Comments included:

- DOE could design a group to have a role that complements (rather than competes with) the Workgroup. Currently there is a hole in that the Workgroup does not provide advice to DOE.
- The Workgroup already exists and it would be very difficult to construct a new group without giving an impression that the new body is competitive with the old group. We are opposed to the formation of a new group. DOE should work with the existing Workgroup.
- The SSFL Workgroup is such an advisory group already. Maybe they could ask those same people (from the public) to be part of a larger group of, say, several more people that would include all those most interested/involved in the cleanup issues for the community.

Other people thought that the existing Workgroup might be used to provide advice to DOE, or perhaps that group could be asked to help develop an advisory group:

- It might be possible to use the Workgroup to accomplish this if they are a good group.
- Maybe DOE could build a new group using the existing SSFL Workgroup.

- DOE might see if it could work with the existing SSFL Workgroup, ask them for advice. If that wouldn't work, DOE might want to form their own advisory group. There would probably be a lot of interest in this idea.
- I could support the idea if the Workgroup got to select the members.

Another reaction related to DTSC's consideration of forming a citizen panel,

- "This idea has caused a lot of controversy. It would be very difficult to design such a group to everyone's satisfaction. DTSC has a CAG in their plans, which was supposed to be formed if 50 people signed a petition. I am told that Christina Walsh got 50 people to sign, but the people thought they were all going to be on the CAG. DTSC said that is not how the EPA rules create a CAG. The CAG would be comprised of government representatives, Boeing, NASA, DOE, DTSC, the Water board, Native Americans, environmental groups, and community members. The DTSC would have to advertise to the community about the CAG. Former Boeing employees and current Boeing employees would become a part of the CAG. That would not leave many positions for community members."

Two people did not respond to the list of possible activities:

- One responded by saying that, "DOE consistently refuses to meet with me, to talk with me. They want to violate the law. They intend to look only at Area IV in the EIS. They are setting themselves up to get sued again."
- The other said: "I don't have any more time to talk to you. This is just a diversionary tactic. It is very typical of DOE. They have no intention to listen to the public."

Table 3 presents the number of interviewees who indicated support for each of the 14 public participation activities.

Table 3. Number of Interviewees who Supported each of the 14 Public Participation Activities		
Public Participation Activity	Number of interviewees who indicated support for each possible activity	Rank by frequency of positive responses to activity
Internet tools for sharing information	43	1
Informational fact sheets	40	2
Information repositories	39	3
Formal public meetings	36	4 (tie)
Periodic informational briefings	36	4 (tie)
Public tours of Area IV	35	6
Periodic review of technical documents	33	7 (tie)
Telephone hotline	33	7 (tie)
Workshops	32	9
Periodic newsletters	29	10 (tie)
Public open houses	29	10 (tie)

Public Participation Activity	Number of interviewees who indicated support for each possible activity	Rank by frequency of positive responses to activity
Ongoing Citizen Advisory Group	24	12
Detailed technical presentations	23	13
Information kiosks	14	14

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

After obtaining reactions to fourteen possible public participation activities, the ninth question asked interviewees which three to five possible EIS activities would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS.

Table 4 presents a tally of the numbers of times each of the 14 suggested activities were mentioned in response to the ninth question.

Public Participation Activity	Number of Interviewees who mentioned as one of the most	Rank by frequency of being mentioned
Internet tools for sharing information	15	1
Public tours of Area IV	12	2
Formal public meetings	10	3 (tie)
Public open houses	10	3 (tie)
Workshops	10	3 (tie)
Periodic newsletters	8	6
Ongoing Citizen Advisory Group	7	7 (tie)
Information repositories	7	7 (tie)
Periodic informational briefings	6	9
Informational fact sheets	5	10
Telephone hotline	3	11 (tie)
Periodic review of technical documents	3	11 (tie)
Detailed technical presentations	0	13 (tie)
Information kiosks	0	13 (tie)

It is interesting to compare the rankings between the two questions. Internet tools for sharing information, detailed technical presentations, and information kiosks stayed in essentially the

same position. Public tours, formal public meetings, public open houses, workshops, periodic newsletters, and ongoing advisory groups all ranked higher when interviewees were asked to list just the more appropriate possible activities. Information repositories, periodic informational briefings, informational fact sheets, telephone hotlines, and periodic review of technical documents all ranked lower.

I would recommend that DOE give serious consideration to conducting as many as possible. I see little merit in the lowest ranked possibilities, particularly the telephone hotline, periodic review of technical documents, detailed technical presentations, and information kiosks.

In addition, given the expressed verbal feedback on the idea of an ongoing citizen advisory group, I would proceed with that idea only if more support is explicitly expressed from the community.

Because the information repositories are already in place and the interest expressed in periodic information briefings, they appear to be warranted and worthwhile.

Some interviewees suggested that DOE should do everything listed and more. Their responses to this question included:

- All could be useful.
- DOE should do as much as it can.
- All of the possible activities would have some benefit. DOE probably can't do them all.
- DOE should do as much as they can. They are all good ideas.
- All those activities would accomplish the dissemination of information. DOE should do it over and over. They say you have to repeat information seven times before people really hear it.

Not everyone listed activities that had been mentioned in question number eight. A number of other possible activities were mentioned in response to question nine, including:

- Working with the existing SSFL Workgroup.
- Communication opportunities with small groups - DOE could go to existing groups to share information. There is a danger of excluding folks if meetings with smaller groups are relied on too heavily. DOE would need to widely announce the availability of this option so that no one was unintentionally excluded.
- DOE needs to reach out to the business community, chambers of commerce, local elected officials. They won't participate in the same meetings that the activists attend. DOE needs to make a separate effort to engage these folks.
- DOE should show evidence of their response to comments.
- Position papers prepared by government experts and independent scientific experts. These should be written in language that can be understood by the public.
- Education for children – this document will take a long time to complete and they will be grown up by the time DOE is done.
- Outreach to the broader community – business groups, education, health care, neighborhood councils, more grassroots folks.
- Take-away documents. Maybe DOE should start with a fact sheet on the NEPA process.

- The most important thing is that DOE should prepare and present a schedule and scope for the public acceptance.
- Maybe DOE could provide the opportunity for contrary opinions to be expressed on their website too, or maybe blogs.
- A shared meeting with all of the agencies participating – including DOE, NASA, EPA, DTSC and the Water Board – a symposium or workshop that would last more than a day, where all the issues could be discussed by everyone. Hundreds of people might want to participate. It could be held at an indoor auditorium, maybe on a university campus.
- A panel of experts at the PhD level – including a health physicist, a chemist, and a physician who is an environmental health specialist with expertise in cancer or autoimmune disorders – that could review documents and help the public understand what DOE is saying in their documents.
- Document storage – a place where all the reference documents could be stored, with a helpful and knowledgeable resource librarian that knows all the documents and can help people find what they are looking for. The existing reading rooms in the public libraries are open at odd hours. Their librarians have to assist with all of the guests. Their librarians may not understand the materials.

Some people did not answer the question about specific public participation activities, but provided more conceptual or even philosophical responses. These included:

- The focus for public participation should be on the cleanup program rather than just the EIS. All public participation should be conducted in a manner that will support building of effective relationships with the public. The workshop approach – which would give the public a real role to play in DOE’s decision-making process – would be best. DOE should make all information readily and easily available. Make sure the decision-making process is transparent and give the public information early and often to allow informed participation in that decision-making process. Avoid approaching NEPA as if it is about checking the box; consider how to conduct the NEPA process creatively so that the public can be involved in the real decisions, not just involved in building a document that really has no role in the decision-making process.
- More openness and more frequent communication with the public.
- Stop lying. Start engaging people. Be transparent. Engage the activist community. We are providing more information to the public than DOE is. If they help ensure we are well informed, we will inform the public. Host a 3-5 day conference with an agenda. Let’s get together and work this out.
- Smaller meetings (rather than large public meetings). Iterative opportunities to be involved (not just one meeting every so often). Techniques that would allow the building of relationships. Use the right people (DOE) - those who know how to work with the public.
- Transparency – make everything available so the public can understand the rationale for everything.
- The biggest suggestion I can make is that DOE should avoid trying to sell their version of the story. They should make every effort not to appear to be promoting their perspective. In addition, there are two distinct publics at SSFL – one group that is really well informed and quite technically proficient and another group that is not well informed. DOE may want to consider addressing the needs of both groups.

- The most important thing is that DOE needs to try harder to provide information to the public that can be understood.
- To generalize, DOE should make every effort to get information out in every way possible.
- As few as possible. Transparency is critical – nothing should be secret. Don't hide. Use the reading rooms and the Internet.
- Regularly scheduled meetings, at appropriate intervals. Notice of when each public comment period will begin and end – so people will know ahead of time. A summarization of new information should be available on the website. DOE should consider having meetings on Saturdays. It skews who they hear from if they only have meetings during the week.
- The problem with almost all of the ideas are they are just fluff. There are two sources of information, DOE/Boeing and the activists. Both are biased. The public needs to get factual information from credible sources.
- Keeping the public informed as the EIS process proceeds and earnestly listening to oral and written feedback. Up to this point, the DOE and DTSC have only been going through the motions.
- It's hard to trust DOE in this situation. They should make every effort to conduct an open process and to fully disclose information.
- Try to do a better job of educating the public on the science of radiation.
- Open process, well explained, with feedback to the public on what DOE did with their input.
- Whatever is done, there should be notices about all activities in the newspaper. The *LA Daily News* is good, the *Times* does not do a good job covering SSFL.
- Honesty. Don't bring Boeing or Pratt Whitney to public meetings. Live up to commitments.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

The tenth question asked interviewees for any other advice they would provide to DOE for involving the public in the development of the EIS. Many people responded to this question by reiterating points that they had previously made. Some people used the opportunity to raise new issues.

Some people suggested that DOE should make every effort to be honest and open with the public.

- One said, "Be open and provide all materials to anyone who is interested."
- Another said, "Be honest. Tell the truth. We are going to find out anyway (eventually)."
- Yet another said, "The public needs non-biased information from credible sources about what is going on up there." That person went on to caution that, "The information cannot come from DOE or Boeing."

Some people suggested that DOE staff should try harder to communicate well with the public. Suggestions included training for DOE staff in making presentations to the public, hiring

consultants to provide communication training, and using the best communicators within DOE to deliver informational presentations.

- One person suggested that DOE should “Take a hard look at getting good communicators on board who can deliver messages. Open, sincere, consistent, non-threatening, non-adversarial, not defensive.”
- Another person recommended that, “DOE should use people who have proven skills at building relationships.”

Others suggested DOE should apologize for past mistakes.

- One person said, “DOE should start with a ‘mea culpa.’ They should admit they may have not been as forthcoming as they could have been in past years and admit that they may have made some mistakes.”
- Another person said, “DOE should recognize the potential benefit of apologizing, publicly, to those people who believe they have been harmed by DOE activities at the SSFL. Excuses and denials that people were harmed are not helpful. DOE could start with an acknowledgement of the harm that was done – even if that harm was unintentional. They could acknowledge the losses and the suffering. This would likely lead to more trust and goodwill, and better outcomes for all. I would also suggest that DOE consider issuing a public apology to those who may have been injured or harmed by any possible past toxic releases. Such an apology could go a long way in bringing the DOE and the community closer together.”

Some people stressed how important it is for DOE to forthcoming with information, even bad news.

- One individual said, “DOE needs to learn how to be honest and transparent when sharing information with the public. It would appear that they don’t want to scare people. Sure, some people are worried about the potential impact on their property values, but the public has a right to know about SSFL and the risks it poses to public health. Being honest will reduce fears. The public deals with lots of horrors in our world, like Anthrax and terrorism, we can handle that. It’s what we don’t know that really scares us. DOE should treat the public like they are grown-ups. In addition, DOE needs to learn how to communicate to multiple audiences, some more technically sophisticated than others.”
- Another person expressed the same sentiment this way “Tell the public the bad news as well as the good. Don’t pussy foot and don’t spin the information.”

Others suggested that DOE make a genuine effort to involve the public and to be responsive to the public’s concerns.

- As one person said, “DOE needs to be responsive, be good listeners, use good communication skills, and get to know the public.”
- Another individual recommended that, “DOE should presume the public is knowledgeable, intelligent, and worthy of respect. DOE should listen to everyone, not just Boeing.”
- One person cautioned that “DOE should sit down with me. Senior officials, not public affairs staff, should sit down with me and other members of the public with technical backgrounds. If they really don’t want to get sued again, that’s what they need to do.”

Several people warned DOE not to assume the activists represent the public.

- One individual said, “DOE should understand that the “public” is not necessarily the folks that presently show up at meetings... The activists that are most involved do not necessarily represent the interests of the public.”
- Another explained that “In the past, DOE has chosen to focus all of its attention on just a few people. It’s always the same people, and they have specific concerns. This over-emphasizes those individuals’ perspectives and under-emphasizes everyone else’s concerns. This should not continue.”
- Yet another suggested that “DOE might want to look at how to involve the neighborhood councils. They would provide access to real community members rather than interest groups/activists.”
- And yet another concluded that, “DOE can’t make the activists happy, and won’t make the public happy if they are only trying to please the activists.”

Some people offered a caution against allowing the activist community to control information that is available to the public.

- As one person said, “It’s so hard for members of the public to know what they need to know. Dan Hirsch has been the only source of information for so long. They trust him because he is the only one who answers their questions, the only one who even makes an attempt to explain things to them. He provides accessible information. By contrast, DOE doesn’t even respond, even when he provides bad information! They must learn how to effectively refute the bad information he puts out there. They should not let Dan Hirsch go on the attack. He can get really out of control so that he will do anything he can to destroy them. DOE loses every time. But not because he is right.”

Some interviewees suggested that DOE try harder to reach out to a broader community while conducting public participation. Some recommended that DOE seek to involve key stakeholders. Others suggested involving the EPA, state regulators, elected officials, and former employees.

- As one person explained, “DOE should try to include everyone, try to reach out to the entire community. DOE should also try to coordinate with the other agencies, like DTSC and the Water Board. The agencies don’t always agree on everything, but most everyone would agree to a common objective – to clean up the SSFL so that it can be safe for the current and future generations. ”

Some people cautioned DOE against going overboard with public participation activities.

- One person said” Know when to stop. Don’t give up your legitimate authority to make decisions. The public doesn’t know what you know.”
- Another said, “Conduct a limited number of public meetings. They are dominated by interest groups.”
- In addition, another said, “Focus on limiting the role of the public to allow the technical experts to work.”
- One individual summed up this sentiment by suggesting, “Be consistent. Don’t cater to the extremists. Create parameters for the analysis; don’t allow the impression that they will chase down every idea, even bad ideas. Communicate as consistently/regularly as possible. Don’t let the public participation process paralyze the decision-making process. Keep moving.”

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

The eleventh question asked interviewees to recommend others for interviewing. To protect the confidentiality of those mentioned, responses to this question are not reported. Responses were used to identify additional people for interviewing. Most of those who were mentioned repeatedly were subsequently contacted and interviewed.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

The twelfth and final question provided one final opportunity for interviewees to bring up any additional issues or concerns. Many people had nothing more to add.

Some people had additional comments.

- One noted, “DOE has a long-standing culture which is very defensive. It hasn’t served them well in establishing good relationships with the community.”
- One person responded that “DOE will just ignore the public’s comments like they always do.”
- One individual used this final opportunity to express concerns about limiting the EIS to Area IV. He said, “DOE should consider all impacts from all activities that occurred in Area IV. The geographical context is critical. The site is on top of a mountain and the contamination goes downhill. The effects of the contamination in Area IV go offsite for quite a distance. All geographic areas that are contaminated by activities conducted in Area IV should be included in the cleanup of Area IV, although that may involve cleaning up a 5-mile (or more) radius around Area 4, including the Chatsworth Nature Preserve (the former Chatsworth Reservoir).”
- That individual went on to make a different point, “... the public needs to be reminded of the historical context in which SSFL and DOE work was done. Work began at SSFL right after World War II to develop rockets. Many of the rockets that the U.S. sent into space were tested here! The technologies were not well understood at the time and the chemical contamination was not well understood. Decisions were made at that time without malice; the chemical dangers were not fully understood, but unfortunately, some of the outcomes have been tragic in terms of the damage caused to human health. Those impacts on human health could not have all been foreseen. That doesn’t excuse the lack of a proper cleanup but if people understand the historical context, then they may be more cooperative and helpful in the development of the EIS and in accepting the positive role that DOE says they want to play in cleaning up the site properly. There is other history at the site that is interesting. Native Americans used the site. And many western movies and television shows were filmed in these mountains. The idea of the site becoming a state park is very appealing. Not only is the area beautiful, but a park could also celebrate both the movie history and the rocketry and nuclear power history of the site as well as providing critical animal corridors and important wildlife habitat.”

Some people reiterated the issue of historical context in responding to the final question.

- One person said, “I was born and raised in the San Fernando Valley, so I have lived here since 1961. When I was growing up, it was really exciting to hear the rocket tests. They were amazingly loud, even from pretty far away. Back in those days, no one lived very close to SSFL. There were big buildings, big factories, all over the valley. I was proud of what they did up there and our contribution to the space race.”

- Another person said, “I had a friend that worked up there, for Atomics International. He told me that everything that was done up there was done professionally, and I believed him. The people who worked there did the best job they could. The workers lived all around the site. They weren’t scared and they wouldn’t have done anything that they thought would harm their own communities. I think some of what they did was accepted practice when they did it. Sure, they did some things that we wouldn’t do today, because they didn’t know any better. There is much more awareness now about the chemicals and how they need to be handled safely. There was stuff that was burned in the burn pit that probably shouldn’t have been. But they didn’t do that maliciously, they weren’t trying to hurt anyone. If they had been aware of the hazard at the time, they would have done things differently. No one can say they do everything exactly the way it should be done – and the folks who worked up there shouldn’t be judged any more harshly than the rest of us are willing to be judged. I resent the publicity that the activists bring to the site.”
- Yet another said, “The history of the site should be preserved. I kind of miss the testing. The windows of our house would vibrate. It was pretty exciting. We have a beautiful community, good quality of life, and not a lot to worry about. People are making a big to-do about nothing. I have confidence in science. We should just let the scientists do what they are good at. All this negative attention is not good for our community. We just need to get the site cleaned up and move on.”
- Another individual noted that the site cleanup could provide an opportunity. This individual reported that “We are very interested in seeing that the property is acquired for parkland preservation in the future, once it has been cleaned up. It would provide a critical link for wildlife, linking critical habitat areas. We are also interested in documenting the history of the site. We would like to see historical interpretation at the site, sharing the legacy of contributions that have been made to rocket research and the space exploration.”
- One individual summed up the interview with a comment that few would have disagreed with had they heard it. This person said, “In summary, DOE’s success or failure will turn on DOE’s commitment to engaging the public in its decision-making. I hope DOE will do things in a new way. I hope they will follow through on the promises that have been made by the new folks. Because of the way things have been done over the years, it will be very difficult. There is a long legacy to overcome.”

RECOMMENDATIONS

Preliminary recommendations were developed based on an early review of the transcripts and were submitted to Stephanie Jennings, DOE’s NEPA Document Manager, on July 21, 2008. A copy of that first set of recommendations is included as Attachment C.

Since that time, I have had the opportunity to review the interviews more thoroughly and to consider all of the responses to all of the questions. In addition, there have been developments in DOE’s plans for preparing the EIS. Following are my recommendations at this point in time.

1. DOE should work with Boeing and NASA to develop a clear explanation of how the investigation and cleanup of the entire SSFL and surrounding areas will be accomplished to meet the requirements of federal and state cleanup laws.
2. DOE should define its overall goal relative to the EIS with an eye on the final goal: to define a path forward for a final cleanup of Area IV at the SSFL that is a) publicly acceptable, b)

protective of the environment and adjacent community, and c) implementable within DOE's constraints.

3. DOE should explore opportunities for coordination with DTSC and/or the US EPA to assure that the current EIS will support final cleanup efforts of Area IV at the SSFL.
4. DOE should embrace the challenge to be as transparent as possible throughout the development of the EIS and the implementation of the cleanup program. DOE should develop a clear explanation of the decision-making process that it will use to determine how it will implement effective cleanup of Area IV and the role that the EIS will play in that process. To the extent that DOE's final decision will rely on other considerations (beyond the information to be presented in the EIS), those considerations should be disclosed as soon as possible.
5. DOE should afford as many opportunities for the public to participate in decision-making for cleanup of Area IV as possible and go beyond the typical public participation activities conducted in compliance with NEPA. In other words, DOE should be prepared to conduct a more extensive public participation effort than is typical during preparation of an EIS. The situation simply requires extensive community engagement.
6. DOE should plan and conduct the public participation program for the EIS at the Involve Level of the IAP2 Spectrum. In other words, DOE should plan for frequent, iterative opportunities for the public to participate throughout the decision-making process.
7. DOE should design public participation activities to provide an opportunity for members of the public to collaboratively explore diverse perspectives together with DOE.
8. DOE should more actively seek out the participation of a broad cross-section of the community and support open dialogue among all participants. I found an extremely diverse range of perspectives during the interviewing process. Despite the fact that everyone I interviewed was extremely interested in the cleanup program, many reported that they don't regularly participate in public participation opportunities. The potential exists that only specific segments of the community actively participate.
9. DOE should prepare an explanation of the laws and regulations it believes it must comply with during preparation of the EIS.
10. DOE should provide opportunities for the public to participate beyond the completion of the EIS.
11. Some members of the community believe that DOE has never admitted to making mistakes. In addition, some believe that past operations may not have been conducted in a manner that would comply with current standards. Consequently, I think DOE should:
 - Admit that releases have occurred in the past as a result of ongoing operations and accidents
 - Admit that not all past operations complied with today's standards.
12. Some members of the community are sincerely fearful about site contamination and the impacts of that contamination on the environment and nearby communities. In addition, some members of the community have suffered serious health concerns that they believe were caused by exposure to site contamination. DOE should consider:
 - Acknowledging the fears of community members who worry about the potential impacts of historic and current environmental contamination

- Acknowledging the suffering of people who have health concerns that they believe are attributable to SSFL operations.
13. DOE should encourage the contractor preparing the EIS to work as independently as possible.
 14. DOE should consider hosting a visioning session to allow the public to contribute thoughts to how the site might eventually become an asset to the community.
 15. DOE should provide an opportunity for dialogue with the community (including representatives of the EPA) about the risk standards that will be used for the cleanup program. I would recommend against dismissing the possibility of cleaning up to the strictest standards prior to full evaluation in the EIS.
 16. DOE should consider the possibility of inviting former employees to a meeting specifically designed to solicit input that might be of relevance to DOE's efforts to prepare the EIS.
 17. DOE should explore the possibility of convening a Native American Advisory Board to support preparation of the EIS as well as implementation of the cleanup program in a manner that would be protective of resources of importance to them.
 18. DOE might want to explore the concept of convening a Technical Advisory Board to provide advice to the contractor should issues arise during development of the EIS and to provide independent review of the contractor's products.
 19. DOE should acknowledge the extensive knowledge within the community by inviting them to share information with the contractor staff that is preparing the EIS.
 20. DOE should define a role for the public that would allow all interested parties to participate constructively in decision-making relative to the cleanup program.
 21. DOE should clearly explain its objectives for each public participation activity, particularly how each activity relates to DOE's decision-making process.
 22. DOE should take steps to coordinate public participation activities with relevant agencies, particularly regulatory agencies.
 23. DOE should make certain that other agencies and elected officials are well informed of all public participation activities.
 24. DOE should commit to considering every comment received as a result of the public participation program and to reporting back to the public on the way each comment was addressed.
 25. DOE should host public meetings to share what they have heard as a result of each public comment period and how they intend to use those comments in the EIS.
 26. DOE should develop an approach to meeting the information needs of all segments of the broader public, including those who do not have a technical background, and to portray information as objectively as possible.
 27. DOE might want to consider the idea of forming a team (including members of the public) to review all informational materials to be provided to the public.
 28. DOE should consider carefully who should present information at public meetings. DOE should seek to balance technical knowledge, public speaking skills, and interpersonal skills.
 29. DOE should attend all SSFL Workgroup meetings, public open houses and workshops hosted by DTSC, and other public meetings to remain well informed about what else is going on at SSFL and emerging public concerns.

30. DOE should provide regularly scheduled status reports, using a consistent format, throughout the duration of efforts to prepare the EIS, and possibly throughout the implementation of cleanup efforts.
31. DOE should design each formal public comment meeting to include:
 - An open house set-up to provide information. Technical experts should be available at each station to answer questions.
 - Followed by a formal public meeting to 1) thank people for their interest, 2) present an overview of the EIS and the schedule for its preparation, 3) respond to any questions, and 4) take formal comments from the public.
32. DOE should consider any alternatives and issues suggested by the public during scoping to the extent possible.
33. DOE should seek to identify at least two alternatives for evaluation that are technically feasible and affordable – so that the public comment period on the Draft EIS allows the public an opportunity to indicate a preference among reasonable alternatives.
34. DOE should consider methods for soliciting comments on the Draft EIS in a manner that would allow the public to help distinguish among multiple alternatives that are deemed acceptable to DOE (technically feasible and affordable).
35. If DOE selects a preferred alternative in the Draft EIS, DOE should seek public comments on how that preferred alternative might be adjusted to make it as acceptable to the public as possible.
36. DOE should periodically evaluate the public participation efforts related to the EIS and critically evaluate the effectiveness of each public event. I further recommend that DOE stay flexible and willing to adjust its plans as time goes on.
37. DOE should consider the possibility of involving the public in any sampling effort to increase confidence in the results.
38. DOE should host a public meeting to share the results of the sampling program and provide another opportunity for members of the public to suggest alternatives at that point.
39. DOE should consider negotiating a role for Gregg Dempsey on the team that will prepare the EIS. Perhaps he could be retained as a technical reviewer. If such an arrangement could be made, I think it would lend tremendous credibility to the EIS.

Additional recommendations that should be easier to implement include the following:

- Provide adequate notice of all public participation opportunities. This means that DOE should announce all public meetings and public comment periods well in advance and use multiple channels.
- Provide press releases (not just display advertisements) to regional and local news outlets and ask for help in getting the word out about public participation activities. **The Acorn** was mentioned frequently as a good, local source of news.
- Consider enlisting the help of the various watchdog organizations by asking them to post information about the EIS and opportunities for public participation on their websites.
- Decide before each public appearance who will be acting as the spokesperson at the event. Make sure that person is well informed.
- Prepare for all public appearances by practicing responses to likely difficult questions. Unanswered questions are frustrating to everyone.

- Provide adequate time for the public to prepare comments during all public comment periods.
- Schedule public participation events in a way that minimizes the potential for schedule conflicts for interested parties.
- Consider scheduling public meetings on Saturdays and/or evenings to support the involvement of people with normal Monday through Friday working schedules.
- Provide handout materials for all public meetings that allow members of the public take home any information that was presented.
- Provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions well before the end of all public comment periods to help ensure that comments are well informed.
- When asked a question at a public meeting that DOE staff is not able to answer, DOE should make sure that an answer is provided directly to the person who asked the question in a timely manner. DOE should also take steps to broadcast any answers to questions to all who were in attendance when the question was asked. It was noted that failing to do so leaves any who observed the question to conclude that DOE never responded.

Interview Template

Introduction

Hello. My name is Wendy Lowe. I want to thank you for taking the time today to meet with me. I specialize in planning and implementing public participation services for government agencies. The Department of Energy has asked me to provide them with advice about how they should proceed with conducting public participation activities to support completion of an Environmental Impact Statement - or EIS - for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory.

I will be interviewing several people with knowledge of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory as well as others who are concerned about the site cleanup.

As you may or may not know, DOE has been ordered by a federal judge to prepare this EIS before embarking on the cleanup of Area IV. It is my understanding that DOE has every intention to comply with the judge's orders. Accordingly, the EIS will examine the environmental impacts of a full range of reasonable alternatives that would allow full cleanup of Area IV.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires federal agencies to conduct public participation activities at key junctures during the development of an EIS. In order to increase the chances that the public will be satisfied with the resulting EIS, the Department intends to conduct an extensive public participation program throughout the development of the EIS. The purpose of this interview is to learn about your concerns about cleanup of Area IV as well as the public's preferences for being involved during the development of an EIS.

I will be preparing a Report for the Department of Energy, transmitting my recommendations for an overall approach and specific activities for public participation activities for the EIS. All comments that you make to me during this interview will be treated confidentiality.

I have 12 questions and I think we should be able to complete our discussion in about an hour. I will not be tape recording this interview, but I will be taking notes during our conversation as well. After we are finished today, I will type up my notes and then send them to you. I will make any changes you ask me to make, and I will not use the record of this interview until you have approved it. My report and recommendations will be based only on those interviews that have been approved by the people I speak with. My report to DOE will not include the names of the individuals that interviewed.

Before I begin, do you have any questions about this interview or what I will be doing with your responses?

Attachment A.

Questions

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?
2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?
3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?
4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?
5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?
6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?
7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?
8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)
 - a. Telephone hotline
 - b. Information kiosks in public settings
 - c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
 - d. Periodic informational briefings
 - e. Informational fact sheets
 - f. Periodic newsletters
 - g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
 - h. Internet tools for sharing information
 - i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)

Attachment A.

- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?
10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?
11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?
12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I have a number of concerns. 1. The public has unrealistic expectations about what the EIS is and what will be accomplished. DOE has capitalized on that in a short-sighted manner. No one will be served well if DOE doesn't meet the public's expectations. 2. The EIS will address activities in a pro-forma manner; DOE will do only what is necessary to comply with NEPA without actually accomplishing cleanup in a manner that will satisfy the public. DOE sees preparation of an EIS as jumping through the hoops. 3) There are myriad ways that preparation of the EIS could result in bad outcomes. Of course, DOE will prepare an EIS that will meet the court's requirements – but that doesn't mean the court understands what is necessary.

A major problem is that the NEPA process is fundamentally unsuitable for the situation at SSFL. The purpose of an EIS is to provide information and analysis to inform a decision. EISs are designed for situations where negative impacts might result from a project. If an agency is considering building a facility, for example, where there is nothing there, they describe the proposed project, analyze the possible ways it will negatively impact the environment, evaluate alternative ways to build it and how those alternatives might negatively impact the environment, and they identify ways to mitigate the impacts. At SSFL we have the opposite situation; DOE is considering positive impacts and the question is "How clean is clean" not "Is this impact too great." The NEPA process does not fit this situation. DOE is doing NEPA because they have to, not because they think it will result in more effective cleanup.

Another fundamental problem is that DOE doesn't use NEPA to make decisions. DOE says that they use the results of NEPA (environmental documents) to make decisions, but considers other factors which are not explained to the public. Actually, DOE has another process for making decisions that is not explained to the public. This makes it almost impossible for DOE to explain how it made any decision. This erodes public trust and confidence. The NEPA process needs to be better integrated with how DOE will actually make the decisions about cleanup.

The public would like to see DOE: 1) develop a full characterization of the contamination that needs to be cleaned up, 2) evaluate the need for cleanup and decide how clean the site should be when they finish, 3) develop a range of alternatives that would accomplish the desired level of cleanup, 4) devise the most appropriate strategy for conducting cleanup, 5) implement the cleanup, 6) evaluate the cleanup, and 7) conduct testing and/or monitoring to demonstrate that the remedy is successful.

DOE does not presently have a complete characterization/full and comprehensive inventory of all contamination. In addition, DOE expects to decide how clean the site should be (after the cleanup) in a vacuum, without engaging the public in that determination.

In other words, DOE has no intention of meeting the public's expectations for the first two steps in the desired process. In the absence of those steps, the rest of the process will be meaningless. It will result in a public relations disaster.

There are two additional problems. The public defines "contamination" as the presence of something that didn't use to be there that is potentially harmful. DOE doesn't use the word "contamination" unless it exceeds their cleanup standards. DOE denies that it exists, which enrages the public. The second is that the public believes successful cleanup should be protective. DOE doesn't see the need to assure long-term protectiveness. They want to clean only enough to meet the standards, and then walk away.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE should review the EPA's comments on the Draft and Final EA. If they understood those comments and changed the way they are seeing this, the EIS will be better than the EA (more appropriate and more satisfying to the public).

DOE and the EPA entered into a joint policy in 1995 in which DOE committed to conducting NEPA in a manner that is consistent with CERCLA for cleanup actions. They have moved towards implementing the policy in recent activities, but in the past have not lived up to that commitment. DOE should comply with the 1995 Joint Policy.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

"DOE has failed miserably and spectacularly."

DOE has not been responsive to public comments in the past. They have thoroughly alienated the community by treating individuals and the community in general with disdain and in a patronizing way.

They used to host quarterly meetings. Mary McDaniel of McDaniel Lambert Inc. was involved and she was really helping to establish good working relationships. DOE was gradually getting better. They had not communicated effectively, but she was helping them improve.

DOE typically does only what is required, nothing more. They let the public rant and then they ignore what has been said. DOE's real decision-making is not transparent and it is not inclusive. The public's concerns are not integrated into DOE's decisions.

DOE does reasonably well at informing the public. However, they usually try to make themselves look as good as they can. They often use specialized words that the public doesn't understand. They often appear defensive. They come off as being disingenuous.

They have used categorical exclusions to avoid having to make decisions in the open.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should not conduct public participation for the EIS in isolation from the overall cleanup program. Public participation should be tied to real decisions and it should be inclusive, transparent, ongoing, frequent, accessible, regular, sensitive, respectful, not condescending or paternalistic. DOE should commit to publicly disclose all relevant information, in a complete and thorough manner. They should not hide anything.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

Perhaps most importantly, all alternatives suggested by the public should be thoughtfully considered. The information provided should be factual and complete. DOE should be responsive to everything that the public has to say.

I would suggest a series of interactive workshops that would 1) fully disclose the full extent of existing contamination (using maps, monitoring data) and 2) a full range of remedial technologies. These workshops should include technical experts who will be honest and

Attachment B, Interview 1.

forthcoming and who can respectfully answer questions who will be honest and forthcoming. These workshops should be early in the scoping period to facilitate thoughtful preparation of scoping comments.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public can help define the relevant issues that should be considered, like truckloads of excavated material that will have to be transported through their communities. Let the public help.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

In order to get better, more focused comments, consider using more engaging strategies. Go to community groups. Publish the draft EIS, release it, then let it sit on the street for awhile, then provide open house/workshop type meeting to allow people to ask questions before the end of a comment period. Give the public time to learn/understand the draft EIS. The faster the comment period, the less well informed the comments will be.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – *DOE could “get points” for doing this*
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *the information that needs to be provided is too technical for this to work*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents. *Of course.*
- d. Periodic informational briefings – *Quarterly, perhaps, but only if there really is something to say*
- e. Informational fact sheets – *these are not a lot of work, they can be expensive but the money will be well spent*
- f. Periodic newsletters – *only if there is something to report*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) *YES – but these must be well done*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information. *A given. Put as much as possible on here, including reference documents in pdf format.*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) *These tend to be condescending by talking over people’s heads*

Attachment B, Interview 1.

- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) *These are not particularly useful. Use only as required, but do as creatively as possible*
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis. *This is the best idea. Give the public something real to do, with a product that would be helpful to DOE, and then reflect their work in the decision-making process*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS. *The website could be used to accomplish this.*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group. *The Workgroup already exists and it would be very difficult to construct a new group without giving an impression that the new body is competitive with the old group. The existing Workgroup does not provide an effective vehicle to accomplish anything substantive and positive.*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

The focus for public participation should be on the cleanup program rather than just the EIS. All public participation should be conducted in a manner that will support building of effective relationships with the public. The workshop approach – which would give the public a real role to play in DOE’s decision-making process – would be best. Make all information readily and easily available. Make sure the decision-making process is transparent and give the public information early and often to allow informed participation in that decision-making process. Avoid approaching NEPA as if it is about checking the box; consider how to conduct the NEPA process creatively so that the public can be involved in the real decisions, not just involved in building a document that really has not role in the decision-making process.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should actively reach out to the key players, including Liz Crawford, Holly Huff, and Dan Hirsch. DOE should use people who have proven skills at building relationships. Mary McDaniel used to do a very good job for DOE. Someone who is that skilled. Marie Rainwater is also very good; maybe she could help DOE.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

The situation at SSFL is very complicated. DOE has a long-standing culture which is very defensive. It hasn’t served them well in establishing good relationships with the community.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I think I understand why DOE must prepare an EIS – but recent events make me wonder if it's really appropriate. Boeing has made a commitment to release the site to the State of California's Department of Parks and Recreation. This land transfer would prevent the potential that the land will ever be used for residential purposes. This land use scenario would greatly reduce the potential for human health impacts from any residual contamination.

In addition, Senate Bill 990 dictates the cleanup standard that must be achieved. These two developments mean that the cleanup standard has been established and the future use of the site has been set.

NEPA requires federal agencies to consider reasonable alternatives. Boeing and Senate Bill 990 have effectively eliminated most of the alternatives. These "pre-set" conclusions radically restrict what the EIS can evaluate.

Having said that, the EIS will provide an opportunity for the public to develop a solid understanding of the true amount of pollution in Area IV of SSFL. This information will provide an accurate picture of the real problems. The public participation associated with the EIS will show people what is really there.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

The only activities I have witnessed are the public meetings conducted in support of the two most recent Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analyses. DOE did the "right things" but the audience/public had another agenda. Their agenda was to discredit DOE and support the perpetuation of misinformation. DOE followed the CERCLA process, including the public participation activities that are included in that process, but the meetings were attended by an audience that was extremely antagonistic towards DOE. DOE was simply not able to overcome this antagonism to provide information in a way that the public trusted. The EE/CAs provided valid information, but no one believed that the information was valid. At the time, the public was more focused on the legal action that had been taken against the Environmental Assessment prepared by DOE.

I don't know if this is entirely DOE's fault. Boeing has become an easy target for those who oppose SSFL.

Hopefully, the EIS process will allow DOE to overcome the history of mistrust.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should use the EIS to provide an accurate picture of what is there that needs to be cleaned up. The information must come from credible sources to overcome the lack of trust. DOE must follow the EIS process in order to address public concerns. The very active anti-community will challenge all of the information that is presented in the EIS.

Attachment B, Interview 2.

The best outcome, from DOE's perspective, would be in the public develops a true understanding of what is really there.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

The alternatives have already been determined if DOE accepts Boeing's commitment to the state of California and SB 990. Getting the site so that it was spotless would take a huge amount of work. The pre-determined levels of cleanup are achievable, but would require a lot of material to be removed and a lot of backfill. The only sources after the buildings have been removed would be the soil and the groundwater. Remediation of the soil would entail hauling a lot of material away.

It will be interesting to watch it play out. A lot fewer decisions will be made as a result of this EIS than would have been the case in the absence of Boeing's gift to the State and Senate Bill 990.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

Participation in the development of the issues to be evaluated would be an excellent role for the public. They could make suggestions of how to best avoid disruptions to the community, for example, and other impacts of the cleanup efforts on the neighbors.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

The public could be very helpful to DOE in deciding which remedial technologies to use in implementing the cleanup. In that manner, the public can help make sure that the technologies are acceptable to the public.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *the area surrounding the site is very large and it would be very difficult to figure out where to put the kiosks*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – *these are required*
- d. Periodic informational briefings – *these could be very helpful*
- e. Informational fact sheets

Attachment B, Interview 2.

- f. Periodic newsletters – *it would depend on the format used*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) - *Absolutely*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *presentations to organized groups focused on helping them understand what pollution is really there*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *only to meet the requirements. Formal public meetings don't provide an opportunity for people to ask questions. They can't provide good comments if they don't have answers to their questions.*
- k. Public open houses – *more informal meetings would be more helpful.*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *it depends on how it was configured and if it could be constructive or not.*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Tours
- Open houses/question and answer sessions
- Newsletters and an internet-based process of providing periodic information

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should do a good job of scoping – by getting as many people involved as possible and ideally a broader cross-section of the community than has been typical in the past. DOE can't make the activists happy, and won't make the public happy if they are only trying to please the activists.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

Try to talk to some people who have an “outsider” perspective like local civic groups.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I really have no more concerns than I would have for any other EIS. It should cover all impacts to humans and ecological receptors and include traffic impacts to the surrounding community. The biggest question is whether it will be limited to Area IV or it will cover cleanup of contamination that originated in Area IV but migrated to other areas. It should be comprehensive, in my opinion.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

There is so much information available. DTSC has many historical documents on its website. The activist's websites also have a lot of information. There are thousands upon thousands of documents about SSFL. DOE should be very thorough. Of course, they will need to look at all historical information they can find. The current employees need to search all old documents for information that is pertinent to Area IV.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I haven't seen much in my tenure that would allow me to make any observations.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

In developing the EIS, DOE should recognize the potential value of public knowledge. The public has a lot of information that hasn't been written down, particularly former employees. They know lots of things that haven't been documented. Some of what I have heard is probably hearsay. Some have gotten sick or lost someone and they blame it on SSFL. And some of the former employees are loyal to Boeing and may not disagree with the party line. So DOE should value the knowledge they find in the public, but they will have to sift through all of it to find what is useful.

Of course, the more the public is involved, the more they will trust the process, the outcomes, and the agencies.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public could have an important role. We (agencies) tend to value the knowledge and opinions of scientists, engineers, toxicologists. But, that sort of mind-set is not capable of making policy decisions, because it does not factor in the political considerations.

The public is afraid. That affects how they will see the alternatives. Some of the alternatives will not be politically acceptable because they will scare the public. By bringing them in, we will have a better understanding of how the alternatives will fare in the political arena.

Some alternatives will be technically impossible. Some alternatives will be politically impossible.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

In the public's mind, Area IV has impacted a much larger area. They will want DOE to look at a much larger area, say within two miles around the entire site. The best outcome might be a commitment to look for evidence. If contamination originated in Area IV, it should be addressed by the EIS.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

Obviously, the public should have the opportunity to review and comment on the draft EIS at a public hearing. The public comment period should be as long as possible, at least 60 days.

DOE should respond to all comments.

It might not be a bad idea to give the public a role in watching the cleanup to avoid creating a temptation to them to trespass (because they may not trust DOE to implement the cleanup). They will want to make sure that the cleanup is being implemented properly.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *these likely wouldn't be that useful*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – *It might be nice to have one in Simi Valley and one on the other side. Don't overdo. Most people prefer to see on the Internet now.*
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – *these are good for people who won't go to public meetings*
- f. Periodic newsletters – *don't do both these and fact sheets*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) - *Not many people would be interested*

Attachment B, Interview 3.

- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – *our agency has used these successfully. They are particularly good for people who don't have a lot of history with the site.*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – *only a handful of people would even be interested*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group - *This might be a good idea. I can see how that might be valuable for DOE*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Workshops – with real tasks – some of the very interested folks would probably really appreciate any opportunity to do something that would be helpful. Our agency has used workshops a lot. We get people together, give a presentation, allow questions and answers, and then just talk. A lot of people are very knowledgeable. Smaller, more frequent meetings. This approach can be very time consuming, however, open communication is the result.

Website

Tours

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should really give the public the time they need to review documents, get answers to their questions, and then provide comments. DOE needs to be responsive, be good listeners, use good communication skills. Get to know the public.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

Use people to communicate for DOE that are good at communicating. Laura Rainey is an example of an excellent communicator. She explains things so people can understand her. Don't use the person who has the most seniority. Don't use the person who knows the most. Use the person who can communicate clearly.

DTSC will do an EIR for the entire site. They will have the ability to compel cleanup. I am not so worried about whether DOE does a complete job because I am confident the cleanup will happen.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I would like to know where all of the contamination is, where it has gone, and where it might go. There is a perception that DOE has tried to cover-up what has gone on there in the past, and it is probably time to put everything "out on the table." This is the time for complete honesty and open-ness.

I have 70 acres next to SSFL. Maybe its selfish, but I just want to know what is going to be done to make sure that my property isn't contaminated and won't be contaminated in the future.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No. Of course, I think DOE should have a full accounting of all of the contamination before they decide how to clean it up. How could they decide how to proceed with cleanup before they know the full extent of the contamination and where it has gone. I have heard that there is contamination, or at least there is a perception that there is contamination, in the Santa Susana Knolls area. If they are going to clean up, they need to know where all of the contamination is before they can decide the best way to clean it up.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I have not been involved in any public participation activities in the past.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should try to be honest and open. The public should have an opportunity to raise their concerns about the contamination and DOE should address those concerns.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to help identify the alternatives that will be considered. In my experience, sometimes people who don't know much can identify a new, creative idea that no one else has thought of before. Of course, the public can't help if they don't know how much contamination there is or where it is located.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

There can be a problem if you have too much public participation. DOE shouldn't have to evaluate every single idea – that may be counter-productive. DOE should try to strike a balance.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with

requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should be kept aware of what is going on at the site, particularly those activities that could impact on the public. People should be notified if they might be affected (shipments of material leaving the site, for example, so that people could avoid being affected by the shipments).

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – *this might be helpful, especially if someone wants to know something right now*
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *good locations might be at the bottom of the hill*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – *not too frequently and only if there is something to report*
- e. Informational fact sheets – *upon request, otherwise, these will just end up in the trash*
- f. Periodic newsletters - *these would just end up in the trash*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
 - i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – these could be incorporated into the periodic briefings
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *these can be good if they are well controlled – time limits for commenters*
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – *if they have something real to do, this would be good*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *if DOE could find the “right people” – people without an agenda. It might be possible to use the Workgroup to accomplish this if they are a good group*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 4.

Internet

Periodic briefings

Public meetings in combination with informational open houses or workshops

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

“I would like to meet with someone from DOE to learn more about the contamination on SSFL and how it might affect my property. I have never been to SSFL and might like to go on a tour of the site. I wonder about the role of SB 990 in the EIS and who will pay for the cleanup. I am also interested in what the land will be used for after cleanup.”

Attachment B, Interview 5.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

- We are not sure that the scope of the EIS will cover D&D work.
- It appears that DOE wants to get out fast instead of focusing on getting out properly. We would prefer they not rush and do this right. For example, if they are taking down a building in order to sample what's under the building, they may not be taking down the building in a manner that is protective.
- The scope of the EIS is to look at the cleanup of Area IV, yet there was treatment and/or disposal of materials generated in Area IV that went into other areas. One example: the Area I burn pit was used to burn some things that were originally from Area IV. Another example is that the Area IV pipes and drainage system drain into Areas II and III and the Buffer Zone. There are licenses to work with Strontium 90 in Area 1. The Bowl Area of Area 1 was used for coal gasification and other works from ETEC.
- It is not clear that DOE has correctly classified all buildings. For example, only two buildings in Area IV are said to have radiological contamination. That is ridiculous as many more buildings were used to manage radiological materials over the history of the Site. All historical records should be reviewed before a building is declared to be clean of radiological contamination.
- DOE's poor reputation with the public may be related to the fact that they have not been present for so long. They stop participating in the Workgroup meetings and have a history of hiding information rather than disclosing it. For example, two burn pits operated for over 30 years and only ceased operations in 1990. They burned toxic wastes (like strontium and agent orange) in the burn pits. People talked about days when the the BFRC (Big Fucking Red Cloud) could be observed, about having their clothes melt to their bodies. Another observation is that there was this big pile of office equipment (desks and chairs) just laying out in the open until it cooled off enough that it could be disposed of.
- There are fault lines through SSFL that provide a conduit for contamination away from SSFL into Chatsworth Reservoir and other surface water bodies. There are diversion tunnels and channels leading from the SSFL into and around the Chatsworth Reservoir and had to be completely drained in 1969 and it has never been used for drinking water since. The claim was that the contamination was caused by a 1971 earthquake. But they drained the reservoir two year BEFORE the earthquake! The Department of Water and Power owns and operates the reservoirs and they have never been able to provide an explanation of how the contamination got into the reservoir.
- DOE and the EPA promised the public that there would be a ground survey of radiation, but it has never been conducted. Funding for the survey was provided in Feinstein's Appropriations Bill (SB 1169?). An aerial radiation survey was done in 1979, but no ground survey has ever been done. It found radiation all over the place. They later claimed it was because the radioactive material had been moving around on the site the day the survey was done.
- Laura Rainey (DTSC geologist) has reviewed a lot of documents. She has found information buried in appendices that is not referenced in the body of reports. DOE would have to read every single document to do a thorough review.

Attachment B, Interview 5.

- We are more confident about the hazardous contamination than we are about radiological because DTSC oversees the hazardous part. No agency has oversight over DOE with regard to radiological contamination.
- We have heard that Boeing may not deed the land back to the state of California after all.
- The EIS must be thorough. DOE claims that only two buildings in Area IV have radioactive contamination. The SPTF and Building 100 and 55 need to be looked into more closely and historical data investigated as well. Groundwater leaching into Building 4024 is an indication of prior reactor buildings with the same problem, this is proof of a continuing Groundwater issue. They say that the Nuclear Materials Handling Facility is clean. How can that be? The entire site should be presumed to be contaminated until it is proved to be clean, not the other way around.
- DOE hasn't not always been open and forthcoming. They put an impermeable cap on one area. They used material from another part of the site. When questioned, they admitted that water was entering the impermeable cap. They explained that of course some water would enter any cap. "What is the definition of impermeable?" The activists joke about the "magic clay" that was used for the cap. They just look bad when they do something like that.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

We are more confident than we had been that DOE will look at everything that they should to prepare the EIS. There is a huge volume of information. One document prepared by SAIC in 1991 states that several reference documents were not used as they did not contain references to specific locations that would confirm they were relevant to SSFL. Ignoring information for this reason makes no sense at all. DOE should at least consider/review all of its own reports and historical documentation.

The RCRA cleanup has divided up the entire SSFL into specific areas. This segmentation is of concern as 1) some known contamination sites are not in areas that are scheduled for assessment and cleanup, and 2) in some cases, the contamination in one segment may be related to contamination being investigated in another segment. Dividing things up in this manner may result in overlooking something important. The RCRA area boundaries may make sense, but they have not been well explained.

There are some very knowledgeable individuals (Dan Hirsch, for example) who know a lot. These individuals may know more than DOE staff, for example, Knowledgeable individuals may be able to help ensure that no relevant information is overlooked.

Former employees are another good source of information. We have talked to some former workers who describe caverns where contaminated material was dumped. The retirees know a lot, can remember where things were dumped, what existing facilities were used for before their most recent uses. We have heard stories about employees clocking-in in one area and then working in another. They might have reported to work on one project but then be needed elsewhere. Their stories do not always corroborate the official reports/reference documents. DOE should be conducting oral histories with them before they die and the knowledge is permanently lost.

It is disconcerting that DOE doesn't appear to know what is there. There is a facility on the maps, ESADA, that DOE can't explain what the facility was used for. Since they don't know,

Attachment B, Interview 5.

they assume it is safe. We can't make that same assumption. We are still going to be living here when they call it done and go away.

There is another site, an open pit that is full of water. DOE says the water came from groundwater. The pit was dug to house a new reactor. When the water seeped in, they abandoned plans for the reactor. A lot of money went into excavating the pit. Is there contamination in the pit? Why haven't they filled it in again?

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

In the past, DOE has done a poor job of advertising public meetings by putting a legal ad in the classified pages of the paper rather than a larger, more noticeable ad in a more well-read section of the newspaper.

DOE does not always give the public enough time to review documents during public comment periods. We remember one meeting where public comments were sought, but the document wasn't available until we walked into the public comment meeting. Documents should be made available in time to allow public review before the comment meeting. They can be made available on the Internet using URLs that are easy to find and remember.

In the past, DOE has conducted meetings in a manner that didn't provide an opportunity for everyone to hear what everyone else has to say. These open house type meetings don't work when there is low trust.

In the past, DOE has hidden behind specialized lingo, acronyms, and jargon that the general public doesn't understand. They haven't learned not to use words to try to reduce concerns. They need to be more honest and forthcoming.

DOE should avoid trying to spin information. At a minimum, it makes them appear to be insincere.

DOE needs to learn how to treat the public respectfully. Many people who attend these meetings have suffered health effects that they attribute to SSFL. DOE should be responsive to their concerns.

DOE often uses strange wording to obfuscate information. For example, one report said that the nuclear rods were parted. What does parted mean? The way DOE explains information can affect how people understand what is being said.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

Public involvement during the preparation of the EIS should provide an opportunity for the public to review and provide comments on documents. DOE should make every effort to consider what the public has to say and use the comments in the decision-making process. Even if DOE disagrees with what the public has to say, they should listen respectfully and appreciate public concerns. DOE should take public comment seriously.

In 2001, DOE released a document that said the no-action alternative was preferable to the cleanup alternative because the cleanup alternative would result in 1.4 deaths related to off-site shipments of the excavated material. The material that was not excavated poses grave risk to public health.

DOE should in particular pay attention to the folks who have been following SSFL for many years. We read a lot and know a lot, in some cases more than DOE staff know about what has gone on at SSFL. DOE should not overlook former site workers. They know a lot and

Attachment B, Interview 5.

remember a lot about how things were done. The documentation is not always complete and retired workers can help fill in the gaps.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

The rationale for all alternatives to be considered should be fully explained.

The preferred alternative should not be preferred simply because it is the least costly alternative.

The public could provide input to what is of greatest concern to them and alternatives could be formulated to address those concerns.

DOE should not evaluate technologies without demonstrating that they might be viable at SSFL.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

DOE is having to prepare an EIS because Judge Conti did not believe the Environmental Assessment supported a Finding of No Significant Impact. How could DOE think the cleanup of all that contamination would really have no significant impact? DOE has ignored problems for years and their lax approach got them where they are now.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should make every effort to make all decisions about cleanup – through the implementation of the entire cleanup program - as transparently as possible. The public should be kept informed and should have the opportunity to participate in decisions from beginning to end. DOE should disclose everything that happens, especially if something unexpected happens. Public disclosure if/when DOE makes a mistake will gradually enhance public trust. DOE should tell the truth, not just what they want the public to believe. That will build credibility.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline – *this would be good for elderly people and former site workers*
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *never seen this done*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – *it can be hard to find things at the reading rooms. It might be better to post these on-line.*
- d. Periodic informational briefings

Attachment B, Interview 5.

- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters – *this would be a good way to keep the public informed of progress, but should be developed in conjunction with all the players (NASA, DTSC, Boeing)*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – *These could be used to raise awareness. DOE might want to announce the opportunity to go on a tour at public meetings.*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) - *Only for folks with a more technical (better informed) background*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – *in combination with the formal public meetings*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis - *Only for folks with a more technical (better informed) background. These would be best if people were required to make a commitment ahead of time to participate (make the time commitment and do their homework ahead of time)*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group. DOE could design a group to have a role that compliments (rather than competes with) the Workgroup. Currently there is a hole in that the Workgroup does not provide advice to DOE.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

No response.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE needs to learn how to be honest and transparent when sharing information with the public. It would appear that they don't want to scare people. Sure some people are worried about the potential impact on their property values, but the public has a right to know about SSFL and the risks it poses to public health. Being honest will reduce fears. The public deals with lots of horrors in our world, like Anthrax and terrorism, we can handle that. It's what we don't know that really scares us. DOE should treat the public like they are grown-ups. In addition, DOE needs to learn how to communicate to multiple audiences, some more technically sophisticated than others.

Attachment B, Interview 5.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

DOE should do it right. The EIS should cover all of the necessary areas. People have been suspicious about SSFL for years. News came out about accidents and mistakes many years after the fact and it made people very suspicious. Some people will probably never feel satisfied that they know what they need to know. There is a perception that DOE has lied to the public and that has made the public distrust them. The EIS should address all current and future impacts on public health and the environment.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE should look at everything – reference materials related to dust, water, air, everything. DOE should be thorough.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE hasn't really done much public participation. They do the minimum, if any. They have actually done some outreach recently, using an open house format.

They don't seem fully engaged with the public. The information they produce isn't perceived as being trustworthy. They don't give direct answers.

It would appear that there is little trust between the various agencies, like they are not working together. There is no evidence of coordination.

DTSC seems to be doing a better job than anyone else. Norm Riley exhibits confidence, like he is on top of it. He is not an alarmist and he seems sincere.

DOE's approach continues to feel deceptive, like they have something to hide.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE needs to understand people's fears and concerns and to address those fears and concerns. We are skeptical that this will happen because of their track record. Their track record would lead us to believe they won't listen and won't care what the public is concerned about.

DOE needs to get the EIS done in a timely way and get on to the cleanup.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public may not be able to do that, may not have the technical knowledge to know how to address the contamination. The public should share their concerns and DOE should figure out

Attachment B, Interview 6.

how to address those concerns. They need to analyze alternatives that would address the public's concerns.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The impacts/issues addressed in the EIS should reflect the public's concerns.

DOE may need to describe (fully) what each alternative would entail before the public can suggest the impacts that should be addressed.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should publicize the release of the draft EIS very well. It should be distributed to city councils, homeowners' associations, and all activist groups.

DOE should set deadlines for public comment and stick with the deadlines. They should not drag this out forever. They need to get the place cleaned up, not delay.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *only for those who would understand them*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *"I suppose"*
- k. Public open houses

Attachment B, Interview 6.

- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *If it was possible to get a good cross-section of the community, set ground rules, give them specific assignments, not give them the opportunity to stand on their soapbox, and then listen to what they say*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

All that would accomplish the dissemination of information. DOE should do it over and over. They say you have to repeat information 7 times before people really hear it.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Be honest, be open, be real. Understand that the public is suspicious. Tell the public the bad news as well as the good. "Don't pussy foot and don't spin the information."

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

DOE is at a disadvantage going into this effort as it has an extremely poor reputation, particularly with the public and the communities around the site. DOE has a reputation of not fully disclosing information as well as spinning information ("torturing the data") to serve its own purposes. DOE needs to be mindful of its bad reputation and take steps to avoid reinforcing it. I would encourage DOE to be forthcoming, respond to questions, and provide early notice of its plans.

DOE's reputation among the regulatory agencies is only slightly better. DOE should treat the regulatory agencies as respected and valued partners by considering agency comments seriously. DOE should see the regulatory agencies as partners rather than combatants.

In the past, DOE seems to have been more concerned about minimizing costs than about doing what is right, necessary, and protective of public health. If DOE continues in that vein, the result will not be success for anyone. DOE should not continue to stand apart from everyone else. Yes, the agency has separate authority under the Atomic Energy Act, but constantly reminding everyone about that does not engender trust and cooperation. DOE's primary purpose in conducting the cleanup of Area IV should be to protect public health.

In their defense, the people who work for DOE are nice people. But as an agency, DOE tends to act differently than they do as individuals. DOE makes decisions and acts in its own best interest instead of in the public's interest. Even if the cleanup will cost a lot more (even \$40 million more), they should be willing to do that if necessary to protect the public.

DOE needs to be honest, open, and forthright in its decision-making and in the performance of its work to overcome the difficulties it has had in the past. They should not be so concerned about costs. They should be more concerned about keeping the public well-informed and telling the truth.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No. DOE has the information. Indeed, they have more information than anyone else. The problem in the past has been that they have not been willing to share the information with anyone else. It took forever for DOE to release the meteorological data related to the SRE accident – they sat on it for years. This information was important to help the public understand where the contamination went after the accident. Keeping the information from the public all those years just damaged DOE's reputation.

In fairness, it would appear that there is a new culture emerging at DOE. Some people are acting in a more trustworthy manner. It remains to be seen if DOE is really going to do what it will take to have a more positive relationship with the public.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They have had not public participation activities in quite some time. They used to participate in the SSFL Work Group, but they discontinued participating. They have only recently started participating again.

Attachment B, Interview 7.

DOE has a website that is pretty good. They should keep that up and the information on the website should be even more complete. They should not hide anything. When DOE is hiding information, it is hard not to suspect the agency.

A lot is not known about what happened at SSFL from the 1950s through the early 1970s. Log books and memos have never surfaced. By many accounts, all shift supervisors maintained detailed log books. Where are the log books for the SRE accident? We think DOE has it and won't release it because DOE wants to protect itself from legal liability. DOE is a government agency, but they act like they are a private entity. A public agency's primary interest should be the protection of the public interest. This hiding of information is inconsistent with the concept of "good government." DOE is afraid it will be sued, but they can't hide from the truth forever. The agency needs to get over its paranoia. It should make the information available that would allow the public to know and understand the true nature and extent of the contamination that has occurred at the SSFL and let us all deal with the real problems.

Continuing to act this way will only result in unnecessary and counterproductive tension with the public.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

The two most important objectives should be education and cooperation. DOE should clearly explain its intent and purpose and should solicit public input on the scope of work and the adequacy of its analysis. DOE should proceed in "plain view of the scrutinizing public."

It will be time-consuming. But the public has many questions that have never been answered. Turning its back on the public's need to know will only heighten suspicion and fear.

The public must be a full partner in the development of the EIS and decisions related to the cleanup of SSFL.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should pose questions and provide an opportunity for the public to indicate its preferences. DOE should be open minded about and responsive to whatever they hear. The public should expect DOE to fully evaluate everything that is suggested; DOE should have the final say. DOE should go out of its way to provide an ample opportunity for the public to participate in development of the alternatives that will be evaluated in the EIS.

The public should have an opportunity to develop a full understanding of the alternatives that have been identified by the agency AND an opportunity to suggest additional alternatives. DOE should not have to evaluate unreasonable suggestions that may be offered, but there are bright, creative, and articulate people with good ideas and the possibility of useful ideas coming from the public should not be discounted. DOE should listen with an open mind and thoroughly evaluate any good ideas. DOE should have good reasons for discounting any idea that is rejected.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Attachment B, Interview 7.

The same role as described for the previous question. The public has the capacity to provide good ideas. Public participation activities should be designed to provide an opportunity for these good ideas to surface.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to thoroughly review and comment on the Draft EIS. DOE should provide enough time and should provide clear directions on how to comment. People should have an opportunity to ask questions about the document in order to develop good comments.

This will not be easy. Some of the folks that have been involved for years do not know how to behave. Some will be fearful and some will vent their frustrations. It will be hard to convince the public that DOE really means to do things differently than in the past. DOE should anticipate the difficulties it will face in conducting public participation activities.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline - *this is an interesting idea, but unless it is well staffed, it will fall short of the potential*
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – *there is considerable interest on the part of the public in doing this – but it would be challenging*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – *DOE should consider providing a dedicated portal for SSFL cleanup instead of making people navigate through a complicated website. Everything possible (reference documents, etc.) should be provided.*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *what has happened in the past and how that poses risks to the public health*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)

Attachment B, Interview 7.

- k. Public open houses – *the potential value of these decline if DOE is doing a lot of the other activities mentioned*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

DOE should not try to do everything listed. DOE should talk to members of the public and find out their preferences and should do a few things well – pick those that would be the most effective at educating the public and providing a meaningful opportunity to participate in decision-making about cleanup.

I would suggest:

- An informative, easy to navigate website
- Newsletters and fact sheets that are mailed out to people
- Public meetings – whether using an innovative format or the normal
- An advisory group, created by DOE to provide informed advice
- Workshops – opportunities for people to work together on issues that matter

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should understand that the “public” is not necessarily the folks that presently show up at meetings. We really don’t know much about the community “at large” as we never hear from the vast majority of people who live around the site (several hundred thousand live very close to the site). We hear over and over from the same two dozen people, some of whom are very extreme in their views. DTSC has hosted “focus group meetings” to advise the community of the agency’s activities. These meetings provide an opportunity for people to really discuss their concerns. The activists that are most involved do not necessarily represent the interests of the public.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

The SSFL Work Group is not organized or operated to provide constructive advice to DOE. The body is configured to provide an opportunity for the public to vent against public officials. The group is dysfunctional and all of the members have ulterior motives. Public officials provide brief status reports of relevance and answer questions. There is a lot of tension. The meetings

Attachment B, Interview 7.

are not focused on DOE, but on SSFL as a whole. DOE needs a forum focused on the decisions it has to make.

In summary, DOE's success or failure will turn on DOE's commitment to engaging the public in its decision-making. I hope DOE will do things in a new way. I hope they will follow through on the promises that have been made by the new folks. Because of the way things have been done over the years, it will be very difficult. There is a long legacy to overcome.

Attachment B, Interview 8.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

Our concerns focus on the Native American burial sites and the Burro Flat caves. They should be protected and preserved during and after the cleanup.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

They may find additional archaeological sites that we don't even know about. We would like to see a tribal monitor accompany anyone doing investigations and/or cleanup work, particularly during excavations. It would also be nice to see DOE do some research into the location of cultural sites within the site boundaries even before they start preparing the EIS. We have not been allowed access to the site for years and I don't think anyone really knows what's there.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They have allowed access to the cultural sites on a few occasions in the past. They really haven't reached out to Native Americans.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should make every effort to be inclusive of all bands of the Chumash, Ventura, and maybe other tribes, along with our tribe. They should at least make sure we are all informed and provided the opportunity to participate.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

We would like to help identify future land use as well as how clean the site should be as a result of the cleanup effort.

We would be concerned if any of the cleanup actions could result in damage to on-site cultural resources. Maybe DOE should form a small advisory body, a Tribal Advisory Board. The Advisory Board could help identify all on-site cultural resources before work begins and then help design the alternatives to ensure that they will all minimize potential damage to cultural resources.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I think I already addressed that.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a

Attachment B, Interview 8.

public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should not identify the location of any resources that are important to Native Americans on maps of the site.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – They could put one in our Tribal office
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – They could come to our Tribal Senate meetings
- e. Informational fact sheets – Electronic so as not to waste paper
- f. Periodic newsletters - Electronic
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – As long as optional – the tours should not take people to Native American cultural sites
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Fact sheets
- Periodic briefings
- Newsletters

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 8.

I like the idea of having an open house before the formal public meetings.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

Contact other Native American Indian agencies and tribes who may be interested in joining on a Tribal Advisory Board. Notification of Native American people should be conducted in the manner that was put into law; check with the California Native American Heritage Commission and Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Commission.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

It is nice for you that they have given you this contract, but having you call the public is just a diversionary tactic. DOE has known for 18 years what they need to do to cleanup the SSFL. They need to do a full site characterization of all of the site contamination. Once they have characterized the site properly, they will know what they have to do to clean it up properly. They did a site characterization once, but they did not do it properly. They have admitted that they didn't do it properly. They need to hire Gregg Dempsey to have it done properly.

They will also have to set reasonable cleanup standards. They need to use the same cleanup standards as EPA, 10^{-6} not the 10^{-4} that DOE seems to think is appropriate.

DOE needs to stop working for Boeing and start working for the public.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

They have everything they need.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They haven't listened to the public. They boycotted the Working Group meetings. Now they have come back. They are sending a very nice guy to attend the Working Group meetings now, but he has no authority. That is a standard DOE tactic. They send someone to do public relations rather than someone who has authority.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE needs to sit down with the public and listen. Actually, they don't really need to talk to anyone else except Dan Hirsch.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I have already answered that question.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I have already answered that question.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a

public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

I have already answered that question.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

I don't have any more time to talk to you. This is just a diversionary tactic. It is very typical of DOE. They have no intention to listen to the public.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

"Stop doing what you have been doing for the last 18 years. No one here has any authority. All of the decisions are made in the upper echelons of DOE. No one here as any authority."

Attachment B, Interview 9.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

The EIS is going to have to be completely inclusive, completely welcoming of the public in order to be successful. There is so much paranoia associated with the SSFL. It seems to come in cycles. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, there was a period of intense interest in SSFL as well.

Some people are convinced that contamination has left SSFL and spread all over, including Sage Ranch. Some of the stories sound like paranoia. For example, I have heard that some people think DOE has been using black trucks to sneak huge quantities of waste debris down back roads to the landfill in Calabasas. A woman sat on a rock in Sage Ranch and she is convinced that she got a radiation burn. That is extremely unlikely; there is no radioactive contamination in Sage Ranch. Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy arranged for the Sage Ranch ranger and California Department of Public Health to take radiation readings all over the park. CDPH verbally indicated that all of the readings were below background.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I am sure they have most of the information that they will need.

I hope that they look at the groundwater data for all three watersheds. TCE has apparently leached from the soils and has percolated into deep groundwater. So, all three watersheds need to be considered.

Of course, we would like to see the SSFL cleaned up properly. We are looking forward to having the site become part of the state park system; it is adjacent to Sage Ranch. Of course, to accept the property into the park system, it would have to be investigated and demonstrated to be clean, even if it was given as a gift. If there is a perception that it might become an on-going liability to the State of California because of residual contamination, it would not be accepted. As a result, we are very interested in seeing a thorough cleanup.

We will have some concerns during cleanup as well – related to the volume of traffic related to transportation of excavated materials leaving the site as well as timing of those shipments. That sort of activity could have an impact on Sage Ranch operations.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I haven't been aware of much except the "dust up" between EPA the DOE, which ended up reflecting poorly on DOE.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should make every effort to provide full disclosure of relevant information. DOE should try to address both real and perceived fears and concerns. They should make every effort to establish a rational dialogue with the public.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

The public should be allowed to offer input into the identification of the alternatives to be evaluated. DOE should base the alternatives on science, but there is always a possibility that someone will come up with a good idea. It is worthwhile to provide an opportunity for the public to make suggestions.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

This would also be crucial. DOE will want to make sure to evaluate the alternatives to see how they would impact on the issues that the public is concerned about.

We would have a different perspective than other folks might. We would not like to see a lot of vegetation/habitat areas disturbed because we will want to preserve the site in a natural state so that it can continue to provide habitat for wildlife. We will be interested in avoiding impacts to the natural resources.

We hope DOE will make every effort to avoid having impacts on natural resources.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

The public will want an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS, of course. DOE should provide for a public comment period that is two or three times longer than the minimum requirement. They will not want to be accused of trying to limit public comment.

There also may be interest in forming some sort of watch dog citizen group to monitor the cleanup efforts. I would guess that some of the more interested activists would be interested in doing that.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings (on second thought, we might want some public info for our own park kiosk.)
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – *these could be put on a website*

Attachment B, Interview 10.

- f. Periodic newsletters – *these could be put on a website*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *Just a few, but these could be helpful for those who are interested*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – *these could be done as part of the formal public meetings*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *DOE might want to offer to do this, see if anyone is interested*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Tours

Open houses

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should start with a “mea culpa.” They should admit they may have not been as forthcoming as they could have been in past years and admit that they may have made some mistakes.

Then DOE should let the public know that they want to be as open as they can, that they really want to engage the public, that they are genuine.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

Sage Ranch is a neighbor of SSFL. It is owned by the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, a joint exercise of powers agency, and is within the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Zone/Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor. SMMC is a state agency that was established to acquire parklands for the state of California, preserve parklands, and to provide

Attachment B, Interview 10.

nature programming. There is hiking and camping (by reservation only) on Sage Ranch. The boy scouts and girl scouts use our facilities. All water available on Sage Ranch comes from Ventura County; there are no wells on Sage Ranch. Some activists are worried about our water, but it is safe.

Sage Ranch was thoroughly evaluated when it was first acquired as a park. We contracted for soil, air, and water samples all over the site, looking for any evidence of toxics and radiological contamination. The only contamination found to be attributable to SSF was lead related to an old employee gun club. The members evidently shot towards a rock cliff and we had to remove a lot of lead shot, along with broken clay targets. There was evidence of wildlife use there, so we didn't want to destroy the place. We wanted to leave it as natural as we could after the cleanup. We sifted the soil so that it wouldn't have to be removed.

In 1993, DTSC did some more investigative work, I can't remember why, but they did sampling on Sage Ranch and Brandeis Bardin. The only thing I remember from the Sage studies was that they found more lead pellets and clay target debris.

We are willing to do our own testing if necessary to demonstrate the safety of our park. There are some very dedicated, very concerned public members out there and they are concerned. They seem to be convinced that something is being hidden vis a vis Boeing and/or DOE..

We are very interested in seeing that the property is acquired for parkland preservation in the future, once it has been cleaned up. It would provide a critical link for wildlife, linking critical habitat areas. We are also interested in documenting the history of the site. We would like to see historical interpretation at the site, sharing the legacy of contributions that have been made to rocket research and the space exploration.

DOE could help Sage Ranch with funding/technical expertise if something happens again (like the lady who sat on the rock and thought she had received a radiation burn). Sage Ranch has no funding from the State of California (they are completely cash funded through user fees)

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

The cleanup should be done independently. The public should have oversight over the cleanup. DOE should do a full characterization of all contamination resulting from their operations at the SSFL. There should be independent testing before, during, and after the cleanup.

The public has little confidence in DOE because in the past that body has been less than forthcoming. Throughout the years, one of the only people we have full confidence in is Gregg Dempsey; therefore we would like to see him put in charge of the EIS. This EPA employee has shown the ability to put technical information into layman's terms so that we can understand, even though there are things that we would rather not have to deal with.

It is so vital to the cleanup effort that a full-site EIS be addressed that we don't understand why DOE been so unwilling to do one. Now they are forced into doing this belated assessment because of the lawsuit.

We pushed them to do a study of the impacts on public health. DOE didn't want to do the study, so they said they would study the former employees first and then assess the community only if they found problems in the employees. UCLA did the study and their findings demonstrated that there were health effects among the employees. Then Rockwell/Rocketdyne spent \$9 million on their own epidemiological study to refute the UCLA study. They could have spent the \$9 million to clean something up, but they spent is just to make themselves look better. No one at DOE has ever admitted to doing anything wrong.

The public worked with an employee at DTSC, named Phil Chandler who was very well-versed and dedicated to a thorough cleanup. He sat down with the public and worked out a plan for a RCRA cover over the Sodium Burn Pit. He was aware that the public wanted something safer than an engineered cover as the pit was full of TCE which leaches into groundwater. It was essential that the contamination be adequately contained. But DOE and Rockwell opposed the RCRA cover and subsequently Phil Chandler was removed from his position and Gerard Abrams was brought in.

Another concern is that they will just cover up the problems. They have planted grass on top of the burn pit. Someone could come along in years to come and never know what had taken place there. The public asked how they were getting the grass to grow and they admitted they were watering the grass. Where do they think the water is going to go? It will run downhill and bring the contamination to residential areas beneath the site.

DOE wants to leave 90% of the contamination behind, but this will cause problems downhill now and in the future. Although burning was done at night to avoid harming their employees, residents nearby were harmed. Water flows down and through residential yards.

There has been an abundance of health problems throughout the many years that cleanup has not been instituted. Many people without the specific markers for specific cancers have fallen victim to devastating cancers and, of course, question their proximity to the site.

It is frustrating that there is a revolving door of agency personnel. The public has been concerned throughout all of the personnel changes and they are frustrated that answers are never forthcoming, but the new personnel go back over old ground. When questions are asked,

Attachment B, Interview 11.

the public is told they will get answers, but the public is always kept in the dark and have lost patience.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE should just be honest and admit their past mistakes. They should tell the whole story of all the chemical and radioactive contamination at SSFL. Everywhere they look, they find contamination. They are always saying we never had any of that at SSFL. Then they find it. That happened with the ordnance. They said there wasn't any ordnance there, then they find some.

That's why we want EPA to do the radiation survey, because DOE won't admit that there is a problem. They say there is no contamination there, but when they are forced to look for it, they always find it. They said no contamination had left the SSFL site. It was demonstrated that contamination had gone off-site, so they bought the adjoining property and then claimed no contamination had gone off-site.

They have never even admitted that there was a melt-down. The third biggest nuclear accident in history and they have never admitted that it occurred.

They need to a cleanup program that is consistent with what really happened there. Just clean it up.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

In the past, DOE has scheduled their meetings on top of Workgroup meetings. At their meetings, DOE is condescending and they don't tell the truth. They never say anything new. They say the same thing over and over and there is never any progress. Its always we are planning to do something but they never get around to doing the cleanup. Their meetings are not meetings - there is no discussion - they are just road shows for DOE to tell their story. Its easier for the community to just have to go to one meeting, the Workgroup meeting. The DOE meetings are a waste of time. "The only reason to go is they always have good cookies."

It is good that DOE has come back to the Workgroup. But they need to answer questions that are asked. They are always saying "we don't know, we'll need to get back to you" but they never do. The DOE staff don't know anything. They are always changing and we know more than they do. Dan Hirsch knows a lot more than any DOE folks do. They are always hiding behind the cloak of "cold war secrecy" – but they don't have to be so condescending.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should involve the public early. Don't do something and tell the public about it later. DOE should keep coming to the Workgroup meetings and keep us informed. They should be honest and trustworthy. They should learn to provide information in an understandable way.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 11.

The public should have a role in deciding which alternatives are publicly acceptable. There should be alternatives in the EIS that are acceptable to us.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should look at the cancer cluster. They should do testing. The most important issue will be the long-term protectiveness of the remedy. The contaminated soils should be hauled away or at least stabilized. There should be long-term monitoring.

DOE has its own weather station. They denied it, but they have their own monitoring station.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should be kept informed through-out the implementation of the cleanup program. The public should be notified when shipments of excavated material are planned. The EIS should be written so people can read it, can understand it. The public should have a role in monitoring the implementation of the cleanup. Someone independent and trustworthy should do environmental monitoring and share their results with the public.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – *for the Working Group*
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) - *to the Working Group*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – *we don't like these. They are just dog and pony shows for DOE, they belittle the public, they try to create a false sense of security*

Attachment B, Interview 11.

- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – *but if DOE does this, the documents need to be provided in advance and they need to give the public enough time to review them and to come prepared to ask questions – and DOE needs to be able to provide answers*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *we are opposed to the formation of a new group. DOE should work with the existing Working Group*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Internet website

Working with the existing Workgroup

Public tours

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Be honest. Tell the truth. We are going to find out anyway (eventually).

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

The original purpose of the Workgroup was just to get everyone together to give share information. It was as much about providing an opportunity for the agencies to talk to each other as it was for us to talk to them. It was a way to force people to communicate.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

None. There does seem to be some confusion about the scope of the EIS and there seem to be several opinions. It appears that in general the scope of the EIS is Area IV, however if DOE contamination has migrated outside of Area IV, it will be included. The scope will need to be explained.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE could benefit from additional training in communicating with the public.

It appears that DOE is mistrusted by the public.

Sometimes DOE is asked a question and the DOE staff/representatives who are present seem to hesitate. They appear to not be sure about what they can say and who should say it. The resulting impression is that they have something to hide.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

At a minimum, DOE needs to fulfill the legal requirements. DOE probably needs to do as much as they can to make the document understandable and available.

DOE needs to listen to the public. They need to answer questions in a timely way and provide clear and credible answers.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public has a right to review and comment on the range of alternatives. After evaluating public input, the federal agency determines what alternatives should be evaluated.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The whole point of scoping is to provide this opportunity to the public. The public should be the primary source in developing the list of issues that will be evaluated.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a

public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIS. DOE should communicate back to the public what it has done in response to the comments and to communicate the resulting decisions.

DOE should go above and beyond the minimum requirements.

Public participation should continue until the cleanup is done.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *unless they are required.*
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – *these could be done whenever there might be a real opportunity for the public to help make a decision. DOE could find every opportunity possible.*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Tours – these could be combined with an open house meeting

Attachment B, Interview 12.

Workshops

Communication opportunities with small groups. DOE could go to existing groups to share information. There is a danger of excluding folks if meeting with smaller groups is relied on too heavily. DOE would need to widely announce the availability of this option so that no one was unintentionally excluded.

Website availability of documents, reference documents and technical appendices

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Be open and provide all materials to anyone who is interested

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susan Field Laboratory?

We have heard that they want to be done by the end of 2008. There is no way they could clean SSFL up adequately by then. I have no confidence in DOE's ability to accomplish the cleanup in that timeframe. I don't even think they could clean up the Area IV landfill that quickly. If they leave contamination behind, I am confident that DTSC will clean it up properly. Norman Riley is the "best, most honest cop" we could ask for.

Until now, DOE has hidden behind a legacy of cold-war secrecy to obfuscate, obstruct, and fail to respond to public concerns. There have been four accidents in the hot Lab, they had a uranium fire that lasted three days, they put it out with liquid nitrogen. The public has been told nothing about this.

There is a long history of lying to the public, a pattern of lying to the public. Ask Bonnie Klee about it. She was just a secretary. No one told her the health risks she was facing. She was the only woman there and these guys were coming in to say hello to her all day long, she was exposed to who knows what.

I bought this house in 1978 from a friend. His father-in-law worked up at SSFL. My friend didn't think there was anything to worry about here. There is a house down the street that hasn't sold in months. They thought they had a buyer, but the buyer read the disclosures about SSFL and backed out.

There was a fire in October of 2005 that went right through here. We found an asbestos dump right next to Sage Ranch. DOE never knew it was there. It was ruled to pose an "imminent and substantial endangerment to the public." They have removed 2000 cubic yards so far, with 8000 more to go. Dan Hirsch knows more about SSFL than anyone from DOE does. DTSC is doing a better job protecting the public than DOE is.

The Water Board wants to deny that the asbestos dump is there. We have been trying to get a site-wide radiation survey. There has been no testing for radiation in the eastern drainage.

There was testing done on the Devry site at Fallbrook and Roscoe. They found high levels of gamma radiation in groundwater monitoring wells. They tried to explain it away saying that they found Radium-118 and Freon-10, both of which are naturally occurring. They didn't even test for cesium, uranium, or plutonium. You can't find anything unless you look for it.

The Regional Water Board did only minimal field work around the asbestos dump found in Sage Ranch Creek. There are only three possible explanations for that; they are stupid, negligent, or criminal. There is no other explanation.

The EIS will be very important. It will provide data from sampling. DOE has been unwilling to provide that sort of information to the public, but we have a right to know.

Several of the outfalls are located above the more contaminated areas. Outfall 7 is located above grade from the Area IV landfill.

One big question is how DOE will define background. They think as long as the radiation levels in our communities are lower than at SSFL we should be happy. But we shouldn't be compared

Attachment B, Interview 13.

to SSFL, we should be compared to similar communities. They want to claim that there are high levels of radiation naturally found at SSFL that results from the sandstone formations.

It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that ionizing radiation is bad.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I don't think they will look at everything that they should; hopefully they will. There are 17,000 documents that pertain to the Sodium Burn Pit alone! They will need to cooperate/coordinate with everyone else up there (NASA, DTSC, Boeing). They need to consider the entire site.

It feels like they made a corporate decision at some point to hide everything up there. For example, they disposed for 4 Kg of mercury. The only choices they had were to destroy, burn, or dilute it. They diluted it. And then what? What did they do with it then? There is mercury contamination everywhere. SRE has mercury contamination.

DOE needs to do a systematic field survey of entire northern drainage. They need to provide detailed information about where all the contamination has gone if they expect us to believe they don't have to clean it up now.

DOE needs to talk to the former site workers, like Bonnie Klee. These people have paid the price through their own health for working there. They have been denied their claims for compensation. DOE at least needs to listen to what they have to say so that other people's health can be protected. Another former site worker, Dan Parks, talks about off-loading "bird cages" full of enriched uranium. Metal shavings were falling out of the cages. They were tested and found to be enriched uranium. If this stuff was handled on SSFL, there needs to be an assumption that the place is still contaminated.

Check out the rocket information society at cleanuprocketdyne.org. One hundred people have joined so far, all asking questions.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They haven't done any public participation. They have lied and stonewalled the public. They have not responded to questions or public concerns. There was a joint agreement with the EPA that they would cleanup in accordance with Superfund, but they have ignored that agreement the whole time Bush has been in office. This administration has ignored that commitment.

DOE should follow the example being set by DTSC. Even NASA does a better job engaging the public. They took us on a site tour around Areas 1 and 2 and let us take pictures of anything we wanted to (except one thing that was wrapped up in a big tarp). They operate with transparency.

DTSC is hosting meetings that are fabulous. The meetings are by invitation only – they are not inviting everyone under the sun. Sue Callery facilitates them, creating an opportunity for dialogue. The Water Board, however, that's another story.

Laura Rainer does a fabulous job of putting information in layman's terms, so the public can understand.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should talk with Dan Hirsch, Christina Walsh, Bonnie Klee, and me (old-timers who have been watching them for a long, long time). They should be sampling all drainage ditches. Pamela Logan from the DOE talked to us awhile back about a Gap Study but we haven't heard any more about that. They say that 92% of the public don't care, just want DOE to do its job and clean the place up. DOE should work with the rest of us, the 8% that attend Workgroup meetings, and consider our concerns and comments. They should look at comments they have received in the past, like on the Group 6 Remedial Investigation.

There may be legitimate national security concerns. But they should not hide behind such concerns if they are not real.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should evaluate a full range of alternatives and give the public an opportunity to help decide what those alternatives should entail. They should take the public's input seriously. They should host a multiple-day conference, providing an opportunity for everyone to sit down together and agree to a full inventory (constituent by constituent) contamination that should be cleaned up, agree to cleanup standards for every single constituent that is there.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

That is an open question. Public health should be the driving force. They should not be allowed to leave contamination just because some level of contamination is allowed under permits. They should have to clean it up to the way it was before they opened the facility. Any amount of ionizing radiation is unacceptable. This area has cancer rates that are 60% of those found everywhere else. They don't want to accept responsibility for that, but we don't want to accept the risks of leaving gamma radiation in place.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DTSC is listening to the public, but there is no evidence that DOE has heard any of the public's concerns. Some people explain it all with conspiracy theories. Some of us have demonstrated the ability to serve as a "community regulatory/monitoring agency."

DOE should not plan to conduct on-going operations while conducting cleanup. There is no point to cleaning the site up if they are simultaneously re-contaminating the place. They should remove anything that poses national security concerns and then wait to finish cleanup until after the site is ready to shut down all operations.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
– *there are three of these already – but they are underutilized*
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – *particularly pictures. Pictures tell more than a thousand words. DOE should show the worst problems, it will enhance their credibility*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *Be careful not to talk over the heads of the public, their eyes will glaze over.*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
– *These can be intimidating. More interactive set-ups are better.*
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – *These sound like what DTSC has been doing lately, roundtable discussions*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *I would like to be on one of these. The Working Group may have run its course. Maybe a more fluid, less formal discussion would be more helpful.*

Notes on all of the above: Tell the truth. Don't bury any information. Another idea might be billboards.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Stop lying. Start engaging people. Be transparent.

Engage the activist community. We are providing more information to the public that DOE is. If they help ensure we are well informed, we will inform the public.

Attachment B, Interview 13.

Host a 3-5 day conference with an agenda. Lets get together and work this out.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

Ideally, DOE and the EPA would work together to establish the cleanup standards for the cleanup of SSFL. That doesn't seem possible. There have been years of Workgroup meetings with many angry people. The US EPA and DOE have disagreed publicly on many occasions. DOE will say we are meeting the federal cleanup standards and EPA will say no you are not, and DOE will say yes we are and EPA will say no you are not. Back and forth. But the public trusts EPA a lot more than they trust DOE. There have been years of mistrust. DOE seems to be looking for the least costly and quickest solution to get the cleanup done. The public doesn't seem to be satisfied with that standard. They would like more a stringent standard and believe the cleanup should be complete and thorough regardless of the cost and schedule. The public expects DOE to do what is necessary to be protective of human health.

It is not clear what risk standards will apply for the cleanup of Area IV. Will the cleanup comply with SB 990 and result in trucking large quantities of contamination off-site? Federal standards or state standards? Who will make the decision and will it be based on the public's interest or on political interests?

DOE will always be fighting the trust factor. They just recently found radionuclides in the Area I Burn Pit. How did they get there? Some contamination has migrated to other areas of SSFL or even off-site. DOE says that no contamination has migrated off-site. They should be willing to do the sampling necessary to prove that assertion. Some things have been dumped where they don't belong. There wasn't supposed to be asbestos and antimony in a creek bed. There is a long history of finding stuff where it wasn't supposed to be. If they want us to believe that there is no contamination left at SSFL, they should be willing to share their records of where that contamination went, how it was cleaned up and where it is now. Final disposition of all contamination that was ever generated on the SSFL should be documented so that the public knows where it went.

There are national security considerations. No one wants them to jeopardize national security. But they need to disclose what they can. Failing to disclose just feeds the conspiracy theorists.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Many of the stakeholders have websites that are packed with publications. DOE should be familiar with all the information that is out there in the public domain. California DTSC has a lot of documents. Rocketdynewatch.org and cleanuprocketdyne.org. DOE should also talk to retired employees. They have first-hand knowledge, institutional knowledge about what happened. DOE should be overly cautious and thorough.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE's presence in the public eye has not been consistent.

DOE might learn from DTSC. DTSC has had some success in conducting less formal discussions in their community Workgroup. They host informal meetings where people work together. A lot of information is disclosed, communication is more open, and the meetings are less confrontational. The setting is more focused on dialogue and less formally structured. DTSC was interested in having the opportunity to work with the public in a more collaborative

manner. Susan Callery has done a wonderful job of getting people together. DTSC often has 3 or even 4 public participation specialists in the room for the meetings and they go smoothly. My observation is that trust is increasing and a working relationship is emerging. Some of the activists are providing real, helpful information to the agencies.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE needs to be willing to go beyond the minimum requirements. Maybe they should consider releasing the Draft EIS in sections as they are completed, to give the public time to review and digest each section. An EIS is such a big document. It is a lot to review and digest during a 45-day public comment period. DOE really needs to provide enough time for the public to review the documents. This might mean more work, but it would go better.

DOE needs to fully disclose all relevant information.

DOE needs to comply with the spirit or intent of NEPA, not just the requirements. It is not a checklist. They need to run an open, inclusive process. They need to be forthcoming.

The public could also help DOE figure out who should be on the mailing/distribution list for the EIS.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public has been very involved for a very long time. DOE should review all reasonable alternatives that would accomplish the cleanup standards that are established. The preferred alternative should be the most comprehensive, most protective alternative. If DOE were to prepare the EIS without the benefit of public participation, they would likely select the least protective as it would be the least costly. Frankly, the EIS should not even consider alternatives that are not protective.

A full characterization/radiation survey is needed before the EIS can even proceed.

The state and federal regulators should be involved in developing the alternatives that will be evaluated. The Air Pollution Control Board should be involved.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should evaluate the impacts that the public cares about – health impacts.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. They public should receive regular progress updates. The public could have a role in on-going environmental surveillance and monitoring after the cleanup is complete.

Attachment B, Interview 14.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
– *DOE should establish these in many more libraries, including Thousand Oaks, Agoura Hills, the Oak Park area, Ventura County Government Center, Westlake Village, Simi Valley, Calabasas, West Hills or Chatsworth*
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – *all reference documents should be available on the Internet*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
– *only as needed*
- k. Public open houses – *these could be helpful but not as helpful as workshops*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis - *This is what DTSC has been doing and its working really well.*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – *these should be made available on line or in the libraries*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

See above. All could be useful.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE needs to work in cooperation with EPA and the state regulators. They need to consult with the knowledgeable publics. They need to have a strategy for regular and genuine outreach with elected officials. They need to talk to former employees to capture the institutional knowledge before it is lost.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

DOE should not allow Boeing to conduct environmental monitoring work. They have had too many violations in the past.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

DOE needs to fully consider all of the operations and all of the problems they have had over the years. They need to do a thorough review of all of the historical documents. They need to present everything they learn to the public so that the public has a good, solid understanding of the information considered and the current condition. The public needs to have a good understanding of what DOE is dealing with. "Honesty is crucial to building trust."

During discussions with a representative from Boeing, he said over and over, that he had no idea where the contaminant detected at elevated concentrations in the storm water runoff could be coming from here. Then a cleanup document for a nearby (upstream) area of contamination was submitted for public comment and that contaminant detected at elevated concentrations during storm water monitoring was listed as a contaminant of concern at the cleanup site. The technical people from the various facilities/organizations (Boeing NPDES permitting personnel, Boeing site assessment and cleanup personnel and DOE personnel) don't appear to talk to each other. The folks with knowledge of the NPDES monitoring historically did not consider the data collected during assessments and cleanup operations. All of the information available must be considered.

Review of historical documents will provide a more thorough understanding. A lot of the newer employees just plain don't know what happened before their time. All documents related to a particular area or facility should be kept together.

The other thing about SSFL is that so many community members know so much about the site. There are a number of people who have historical documents, photos, and who know former employees. They have a very thorough understanding of the site.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Nothing specific. They should probably take a look at the storm-water runoff data from the Water Board outfalls, outfalls 3-7, and any other surface water sampling that has been done.

Some cleanup of soils (including organic, inorganic, and radiological) may have occurred already. But contamination can show up in storm-water and shallow groundwater even after cleanup has occurred.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE has gotten better. They have started showing up again. When they were absent, it left a "horrible, gaping hole." It was easy to blame them when they weren't there to defend themselves. It was suspicious, just the fact that they weren't there.

The DOE representatives onsite handle questions about DOE operations and decisions very well. It seems like DOE starting to listen.

One thing that DOE used to do is schedule their meetings on the same day (same time) as Workgroup meetings. The public had to choose which meeting to attend. It was "atrocious."

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should try to provide the full and honest explanation of what has happened and the location of potential contaminants. They need to thoroughly review all historical documents. Once the public feels that DOE has disclosed the full extent of the problem, they will feel included, and they will feel like they are being given an opportunity to help decide how to clean up.

When the public is confident that their input will be considered, that DOE will consider what is good for the community, the situation will improve.

Everyone needs to focus on protecting public health and the environment.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should offer the public an opportunity to suggest other alternatives. The public appears to have bought off on the idea that the site will be used for a park in the future. At least DOE won't have to argue about future use.

At a minimum, DOE should evaluate alternate standards of cleanup.

DOE should probably explain the alternatives it has already identified, give the public time to digest those ideas, and then let them weigh in on those ideas.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The scoping document should outline what will likely be considered. The public can then make suggestions for additional issues that should be considered.

DOE needs to be prepared to evaluate the ideas that are submitted by the public. DOE should be expected to explain why it chooses not to consider something that has been suggested by the public.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

Of course, the public will want to comment on the draft EIS. People will want to hear what others have to say about the document.

The public will want a role long after the EIS has been completed. The public would probably like to have a role in monitoring the effectiveness of the cleanup. DOE will need to be able to answer questions that come up as the cleanup is implemented. The public would likely want know more about shipments that leave the site, like when and how DOE will be moving contamination, how it will be covered, and the dangers the shipments will pose to the community.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – *but only if it is staffed by someone who can answer questions, not have to get back to the caller*
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – *maybe this could be combined with newsletters*
- f. Periodic newsletters – *maybe this could be combined with fact sheets*
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – *at the site*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis. – *The pro of this idea is that people could have a say early on in the decision-making process. The con is that DOE shouldn't imply that the public can have a say unless they can follow through on the promise*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – *only if there is an opportunity to ask questions too*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *there are already too many going on. This could create the potential that not everyone will have the same information.*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Opportunity to review and comment on documents

Tours/open house with technical people

Telephone hotline – is someone could answer questions

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE really is doing pretty well. They appear to be listening. They are answering questions. They are entering into a dialogue. They are approachable.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My biggest concern is that DOE will only be looking at Area IV. In previous years, the site owners didn't care what belonged to whom, and as a consequence things were dumped and buried all over the place, very haphazardly, without regard for where they were supposed to go. Two people were killed disposing of materials awhile back. They are now finding ordnance all over the place. There needs to be a full site characterization of the entire SSFL.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE needs to look at information other than that which is provided by Boeing. The site has been there a long time. They need to consider all possible sources of information. They need to get testimony from former employees because a lot of their knowledge has not been documented. But mostly, they need to understand that the public won't trust the information if the only source of information is Boeing.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE has taken a lot of shortcuts in the past. They don't dig deeply enough for information and they rely too heavily on their contractor. They take their contractor's word for it.

In the past, DOE underestimated the community's knowledge and the community's passion. DOE's actions have left the impression that they do not take the community's concerns and interests to heart. The community is not just interested in the data, but how the data was collected, the sampling methods, who did the sampling, and the standards that they are using for background, for both chemical and radiological contamination.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should cast a wide net, as wide as they can. A lot more people are interested in this site than most people realize.

They need to announce meetings well in advance. They need to tell the public what they will be doing and when. They need to post invitations to the meetings in the Daily News, the LA Time, and the Ventura County Star – maybe even in a Simi Valley paper. The people will need to be notified of every single thing they do.

DOE should ask the two websites (rocketdynewatch.org and cleanuprocketdyne.org) to help spread the word.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 16.

The public needs to be included in the discussion about the alternatives that will be evaluated. DOE needs to go beyond the minimum. What's the point of doing scoping if DOE isn't going to pay attention to what the public says?

DOE will finish the cleanup someday and go away. But the community will still be there. The community is already worried about high cancer rates. They would like to stop worrying about that. A thorough cleanup would allow the community to stop worrying.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public should have a role.

DOE needs to adopt the highest standards for ongoing protection of public health. The community's health must be protected.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public will want to participate during the public comment period on the draft EIS. DOE should provide a meaningful opportunity to comment on the document.

The public will be interested in participating in the cleanup program through the implementation of the cleanup. DOE might want to consider setting up a citizen environmental monitoring team, maybe 5-7 people, who can keep an eye on the cleanup for the broader community.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – *Maybe quarterly during implementation of the cleanup so people can watch the progress*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information

Attachment B, Interview 16.

- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *These would be good for the folks who are more well informed*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *the transcript provides a record. Knowing that a court reported is there makes everyone tell the truth*
- k. Public open houses – *those do not go over well in this community. People can't hear what others are saying and they can't learn together. This community likes to learn together, to share what they have learned*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – *for the more interested folks*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – *for those with technical expertise*
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group. *The design would be difficult. Who would choose who would sit on the group? People in this community don't like the idea of any meetings being held in secret or behind closed doors. This idea might have potential but it might be ill-advised. The SSFL Workgroup is such an advisory group already. Maybe they could ask those same people (from the public) to be part of a larger group of, say, several more people (see names under # 11 below) that would include all those most interested/involved in the cleanup issues for the community.*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

DOE should do as much as it can.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should presume the public is knowledgeable, intelligent, and worthy of respect. DOE should listen to everyone, not just Boeing.

Everyone agrees about the importance of the cleanup, so we should be working together to improve public health.

DOE *should* ask Gregg Dempsey of the EPA's Las Vegas shop for help in doing a broad site characterization of the on-site radiation before they even start this document.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

DOE should do a deep, thorough, broad investigation and cleanup. DOE shouldn't worry about how much it would cost. Boeing should be made to pay for what DOE can't afford.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susan Field Laboratory?

I am concerned about DOE willingness to be responsive to the public concerns. The public is the constituent base, but I have not seen DOE be responsive to the public in the past.

In addition, it appears that DOE is violating the agreement they have with the EPA regarding how risks are supposed to be calculated. It was my understanding that DOE would use methodology under CERCLA for evaluating risks in conducting cleanup, but they are not doing that. The upshot is that there will be less "dig and haul." The less material that is removed, the less comfortable the public will be with the cleanup. That posture is not responsive to the public's concerns.

DOE has always been welcome to attend the Work Group meetings. They used to attend, but they chose to stop attending some time ago. They are only recently attending again.

They have Historically conducted some public participation events very close in time to the Work Group meetings – which made it hard on the public that is interested in SSFL issues. It was seen as disrespectful towards the Work Group.

It is my understanding that for a long time the Work Group meetings were pretty bad. All parties behaved with a great deal of hostility towards each other. None of the agencies regularly demonstrated good communications skills. Recently, they have been much more civil. DOE is starting to attend again, which is good.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Not necessarily any documents. But I would suggest that DOE give consideration of anecdotal and other information. They should be talking to the stakeholders who have been involved for a very long time. They know a lot.

I had heard about Rocketdyne and Dan Hirsch for many years. He is extremely intelligent and he has been extremely knowledgeable about and involved in SSFL for over a decade. He is so frustrated with DOE and the other agencies. DOE treats Dan and other community members as if they have nothing significant to contribute. DOE should be asking Dan and the other Work Group members for information. It would be a shame if DOE didn't take advantage of the Work Group members' knowledge.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

"I am heartened that they have hired you to help them do a better job of public participation." Their public participation has been pretty dismal in the past.

DOE demonstrated a huge amount of arrogance when they issued the Finding of No Significant Impact for the Environmental Assessment and the results of the risk assessment. It was really pretty amazing, and done with such an unsympathetic attitude and in blatant disregard of the EPA/DOE policy agreement for DOE to follow CERCLA protocols for HHRA.

Thomas Johnson appears to be very good and very positive for improving public relations. I was not impressed with Stephanie Jennings. She came to one Work Group meeting. She appeared to be very stilted in her responses to questions. She cut Thomas off and corrected

his response. But she did not give straight answers, which felt like she did not have any respect for the Work Group. Her answers were evasive, obfuscating, and defensive. It appeared that they (Thomas and Stephanie) were not on the same page. So, even though it felt like DOE was getting better, Stephanie left everyone feeling the opposite. She was asked if the Work Group would be provided an opportunity to participate in the EIS and she responded that the “public” would have an opportunity. She implied that the Work Group would not be treated in any way differently from anyone else. The Work Group members have been involved for so long, their concerns have been ignored for so long, it was a very disrespectful way to respond to the Work Group.

4. What do you think DOE’s objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should make every effort to make the decisions in a transparent manner. They should demonstrate a willingness to be responsive to community concerns with concrete actions and changes in approach where appropriate. They are a federal agency with limitations, but they should just clearly explain the constraints they face. In the past, they have given the impression that they are just trying to save money. The public understands that cost is a consideration, but DOE is still responsible for cleaning up. DOE should not cut corners on the cleanup.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

In this case, the interested and involved public trusts Dan Hirsch. He should be invited to help frame the alternatives that will be evaluated. He is very technically astute, and “by the way, very well-connected politically.” The public that attends the Work Group meetings trust Dan Hirsch.

In any case, the public should be provided an opportunity to participate in constructive discussions with DOE to develop the alternatives. DOE should do more than the minimum requirement for public meetings. The process should be iterative with multiple opportunities for the public to participate. Of course, such meetings should be facilitated by someone who knows how to handle difficult discussions among strong personalities.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

In the same manner as I described for the development of alternatives. The public participation process should be iterative. The decision making process should be transparent. DOE should strive to develop cooperative relationships with the interested public. People have been concerned about SSFL for a long time. They have been actively involved for a long time. They should be invited to participate and treated with respect.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

In the same manner as for scoping. The public participation process should involve frequent, iterative opportunities to participate. For this to be effective, however, DOE will have to

Attachment B, Interview 17.

demonstrate that they are listening. They must demonstrate the ability to be responsive to public concerns.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – *this would be a low cost method*
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – *absolutely. But DOE has resisted putting some documents here in the past. They have short hours, sometimes the documents are hard to find or missing. It is hard to make copies of the documents. DOE should consider making copies of the more important documents for the most interested/involved member of the public.*
- d. Periodic informational briefings – *Not sure – but DOE should provide briefings for the Work Group*
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) - *absolutely*
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – *DOE should make reference documents available on line*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – *not everyone should be invited to these – but they should be made available for people who are interested and with a more sophisticated understanding of the technical issues who can understand the information presented*
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *Public meetings are good in general depending how they are conducted. Use a court reporter ONLY if they are required (people behave differently in this sort of setting). All of the DOE personnel who participate need to be trained in more effective communication, including risk communication.. DOE needs to have a person at meetings and interacting with the public who is trained, comfortable, and empowered to speak for the organization. The DOE team needs to commit some time to being better prepared for interacting with the community, including thinking about tough questions and appropriate answers before being in the public eye. Just because someone knows the technical answers doesn't mean they should be presenting in public, or be the point person.*
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.

Attachment B, Interview 17.

- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *this would not be well received after the many years that the Work Group members have been attending those meetings*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Smaller meetings (rather than large public meetings)
- Iterative opportunities to be involved (not just one meeting every so often)
- Techniques that would allow the building of relationships
- Use the right people (DOE) - those who know how to work with the public

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

No

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My biggest concern is DOE's transparency. They should complete the EIS as efficiently and expeditiously as possible without compromising the quality. If they are going to restrict the analysis to Area IV, they need to explain why in a manner that addresses the public's concerns. Senator Feinstein led legislative action to allocate \$13 million for conducting a radiation survey. I understand there are now questions about whether the money is available to do that work. Where is the money? DOE needs to do what the federal judge told them to do. The grassroots organizations keep track of commitments and DOE needs to follow through.

There is such a complex relationship of owners and leasing relationships at SSFL. The successions in corporate ownership are confusing.

EPA has taken a lead in the past for coordinating and collaboration on the cleanup. They need to be involved in the radiological survey.

The site needs to be cleaned up to the highest standard by the most responsible party. The federal agency needs to be in the lead.

DOE needs to provide a full rationale for each of its determinations.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE should look at everything. They should look at official correspondence between members of Congress, the EPA, and DOE. There is a paper trail and they need to be aware of what's in the paper trail. They need to look at every promise they have made, every assurance they have made. They should also review the press coverage.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

We've heard that the public has been frustrated in the past. We understand that DOE is unwilling to cleanup to the highest standards. The full radiation survey would show where they need to focus their attention.

There has been a resistance to involve stakeholders in the past.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE needs to make every effort to go beyond the minimum requirements.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 18.

The public needs to have a significant role in defining the range of alternatives. When a federal agency only evaluates a set of pre-determined alternatives, that can be a source of frustration.

The face of the agency – whoever is representing the agency in the public's eye – needs to be able to answer questions. The public want to be able to get answers to their questions.

The representatives of the agency who are working with the public need to have the authority to make decisions. Those who have the authority to make decisions need to listen to what the public has to say.

Every time DOE presents something to the public (like PowerPoint presentations and posters), they need to give the public a take-away document. Something they can take home and study.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public needs to have a significant role in defining the issues that will be evaluated.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public needs to have a significant role throughout the entire EIS process and the cleanup process. The public needs an opportunity to provide ongoing oversight for this effort. The role needs to continue through the foreseeable future.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *The transcripts need to be made available in the reading rooms*

Attachment B, Interview 18.

- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Continuing communication through briefings and newsletters

Transparency – make everything available so the public can understand the rationale for everything

Take-away documents. Maybe DOE should start with a fact sheet on the NEPA process.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

There was a joint federal/state EIS done for a veterans hospital that did a great job of public participation. It involved the US Department of Veterans Affairs and the California Department of General Services. The state folks did an excellent job. They hired the Consensus Planning Group to do the public participation: www.consensusp.com

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My primary concern would be that DOE won't be transparent or inclusive. They should not let past experiences with specific individuals affect how they will approach the EIS. They should not discount the input such individuals would provide, however.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Nothing specific.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE was active in the Workgroup and then, for whatever reason, they stopped going. I am glad to see that they have rejoined the Workgroup and I am glad to see that the other members of the Workgroup were receptive to allowing them a seat at the table again.

I think looking ahead is more important (than remembering what has been done wrong in the past). DOE does appear to be making progress.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should strive for early public involvement, meaningful public involvement. They should provide adequate notice to allow the public to participate. They should address the public's concerns, not just listen and then ignore those concerns.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The stickler will be the level of cleanup that is accomplished, particularly for the radiological contamination. DOE should look at cleaning up more completely than they have been willing to consider in the past. They need to adopt more stringent cleanup standards to address the public's concerns.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public should have an opportunity to identify all the issues that should be evaluated. The public is particularly interested in potential off-site impacts. Accordingly, the EIS should evaluate the potential off-site impacts of each alternative.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a

public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have more than one opportunity to provide input. DOE should go beyond the minimum requirements. They should host a series of workshops and have extended public comment periods. They need to make sure that all public participation opportunities are well advertised. The public needs to be well informed throughout the entire process, through implementation of the cleanup program.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – *DOE should have a good website providing access to all technical documents*
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – *when appropriate*
- k. Public open houses – *these can have some value*
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – *these can have value*
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – *the Workgroup is really just a few people. DOE might want their own group so they can get a broader cross-section of the community*

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

“All of the possible activities would have some benefit. DOE probably can’t do them all. The biggest suggestion I can make is that DOE should avoid trying to sell their version of the story.

Attachment B, Interview 19.

They should make every effort not to appear to be promoting their perspective. In addition, there are two distinct publics at SSFL - one group that is really well informed and quite technically proficient and another group that is not well informed. DOE may want to consider addressing the needs of both groups."

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should try to include everyone, try to reach out to the entire community. DOE should also try to coordinate with the other agencies, like DTSC and the Water Board. The agencies don't always agree on everything, but most everyone would agree to a common objective – to clean up the SSFL so that it can be safe for the current and future generations.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My biggest concern is that DOE will walk away again. They have a history of becoming very active, then backing off, getting engaged again, then backing off again. I understand that they are under the judge's orders now, and that the activists can be very difficult to deal with. Boeing has learned the hard way to be more open with the public. I think DOE will benefit from taking that sort of stance consistently. But I am afraid they will open the discussion with the public, then walk away again, disappoint everyone again.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Discussion surrounding the negotiations between Boeing and the State to convert the SSFL property to open space/public parks has illuminated a fracture in the environmental activist community. I think everyone agrees that this is a good idea. But there has been dissension in the activist community about the timing for this to occur. Some activists don't think this should happen until the entire SSFL is fully cleaned up and ready for release; I think the date that has been thrown around is around 2025. Other activists feel that it would be more appropriate to turn over portions of the site as they become available – which would potentially mean much earlier. In the past, the activist community has been unified behind a specific person or organization. They are not unified on this issue, which is making the negotiations difficult.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

Many of the public officials are used to going out in the public and getting beat up in front of crowds. DOE hasn't demonstrated that ability. They have been confrontational, well perhaps that's not the right word. They have been aggressive in expressing their viewpoints, in arguing with those that don't agree with them. They take it too personally. They should understand that not everyone is going to agree with them and learn how to take their lumps and go back to their work. They have a new representative who has been going to SSFL Workgroup meetings and he seems to be handling this better than others.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should strive for full disclosure. They should establish a proper timeline, one that will provide an adequate opportunity for the public to comment, and make sure that the public comment periods are well advertised. In the past, DOE has tried to have very short public comment periods. And they have not done a good job of making sure the public knows when public comment periods will end. We have had to scramble to complete our comments on time. DOE has had to extend their public comment periods before. They will save themselves a lot of headaches if they just do it right: have long enough public comment periods and make sure the public knows when they will end.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

I think DOE should develop a reasonable range of alternatives, alternatives that are technically feasible. They should present those alternatives and let the public react to them. Then they should incorporate the public’s comments into the alternatives to the extent that they are able to.

If they let the public develop the alternatives, there is very little chance that those alternatives would actually be workable.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

The public should have a role in developing the cleanup standards.

The public should not be allowed to decide which impacts are appropriate. If the public prefers cleanup to a higher standard, that will mean that more material will have to be removed. The public cannot demand cleanup to higher standards, then object to the material having to be transported off-site.

Awhile back, the public objected to the analysis that Boeing did that demonstrated that cleaning up to a higher standard would likely result in traffic accidents and deaths. The public scoffed at the analysis that showed more people would be harmed if a higher cleanup standard was used. Reducing the amount of contamination that will remain will require transportation. The public can’t have it both ways.

The more important role for the public is in determining the cleanup standards. Once the standards are determined, DOE will have to implement the cleanup to those standards – and there will be impacts on the community.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should have a public comment period following release of the Draft EIS. DOE should give the public enough time to review the document and should seriously consider the comments that are received.

The public will likely want to stay involved even after the comment period on the Draft EIS.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – these already exist

Attachment B, Interview 20.

- d. Periodic informational briefings – the public would likely appreciate these
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV – If DOE were willing to allow these, they would be well received
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – Of course
- i. Detailed technical presentations – The activists would probably appreciate these, but the general public wouldn't (their eyes would glaze over)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – As needed, perhaps quarterly or semi-annually
- k. Public open houses – These could be done as part of the formal public meetings
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – These would probably go over really well with the general public, the community members, particularly if they were focused on the impacts on the community
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – For those well informed activists
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group - DOE might see if it could work with the existing SSFL Workgroup, ask them for advice. If that wouldn't work, DOE might want to form their own advisory group. There would probably be a lot of interest in this idea

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Open houses for sharing information followed by an opportunity for the public to provide formal comments
- Community workshops, including ones for community members to help figure out how to mitigate impacts on the community and ones for more technically oriented folks to help DOE set cleanup standards
- Something that hasn't been mentioned. DOE needs to reach out to the business community, chambers of commerce, local elected officials. They won't participate in the same meetings that the activists attend. DOE needs to make a separate effort to engage these folks.

Attachment B, Interview 20.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Don't give up part way through. Stick it out and follow through with the public engagement. Be consistent.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

DOE has been dragging their feet for so long, doing as little as possible, caving in to Boeing. It is already so toxic up there that it might not even be possible to clean it up. No one knows if DOE has fully disclosed what has occurred there.

I am concerned that DOE won't be truthful. The original owners up there, the ones who are responsible for what went on up there, were never truthful.

There have been a lot of deaths. The government and the corporations have denied responsibility. They say that it cannot be proven that they caused the problems.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

The run-off, both surface water and groundwater, should be tested. They have denied the fact that everything flows downhill. Not just the creeks, but groundwater flows downhill as well. They should not overlook that reality.

We have identified groundwater contamination on our property, but I can't prove it because I can't get anyone to test it.

There have been so many people with thyroid problems, with cancers. But DOE just says it can't be proven that they caused the problems.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

In the past, DOE has not provided adequate notice of public meetings. They have allowed conflicting schedules for public meetings that are on related topics.

DOE has been very secretive about things that people have observed. People have witnessed trucks and helicopters leaving SSFL, carrying loads that are potentially contaminated, but DOE won't explain what is being transported away.

They have also ignored peoples' comments about discharges. People have witnessed large flows of water through creek beds, in the middle of summer, in creek beds that have been dry for months and there has been no precipitation. Questions have been ignored.

There has been very little, if any, testing or monitoring of air quality, of water quality, across the valley.

They talk as if the site is isolated, so isolated that it could not pose a threat to anyone. But they are on top of a mountain. Everything flows downhill. We are downhill.

DOE treats the public as if they are a nuisance, and doesn't respond to their requests.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

Be truthful.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I don't know.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

They could send out questionnaires and ask people what they think. Everyone around here is potentially impacted. The entire San Fernando Valley and Simi Valley are potentially impacted. That means millions of people. Most of those people never knew the potential danger when they moved here.

Realtors make you sign a disclosure when you buy property within three miles. I had no idea what the implications were. No one told me, told the public, what was really going on up there.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should write the EIS so the public can read it, understand it. If an average person, who is not a scientist and not a bureaucrat, can't read it, we won't be able to understand it. Maybe DOE should prepare two versions of the EIS, one for the technical people and the other for the rest of us. Both versions should be made available to everyone. People could request the version they want. The one for the public should not include any jargon or bureaucratic language.

After the EIS is done, DOE could convene an oversight committee. There are a lot of very interested people surrounding SSFL, who could be very helpful. This group could watch over the implementation of the cleanup program. They could help keep the public informed, explain things in a way that the public would understand. They could act as a liaison between the public and DOE.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents

Attachment B, Interview 21.

- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – These should be simple and readable for the general public
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV – These could be good if they could be run without jeopardy to people’s health, if people could be protected
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations – These might be good for people who already know a lot, for a very focused audience
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – I don’t think they need to go that route
- k. Public open houses – There might not be a lot of participation in those
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – People have been asking for this all along.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- A Citizen Advisory Group
- Fact sheets that are written for the public and very widely distributed
- Public tours

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Nothing that I haven’t already said

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

West Hills is a neighborhood with very desirable properties. If people knew what had happened at SSFL, they would be concerned about the potential impact on their property values. A lot of people probably don't want to know.

People want to live up here because of the great views, but they don't know the risks. The city is so pro-development. Development has encroached on SSFL, but it isn't safe. The development should be stopped. DOE should not allow new developments, like the Dayton Canyon Centex development, to occur.

My home was brand new when we bought it in 1994. We had to sign a disclosure because we were within a three-mile radius of SSFL. We didn't know what had gone on up there. I knew they had tested rocket engines up there. I thought it was pretty neat. They had tested the engines used in for space exploration! But I didn't know about the resulting toxicity. I didn't know the risks associated with living so close. It is scary.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

None. But, if I have any concern it's about DOE's capability to use the information that they have been provided.

This has been going on for years. The activists will keep doing everything they can to set the agenda; they want to be in control.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

That the loudest voices are the activists. The general public does not participate. The general public chooses not to participate. Maybe they don't care. Maybe they don't believe the stories about the contamination. Maybe they don't want to attend the public meetings because they don't want to be around the activists.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should try (make every attempt to) to offer information to the general public. They should try to inform (provide accurate information to) neighborhood councils and the newspapers. The Acorn is a good local newspaper that a lot of people read because it is free and usually delivered to them once a week. However, it has also been used by the activists as a forum for their concerns.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I think they should be given the opportunity to participate.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Provide an opportunity to participate.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 22.

The public should have an opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS.

DOE should hold a public meeting after the decision has been made to explain their decision. They should present their decision and its rationale.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters – that would not be necessary
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) No
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – Those would be even better than the formal public meetings. They would provide an opportunity to open dialogue.
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – That might be a good idea, but if only the activists participated, it would not serve DOE well
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – DOE could convene an advisory group to provide advice that they need

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Open houses
- Tours
- Advisory group

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Know when to stop. Don't give up your legitimate authority to make decisions. The public doesn't know what you know.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I am concerned about the coordination between Boeing's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) compliance program and the EIS. There are two aspects of this potential lack of coordination.

First, I am concerned that the methods/techniques that are used to evaluate data for the EIS will be different from the approved methodology we are using to comply with RCRA. We are preparing documents to support our compliance with RCRA using a methodology that was negotiated with the Department of Toxic Substances Control. If a different methodology is required for the EIS, then it will create a potential inconsistency in the data that is used and/or the way that data is collected and analyzed. Any inconsistency between the two will create the potential for confusion among stakeholders and could hurt our credibility. For example, we must prepare risk assessments for the various chemicals that calculate the threat posed by those chemicals to human health and ecological receptors. If the EIS shows different risks associated with those same chemicals, it will create confusion and erode credibility. The EIS would ideally use the same historical data set, analytical methods for newly collected samples, and risk assessment methodologies. We want to make sure that we are comparing apples to apples.

It is hard enough for the public to understand the risks associated with SSFL. Technical people are not particularly good at communicating with the public. Take for example, arsenic. The mere fact that we find it does not necessarily mean that it poses a health risk. We need to know what the concentrations are and how they compare to naturally occurring background concentrations. There may also be no mechanism for exposure of chemicals humans or ecological receptors. In other words, just because it is there doesn't mean that it is posing any kind of risk. If the conceptual site characterization for the EIS is handled differently than we have been doing for compliance with RCRA, it will provide an opportunity for confusion and the appearance of inconsistencies.

A second concern relates to schedule. Boeing has a schedule for the RCRA program that was negotiated with the Department of Toxic Substances and Control. The entire SSFL was divided into groups for the purposes of compliance with RCRA; and four groups are relevant to the cleanup of Area IV. Groups 5 and 6 include portions of Area IV as well as some portions of other Areas. Groups 7 and 8 are entirely within Area IV. Remedial Feasibility Investigations (RFIs) have been prepared for Groups 6 and 8 and have been submitted to DTSC for approval; we have not received their comments yet. The RFIs for Groups 5 and 7 are not due to DTSC until November 2008 and June 2009 (respectively). It concerns me some that the data gap analysis process the DOE contractor is using is not considering all of the sampling being conducted for the RFI program for Groups 5 and 7, therefore may be requiring duplicative sampling.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

We have 5 different databases that contain historical site documents or analytical data, which have been provided to DOE. They include historical information related to potential contamination on site, radiological as well as chemical, maps and photographs and hundreds of thousands of documents. We believe we have given everything to DOE that could possibly be applicable. We sincerely hope they can incorporate it all into their EIS development.

Attachment B, Interview 23.

On occasion, we hear that stakeholders are concerned about actions taken by former employees that may not have been documented. Of course, not every single thing every employee ever did during their standard work day was documented. But we honestly believe that almost everything that has happened up here which could have caused significant release of contaminants to the environment has been documented to the best of our abilities. When we hear specific things, like something was dumped in a specific location, we spend hours and hours doing everything we can to figure out if what we have heard is document somewhere and what can be learned about it. One thing that is hard for people to understand is that some things were done in the past because those processes were standard at the time, or considered acceptable. We may know now that a particular chemical can risk human health and should be handled in a specific way. Of course, I wasn't here then, but I can't believe that past practices were informed by ill intent.

One result is that we have a lot of documents. Some documents are business information, like invoices for purchases we have made and whatever. So, some documents are not really very helpful. Altogether, we have several thousand documents that we do believe are relevant and they have all been provided to DOE.

Of course, many of our documents are not necessarily easy for the public to review. They weren't written for a non-technical public audience. In fact, many of our documents were written for purposes associated with compliance with regulatory oversight. Communicating appropriately for technical experts and scientists is not the same as communicating properly for the public. The general public may have a hard time understanding many of our documents.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I don't really know that much about how DOE has conducted public participation in the past. But based on the situation we are in, it would be hard to believe that we have done as good a job as we could have.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should try to satisfy enough members of the public that they can proceed with the cleanup program.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public should be able to have a say in the overall list of possible alternatives, and should have the opportunity to review the alternatives recommended by the technical experts and weigh in on them. However, it seems that it would be best to let the experts select the most appropriate technology. Boeing hires experts to do that for us already; as we are not necessarily experts on the technology options and believe having third party experts recommending the best approaches will result in the best opportunity to chose the best path forward. They are getting paid for their expertise and their objectivity. It is in their best interest to make sound recommendations to us. If we give the public the opportunity to direct the selection of the technologies that will be employed for cleanup, that could end up biasing the

Attachment B, Interview 23.

selection of the technology and could result in a technology that is not the best choice to clean up the site. It is in everyone's best interest to select the most appropriate technology that will be the most effective in reducing risks of contamination risking human health or the environment.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public should have an opportunity to review the list of issues that will be evaluated and respond to that list. Scoping is the best time to identify the list of issues for evaluation. The public could help us understand how implementation of the alternatives might affect them.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to review and comment on the document.

The public could have a role in overseeing implementation of the cleanup program if they were interested in that role. Of course, they would have to be willing to comply with health and safety procedures. We don't want them to trespass and we don't want them to put themselves at risk. There are other hazards at SSFL than the chemical and radiological contaminants. We have rattlesnakes and poison oak, for example. But assuming the public can follow all the appropriate health and safety rules, and understand that the experts are in charge of the remediation and those experts are directing all the work.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) Unless these were focused on explaining the documents to folks who were interested in that

Attachment B, Interview 23.

- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
– But only as required
- k. Public open houses – I am not sure I could support these because, in my experience, the true public wouldn't show up, just the activists and they will just try to refute whatever is being presented
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – If the assignments are given are truly appropriate. It wouldn't be appropriate to make all decisions this way.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This would only work if it was designed very well, meaning that it would be composed of real members of the public and not just the activists

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Fact sheets/mailers/newsletters – information products that have been developed for the public
- Open houses – where we provide an opportunity for the public to talk with technical experts, but experts that are able to explain technical information in layman's terms

The most important thing is that DOE needs to try harder to provide information to the public that can be understood. We need to tell them what data we are using to support our conclusions, how that data was developed and what it means. We need to focus on their information needs. We should not expect the public to be able to review documents that have been prepared to meet the regulators needs.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Work harder to translate information into layman's terms. Try to alleviate concerns that are unfounded.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My biggest concern is that it won't satisfy the public, that it won't leave people believing that the site has been cleaned up. I don't know of anyone who has left the area because of concerns about SSFL. I do know of people who have chosen to buy homes elsewhere upon learning about SSFL. I have lived here a long time, and I have no concerns. But I think some people will never be satisfied.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They have done an excellent job. They have jumped through more hoops than they should have had to. They have been here for at least two decades and they have put up with a lot.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

It is not possible to please the activists, and DOE should not try to satisfy them. Most of the activists have a vested interest in opposing SSFL.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I do not always trust the government. DOE should present what they are planning to do, evaluate it, and see if the public has additional suggestions. DOE should provide an opportunity for folks to identify additional alternatives. DOE should retain the authority to decide which of the suggestions are really worthy of full consideration.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should present what they are planning to consider and see if the public has any additional suggestions.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should do no more than they are required to do by law. DOE will never be able to satisfy the activists any way.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
These are a waste of time
- k. Public open houses These are a waste of time
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group This would be worthwhile if it were really composed of citizens, not activists

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- On-line information
- Newsletters on the status of the project

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Conduct a limited number of public meetings. They are dominated by interest groups.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Attachment B, Interview 24.

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

There is some evidence that the contamination found on Centex property was planted there. It was found on top of leaves, but not under. And it could not be found again after it rained.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

There are current jurisdictional disputes regarding the potential for Superfund and agency involvement in the cleanup. The Federal DOE is preparing an EIS before THEY start the clean-up but the California DTSC claims they will supervise the clean-up. I don't know who would do a better job implementing the cleanup. I haven't been impressed with the state agencies so far and there is a clear reputational conflict of interest when the Federal DOE proposes to clean-up contaminations done under Federal contracts. I don't know who should decide.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

There is a deficiency of measurements that have been made in the past. They haven't measured often enough or adequately in the past. Should a cleanup be done in Area IV, the proposals for how that cleanup would proceed should be clear and understandable. The proposals should include testing methods (before, during and after the clean-up) verifying the adequacy of the cleanup. The proposals should be written so that the public can read them.

The appropriate agencies have not adequately identified the nature and extent of the contamination. That must be done before they can clean up.

There needs to be a contingency plan that would be implemented in the event that monitoring shows that the initial cleanup has not been effective, will not offer protection.

I understand that there is a significant amount of uranium occurring naturally in the Santa Susana Mountain.

Of course, there is naturally occurring radiation, but, the cleanup should remove "excessive" radiation that is naturally occurring as well as "man-made." Are there other naturally occurring hazards?

There is evidence that there are increased rates of malignancy around SSFL, of thyroid and other solid malignancies, lymphomas and other liquid malignancies and retinoblastomas in infants.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I have no specific knowledge of what DOE has been doing. It seems like I should know. I have been watching and participating. I should have head more, been more aware. DOE and other Federal agencies were invited to send someone to participate in the West Hills Neighborhood Council Ad Hoc Committee on Dayton Canyon and they didn't respond to the invitation. That group looked into the Dayton Canyon proposal and produced a 65-page report that is on file in the State, City & WHNC archives..

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should make every effort to provide accurate, complete, and understandable information for the public. Their goal will be to show us how the danger posed by the contamination will be

eliminated. A lot of people don't believe and will never believe they can do that. The information will have to be presented in a thorough manner to minimize the doubts of all.

DOE should remember the 1st Amendment. That amendment holds that the government cannot punish citizens just because they disagree with the government. We have a right to speak our piece (so as to maintain the peace).

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should be willing to be thorough. DOE should make every effort to demonstrate clarity, transparency, and thoroughness. They should make a convincing case that they will implement an effective cleanup. Success should be defined as making the public comfortable through assurances that DOE is doing what it is supposed to. The public's expectation is that their health and welfare will be protected. The public has a right and should be made aware of the decision process and decision of the federal agencies.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Some issues are scientific. Some members of the public may have scientific training and they may be able to contribute something of value. Many members of the “public” and, certainly, the WHNC will want to know the steps and proposals in the clean-up process. The DOE has a conflict of interest. They have been contracting the several operators of SSFL to do the work, and they are not trusted by the public.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The Draft EIS should be understandable. The public should have an opportunity to comment on the draft EIS. The scientific information that is presented in the Draft EIS should come from independent scientific sources.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets

Attachment B, Interview 25.

- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – But only if the tour participants are safe/protected
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) for those who can understand
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) DOE should consider the Brown Act – there is a specific definition of a formal public meeting in California. This should be chaired by someone who is skilled in parliamentary procedure.
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – but not is these are designed to try and change people's minds
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – It can be challenging to get membership that represents a full spectrum of expertise/biases.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Public meetings – where the decision maker actually attends and actually listens to the public. These should be run, if possible, in a manner that will allow dialogue to occur
- DOE should show evidence of their response to comments
- Position papers prepared by government experts and independent scientific experts. These should be written in language that can be understood by the public.
- Presentations on a periodic basis to the Neighborhood Councils, specifically West Hills Neighborhood Council in the case of the SSFL, because they have closer communication ties to the public.

To generalize, DOE should make every effort to get information out in every way possible.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

“Get down off your high horse.” Government agencies should show evidence that they recognize their responsibility to the people who entrust them to their governance. They should show us a willingness and ability to work with us, the public, to find possible solutions.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Attachment B, Interview 25.

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

In California, we have the Brown Act (Ralph M. Brown, 1967) which requires that every meeting that is convened by a government entity, including Neighborhood Council meeting, must include provisions for Public Comment. But “Public Comment” which is just “heard” but not appreciated, which is not followed by a meaningful response and which is not incorporated in the related report or decision is an insult to the public, an abuse of the public trust and a sad waste of everybody’s time.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

It feels to me like it is premature to be moving ahead with the EIS. We have an ongoing investigation for our Resource Conservation and Recovery Act compliance program. That program is 4-5 years from being done. We have not completed our investigations.

In addition, DOE only occupied a portion of Area IV. Boeing owns Area IV. What impacts might DOE's decisions about cleanup have on Boeing and our property? DOE was only a tenant. We may have issues and concerns that will not be considered. This could unduly influence the way that Boeing is able to use the property in the future.

The whole idea of DOE being self-regulating for radiological contamination is potentially a major obstacle. The public doesn't know how to get their heads around that one. I see that as an obstacle here. I understand why DOE wouldn't want to relinquish that authority, but it may not be helpful in the long run. The public doesn't trust them.

SSFL is a 3,000 acre site and the regulators see it as one contiguous site. Area IV is only a small portion of entire site. Making decisions for Area IV in isolation has the potential to dictate how things will be done on a much larger portion of the site. I am concerned that DOE will make decisions that will be inconsistent with Boeing's intentions for the rest of SSFL. It could impact how the regulators work with Boeing.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No – we have met with DOE several times. We have given them full access to a huge amount of data.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

It's hard to say. SSFL has been here a lot longer than I have. I don't understand everything that has occurred over the history of the place. I think DOE has a tendency to be overly influenced by the more radical activists. They think those activists are the public. They give the activists too deference.

DOE has some good messages, but they do not necessarily know how to communicate with the public. Just because someone has the technical expertise does not mean they have the communication skills. Often, there is a mismatch of skills. It might not be a good idea to have a spokesperson if that person does not have good communication skills. Some people are better than others in the context of a hostile crowd. Some people are better than others at thinking on their feet.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

Ultimately, the public must have an opportunity to comment on the EIS. In California, compliance creates an opportunity for confusion. Environmental Impact Reports, required by California EPA, are paid for by the proponent for a project and prepared by the regulatory agency – which means that generally there are two parties in an EIR. DOE is in both roles for

Attachment B, Interview 26.

the EIS, meaning that they are paying for and preparing the EIS. That gives an appearance of a conflict on interest. In retrospect, it may have made more sense to have EPA prepare the EIS. Its too late for that, but DOE needs to consider how satisfactory this process will be for the public; they are accustomed to having two different parties involved. It may reduce their confidence that the document will be objective and thorough.

The contractor preparing the EIS should have as much independence as possible. The public won't trust them if it appears that DOE is trying to influence them.

What we did on a similar project is we convened a panel of experts. We asked them to provide objective, expert advice and the panel members were selected based on their credentials, their reputations. None of them had ever worked for Boeing before. They are paid to sit on the panel but they are not Boeing employees so they are not seen as having a conflict of interest. Most of them are academics, so they have the credibility afforded to academics. Each of them has their own reputation, which is more important to them than the little bit of money that we are paying them. When they were first getting started, they solicited input from the broader public on the objectives for the project. Instead of asking the public to provide input directly to us, the public provides input to the expert panel. The public doesn't trust us, but the public does trust the panel. The panelists didn't inherit the public's distrust in us; they had their own credentials and they do not act defensively when the public comments.

Maybe there are parts of what we have done that could be replicated in this context. DOE might want to consider convening a similar panel to review the contractor's products and provide advice directly to contractor on the EIS. The panel could receive public input and then decide how to provide direction to the contractor in response to the public input.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The panel that I already mentioned could review the alternatives being suggested by the contractor, and ask for suggestions from the public. The panel could then take the public's suggestions and develop alternatives that could be considered.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The panel I already mentioned solicited input from the public on the issues that should be used to evaluate alternatives.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should do what they are required to do – solicit input from the public on the Draft EIS. The panel could provide ongoing oversight/direction that is independent of DOE. The panel could have their meetings out in the open, to allow public access to them.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – As long as it is clear to everyone that the person answering the phone won't be able to answer every question
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – Not enough people are interested to justify this
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – we already have these and it would not make sense not to continue using them
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – As required
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – this idea has very limited potential because of the already existing SSFL Workgroup

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Workshops
- Fact sheets
- Internet

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Take a hard look at getting good communicators on board who can deliver messages. Open, sincere, consistent, non-threatening, non-adversarial, not defensive

Attachment B, Interview 26.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I have been aware of SSFL since the 1960s. I graduated from Cal State Northridge, then moved to northern California for a number of years. When I moved back, I became aware of the pollution problems, the activities that had occurred up there, and how waste was handled.

My biggest concern is that the cleanup won't result in full cleanup, that it won't be comprehensive enough. The entire site has not been fully characterized – so how can the cleanup be comprehensive enough.

I am also concerned that DOE won't provide enough information to the public for the public to have a full understanding of the entire cleanup problem.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I don't know that much about Area IV – so I can't say.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

My feeling is that they have been pretty secretive. I really don't know that much, because I haven't been involved as long as some people have. But I have a general feeling that they haven't revealed everything that perhaps they should have.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I would rather see DOE err on the side of trying to do too much public participation than not enough. Too little won't engender trust, it won't be acceptable to the public, and it won't result in public belief that the cleanup has been thorough enough. The public wants a full and adequate cleanup. Extensive public involvement in the decision making process will give the public more confidence that the document is complete.

There is a concept from the legal field – it is called “draw the sting.” The concept is that if someone is guilty of something, that if they just come out and admit that, get it out in the open as soon as possible, then they aren't as guilty as if they hide what they have done. Said more simply – “draw the sting of unpleasant facts by reporting them yourself”. If DOE could approach the EIS by being blatantly truthful, providing full disclosure of what they have done, it would be better in the long run. The public might start to trust them again. The impression that everyone has right now is that DOE has hidden a lot of what went on up there. That just makes people angry and upset.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

The public should have an opportunity to make suggestions for alternatives to be considered. DOE should share what they are already thinking about to get the ideas flowing. But the public should have an opportunity to suggest additional ideas.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

The public should have an open opportunity to make suggestions after hearing what DOE has already identified.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Draft EIS.

The public would probably appreciate an opportunity to comment on the draft Record of Decision, if possible – a last chance to weigh in before the decision is final. The issues are so complex and people are so emotional that having a chance to comment on a draft Record of Decision may make it easier for everyone to accept the final decision.

The public might also be interested in having an opportunity to monitor implementation of the cleanup. This would give them the confidence that DOE is doing what the EIS says they should do.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – these are already in place. They may not be convenient locations for everyone.
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters

Attachment B, Interview 27.

- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) These would be very helpful, people are afraid of what they can't see and seeing is believing
- h. Internet tools for sharing information - absolutely
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) Some people are surprisingly knowledgeable about SSFL and they would probably appreciate having more detailed information and an opportunity to ask questions of experts
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) - Absolutely
- k. Public open houses – These would not work on their own but could be a nice addition to a formal public meeting – provide an opportunity for people to get answers to their questions before they make their formal comments
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – I support this idea 110%. Carefully designed, these would be very good. This sounds similar to what DTSC has been doing lately. A retired nuclear physicist could come and really have some great insight.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – Every document related to the EIS should be available on the Internet. It would be nice to have an opportunity to ask questions about some documents as well.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This is a positive idea. It would provide a mechanism for DOE to get routine input from citizens. Members would make a commitment to participate, spend time to learn, and then they would be routinely informed about the status, engaged throughout the development of the EIS. There might be problems with the existing Workgroup – but they could be invited to apply for membership. This could motivate the Workgroup to be more effective.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Tours
- Internet
- Formal public meetings
- Periodic review of technical documents
- Ongoing advisory group

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should recognize the potential benefit of apologizing, publicly, to those people who believe they have been harmed by DOE activities at the SSFL. Excuses and denials that people were harmed are not helpful. DOE could start with an acknowledgement of the harm that was done –

Attachment B, Interview 27.

even if that harm was unintentional. They could acknowledge the losses and the suffering. This would likely lead to more trust and goodwill, and better outcomes for all.

I would also suggest that DOE consider issuing a public apology to those who *MAY HAVE BEEN* injured or harmed by any possible past toxic releases. Such an apology could go a long way in bringing the DOE and the community closer together.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

DOE should consider all impacts from all activities that occurred in Area IV. The geographical context is critical. The site is on top of a mountain and the contamination goes downhill. The effects of the contamination in Area IV go offsite for quite a distance. All geographic areas that are contaminated by activities conducted in Area IV should be included in the cleanup of Area IV, although that may involve cleaning up a 5-mile (or more) radius around Area 4, including the Chatsworth Nature Preserve (the former Chatsworth Reservoir).

Chatsworth Reservoir may have been drained because SSFL contamination made it unfit for drinking. No one talks about it, but it is well known that SSFL caused the contamination. After the earthquake in the early 1970s, the LADWP said that the reservoir was structurally unsafe in an earthquake therefore the DWP did not refill it and took it out of service.

The land that remains is contaminated. It would be pointless to clean it up at this time because the contamination keeps coming. The LADWP doesn't allow the public in there now and the reservoir area (now a Nature Preserve) provides habitat for wildlife (birds, mammals, native plants, mountain lions and coyotes) including water fowl.

The former reservoir is owned by the LA Department of Water and Power. They restrict access to limit their liability. But it is the last remaining undeveloped land in the valley and there are pressures to release the land for development.

The entire 1,300 acre site is now named the Chatsworth Nature Preserve. It is the only nature preserve within LA city. A lot of people think it should be drained and cleaned, but it would be futile at this time because drainage into the Nature Preserve just keeps bringing contamination from SSFL.

The other point that DOE may wish to emphasize is that the public needs to be reminded of the historical context in which SSFL and DOE work was done. Work began at SSFL right after World War II to develop rockets. Many of the rockets that the US sent into space were tested here! The technologies were not well understood at the time and the chemical contamination was not well understood. Decisions were made at that time without malice; the chemical dangers were not fully understood, but unfortunately some of the outcomes have been tragic in terms of the damage caused to human health. Those impacts on human health could not have all been foreseen. That doesn't excuse the lack of a proper cleanup but if people understand the historical context, then they may be more cooperative and helpful in the development of the EIS and in accepting the positive role that DOE says they want to play in cleaning up the site properly.

There is other history at the site that is interesting. Native Americans used the site. And many western movies and television shows were filmed in these mountains. The idea of the site

Attachment B, Interview 27.

becoming a state park is very appealing. Not only is the area beautiful, but a park could also celebrate both the movie history and the rocketry and nuclear power history of the site as well as providing critical animal corridors and important wildlife habitat.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I don't have many concerns. Maybe I am concerned about the route that would be used to transport waste that is removed from SSFL. I thought I had heard that the shipments would go the other way (not by my home). I guess people that live along that route wouldn't like that. It will be a difficult decision to make, which way to ship materials – because whatever they decide will make someone unhappy. I had the impression they had already decided not to ship waste by my home.

I am also concerned about the quality of our water supply. We drink Las Virgenes water, and I think that's safe. But my neighbor uses a well on his property to water his yard. Should I be worried about that? Is that safe?

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I don't have any concerns, but I haven't been very involved. They have been sending information to me, and I appreciate that.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

We just want to know the status here where we live. Can we dig in our dirt safely? Can our children hike and play outside? I would like to know if the water is safe.

When my children were young, they would play out in the hills. My son would play in the waterfall and the creek. He found a dog that was strong and healthy, but he didn't have any teeth. That dog played in the water all the time. Did the water cause him to lose his teeth?

Awhile back we were sent a survey about our health status. We completed the survey and sent it back. We never heard anything back. What were the results of that survey?

The Acorn is a newspaper based in Agoura Hills. It's a good paper, and its free. DOE could use the Acorn to help inform the public.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public should have a role in helping to determine the route for shipping waste away. The public should know where the waste is going.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Attachment B, Interview 28.

The public should have an opportunity to help decide which issues to evaluate.

Who will do the cleanup, who will get those jobs? How will it be determined who will do the work? Can they be trusted to do things correctly? What if they drive away from the site and dump the waste wherever they can get away with it. There should probably be some oversight to make sure that the waste is going where it is supposed to go, make sure it is being handled properly.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

The public should have a way to watch things to make sure that the cleanup is being done properly. Maybe DOE should form a citizen oversight committee.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – That wouldn't work for me
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – That might be helpful, it would provide more of an opportunity for people to learn about the site and how safe they are
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – This would depend on who participates. I wouldn't want to participate if people were going to react from an emotional basis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – The public should have access to everything. Nothing should be hidden.

Attachment B, Interview 28.

- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This would be wonderful. The more citizen involvement, the better.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Periodic newsletters or briefings
- Open houses
- Citizen advisory group
- Hotline

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Nothing else.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I am curious about what must be disclosed to a seller in case we decide we would like to sell our property.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

Everyone wants to have a healthy environment, but personally, I have tremendous respect and confidence in Boeing and the aerospace industry at large. Since I was a kid, my family has been involved in the aerospace industry. My mother worked for Lockheed and my uncle was an engineer and I wanted to be an engineer when I grew up. Boeing is a good company. I've heard presentations that they have done and I have confidence that they know what they are doing.

So, my biggest concern is that the cleanup will take way too long now that the feds are involved. I don't think the EIS is necessary. The public perception seems to be that the federal government needs to be involved and I don't agree.

The goal is to be able to turn the property over for use as open space. I envision the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy managing the space so that everyone can benefit. It's a pretty place.

Boeing has explained what they are doing to my satisfaction. It is complicated and it is a unique project. The standards Boeing must meet are very stringent, and in some cases, may be unrealistic or even arbitrary. The periodic fires, creating a pollution problem unrelated to the site, further complicate all this. All these hills are sedimentary. We don't know for sure what pollutants were there before the site was developed. There is water running in the creek down our canyon year-round. I believe our community is adding far more pollutants to Bell Canyon Creek than the site. As it was before, the cleanup was to be completed by 2017. Now it appears it will take a lot longer due to federal intervention.

Boeing will do what needs to be done, and they will do it professionally.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

DOE should prepare the EIS as quickly as possible. They should protect the public safety. They should let science guide their decisions, not a hysterical public reaction.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I haven't paid that much attention. They seem to have a lot of public meetings. I don't pay that much attention to who is hosting each meeting. I think there are plenty of opportunities for the public to get involved.

Many of the public meetings are not pleasant or productive. Some people seem very afraid and fear is a mind-killer. People are afraid of what they don't understand.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should have only as much public participation as is needed. They should do a good job of announcing public meetings. They should host the minimum number of meetings and move on.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

The public can't contribute very much. The regulatory agencies and the owner of the property owner should decide, using an open and transparent process.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

DOE should share their plans and let the public react within a limited time frame. Public's role should be minimal.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

The public should have no role after the public comment period ends.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – these could be mailed, upon request
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – everything should be available on the Internet
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – If combined with the formal public meetings

Attachment B, Interview 29.

- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS. These documents should be available on the Internet and in the reading rooms
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group This is just a "PR" thing, populated by quasi credentials – it cannot be balanced

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

As few as possible. Transparency is critical – nothing should be secret. Don't hide. Use the reading rooms and the Internet.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Focus on limiting the role of the public to allow the technical experts to work. I am confident Boeing can do the work. There were problems up there but they can be resolved. The work does not require this much oversight.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

The history of the site should be preserved. I kind of miss the testing. Our windows of this house would vibrate. It was pretty exciting. We have a beautiful community, good quality of life, and not a lot to worry about. People are making a big to-do about nothing. I have confidence in science. We should just let the scientists do what they are good at. All this negative attention is not good for our community. We just need to get the site cleaned up and move on.

- 1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?**

None. We have been doing this a long time.

- 2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?**

No.

- 3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?**

I think DOE does an outstanding job. I am impressed with their patience. It's a no-win situation and they manage to keep going.

- 4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?**

They should have the public meetings that are required. They should put the document on compact disks and make them widely available. They should do a good job of announcing the document and distributing it. They should do a nice job of presenting the information, a professional job.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

DOE should do everything they can to keep the public in the loop.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

DOE should share what they are planning to consider when evaluating the alternatives. They should be transparent. They should continue to do what they have done in the past.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should provide the public an opportunity to comment, then move on. The activists won't be helpful.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

a. Telephone hotline – If they do this, it should be staffed by a real person

Attachment B, Interview 30.

- b. Information kiosks in public settings – maybe in the Chamber of Commerce information center
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – on the website, hard copy only for those who request
- e. Informational fact sheets - on the website, hard copy only for those who request
- f. Periodic newsletters - on the website, hard copy only for those who request
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – the retirees are really interested to see what has been accomplished
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subject?) – Not too detailed
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – That might work, although I have never heard of that before
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS. Maybe by appointment, if people are interested
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – DOE tried that before and it got contentious

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

DOE should do as much as they can. They are all good ideas.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Thomas Johnson is doing a great job. He's calm and he never loses his cool.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I love going to work at SSFL. It is so pretty up here. I really like the idea of it becoming a park where other people could enjoy this place.

Attachment B, Interview 30.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

The concerns that I have include the time, cost, and the resources to complete the EIS. It is contaminated and no one disagrees about that. DOE already had a plan to clean it up; it's a shame that they are not being allowed to implement that plan. The longer this drags out, the more resources will be spent on it. DOE should go as quickly as they can so they can then focus on getting the place cleaned up.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

The process that DOE must use to complete as EIS is so transparent. It isn't even an option to hide information any more, to keep secrets. I trust that they want to make a good decision and that they will use all of the information they have to support that decision.

DOE is completely capable and competent. They understand what they are dealing with, more than anyone else does because they actually have experience at it.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

It is not possible to make some people happy. They don't want to be happy. DOE should accept that they won't be able to make everyone happy.

Every once in awhile someone comes along and says they didn't know about SSFL. But DOE has done everything it could, a completely competent job, of making sure people had the opportunity to be well informed.

There are no easy solutions.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should use the most effective ways of communicating. They should communicate regularly; they should not make people wait. It takes a long time to prepare an EIS, but people will lose interest if they don't hear something every so often. I would suggest that DOE provide an update on the project every 30 days. If people knew that on the 29th of every month that they could check on the website and get the latest information, they would stop worrying about whether something had happened, that they had missed out on something. They could post a list of everything that is new to the website so people can get caught up quickly and easily.

The vast majority of the public trust the government. If DOE provides information, shows itself to be a dependable source of information, they will continue to trust.

When people ask questions, DOE should answer those questions. If DOE can't answer a question, they should follow-up personally and specifically. Everyone that head them say, "I don't know and will get back to you" will also wonder what the answer was. So DOE needs to share their responses widely, so everyone knows the question was answered.

When people say something in public that DOE doesn't agree with, they should not challenge them.

- 5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?**

Frankly, the public isn't qualified to opine about the alternatives that should be considered. The experts and policy makers should decide which alternatives make the most sense. They should then present the menu to the public and ask for reactions. The menu should “book-end” the range of alternatives that are considered, and define the range that DOE considers reasonable. Giving the public a sense of the range of alternatives that will be evaluated with inspire the public's confidence. If someone suggests something that is way out there (beyond the bookends), they can explain that they will not be evaluating alternatives that are not reasonable.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

The public's role in this should be somewhat limited. DOE should start with a list, the issues that they already know they will have to evaluate, and let the public add to that list (within reason). Again, DOE should “book-end” the list of issues, so that the public can avoid suggesting something that is so out there as to be absurd.

One thing DOE should avoid doing is giving the impression that they have already made up their minds. If they are going to ask the public for input, they should be prepared to get input and give it due consideration.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should prepare a summary of the EIS – no more than 10 pages in length. It should present the relevant data and communicate in a broad way, that is understandable to the general public. DOE should print them like business cards and pass them out like business cards.

DOE should also tell people ahead of time for every document that will go out for public review. This will give people heads up, the Draft EIS is coming, I should be on the look-out for it. If DOE has only a 30 day public comment period and some people don't even know its on the streets until half way through, it will just make everyone unhappy.

DOE should continue regular communication through the publication of the Record of Decision.

DOE should provide an explanation of how they address all public comments. They should not expect someone to review the entire document to see if DOE “heard” their comment. The comment response document should provide a tour of where changes were made in the document for each comment. Then people can look in the final EIS and see, yes, they made the change I suggested.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

Attachment B, Interview 31.

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – These might be risky, if someone sees something they don't understand, it will just scare them
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – these should be held on a regular basis, like quarterly
- k. Public open houses – these could tie into the quarterly meetings
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – these could be done in conjunction with the public meetings as well
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – these could also be done in the same venue as the public meetings or open houses
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This is a terrific idea. The advisory group could really help DOE. They should be supported without compromising their independence.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Regularly scheduled meetings, at appropriate intervals
- Notice of when each public comment period will begin and end – so people will know ahead of time
- A summarization of new information should be available on the website

DOE should consider having meetings on Saturdays. It skews who they hear from if they only have meetings during the week.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 31.

Be consistent. Don't cater to the extremists. Create parameters for the analysis; don't allow the impression that they will chase down every idea, even bad ideas. Communicate as consistently/regularly as possible. Don't let the public participation process paralyze the decision-making process. Keep moving.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I was born and raised in the San Fernando valley, so I have lived here since 1961. When I was growing up, it was really exciting to hear the rocket tests. They were amazingly loud, even from pretty far away. Back in those days, no one lived very close to SSFL. There were big buildings, big factories, all over the valley. I was proud of what they did up there and our contribution to the space race.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

We really don't know enough to respond. We want them to do a good job. The more information we have, the better.

We don't have any concerns. We don't know that there is nothing to worry about, that they are doing everything safely, but we trust them, at least we trust them more than the activists do.

The problem is that everyone has a bias. DOE and Boeing/Rocketdyne have their bias. And the activists have their bias. No one tells a straight story. DOE/Boeing/Rocketdyne want to avoid having a problem with the public. The activists want to get everyone scared and upset. Because no one is credible (unbiased), it is very difficult to know what to believe.

In the end, we all believe what we want to believe. I want to believe that I am safe. DOE wants to believe they know what they are doing and that they are doing everything safely. The activists want to believe DOE is lying and that someone is to blame for their health problems. We all hold firm to what we want to believe and we are very slow to change our minds.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

We would like to know more about the settlement between Brandeis Bardin and Boeing.

There should probably be a legitimate health survey. We had a friend who had a tumor, then he had a stroke. After he died, his wife got in on a class action lawsuit. They settled out of court and she got something like \$180,000 for it. The settlement just allows the rumors to continue to perpetuate. Were the health problems really caused by SSFL? No one can prove it one way or the other.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

Well, that's been funny. They invite everyone to a meeting, they serve tea and crumpets, then they tell their side of the story. Then the activists say that everything they have said is wrong. Not much is accomplished. And if you don't know much, you don't know who to believe.

DOE should convene a panel to prepare the information for the public. The panel's job should be to develop information that real people can understand. They could issue a report that says honestly and simply what the problems are. Not reams and reams of paper. Not a complicated large report. Not a dog and pony show. The panel should be a panel of experts chosen by both sides. The report should outline what has happened over the years, what has already been done to clean up, what still needs to be cleaned up, and the options DOE has for finishing the cleanup.

That would do away with the hysteria. We all need some common sense.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should try to find a way to make sure the public knows the truth, the facts. The more the public knows, the better.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should share their plans and give the public an opportunity to make comments and suggestions. DOE should do their best to address the rumors. We don't know enough to be able to figure out what's real.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

We don't know enough to participate in that discussion. Our biggest concern about the removal of contamination is that it will generate a lot of dust and truck transport up and down the road.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to review the document and provide comments.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – They are already doing this but most of the information is too complicated for us
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters – these are just fluff
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) I went on a tour and I am glad I did. It made me feel safer.
- h. Internet tools for sharing information. A website should be structured so that someone who wants to know more can follow links and dig more deeply.
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)

Attachment B, Interview 32.

- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This should not be composed of citizens but people with technical knowledge. The members should be chosen (like a jury). DOE could reject the fellow from the University of California for example. Both sides should get so many opportunities to veto a possible member – opportunities to reject the other side’s suggestions. That would screen out the people who can't work with others. The group should be involved throughout the entire process. The group should be balanced and represent all sides or perspectives.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

The problem with almost all of the ideas are they are just fluff. There are two sources of information, DOE/Boeing and the activists. Both are biased. The public needs to get factual information from credible sources.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

The public needs non-biased information from credible sources about what is going on up there. The information cannot come from DOE or Boeing.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I had a friend that worked up there, for Atomics International. He told me that everything that was done up there was done professionally, and I believed him. The people who worked there did the best job they could. The workers lived all around the site. They weren't scared and they wouldn't have done anything that they thought would harm their own communities. I think some of what they did was accepted practice when they did it. Sure, they did some things that we wouldn't do today, because they didn't know any better. There is much more awareness now about the chemicals and how they need to be handled safely. There was stuff that was burned in the burn pit that probably shouldn't have been. But they didn't do that maliciously, they weren't trying to hurt anyone. If they had been aware of the hazard at the time, they would have done things differently. No one can say they do everything exactly the way it should be done – and the folks who worked up there shouldn't be judged any more harshly than the rest of us are willing to be judged.

I resent the publicity that the activists bring to the site. The local newspaper just wants to sell the paper. They aren't so concerned about getting the facts right as they are about selling papers.

Attachment B, Interview 32.

No one has any confidence in the other side.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I am concerned that they will not tell everything that they know, that they will not share everything that they should with the public. Someone will blow their cover if they try to hide anything. It is time to tell the truth. It is too late to lie.

The federal government has not protected the people. They are not running the government for the people.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

They need to have a full evaluation of all of the contamination.

They need to have an independent evaluation of all of the cultural resources on the SSFL. I don't have confidence that anyone knows everything that needs to be done (before they start work) about the cultural resources on the site. They have prevented the Native people from accessing the site for several decades and I would not be comfortable with them proceeding without an assessment to learn if cultural resources are there. If there is an assessment done of cultural resources on the site, a Native American should be involved in that assessment.

They need to consider where contaminated surface water has gone and evaluate the potential harm to vegetation that has been affected by contaminated water. Native Americans use vegetation for food, baskets, and ceremonial uses. Its possible that a botanist will need to evaluate how the contaminated surface waters have effected plants, especially native plants.

Everything they know needs to be made public. Those who have withheld information need to be held accountable. Particularly if anyone has been harmed because information has been withheld, those who are responsible need to be accountable.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I am concerned that they have prevented the public from knowing the full extent of contamination that is on the SSFL. They have not behaved in a trustworthy manner.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should proceed with full knowledge of the requirements under Senate Bill 18 which addresses traditional tribal cultural places. They should comply fully with the law.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

They should tell the public what they are planning and let people react.

- 6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?**

They should share their plans and see if people have any other concerns. DOE should make sure they keep the LA and Ventura county Boards of Supervisors well informed, and the media.

- 7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?**

DOE should provide plenty of time for the public to comment. The comment period should be extended if someone requests more time. They should announce the opportunities to comment in the media, even the national media as some people who used to live here may be dying of cancer somewhere else.

- 8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)**

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – not unless you mean a billboard that everyone driving by would see
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – But all documents in the repositories should be available on line as well
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – only if these would be open to everyone
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – These just turn into pissing contests
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.

- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – if this group was composed of experts with credentials that would study documents independently

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Expert panel
- Education for children – this document will take a long time to complete and they will be grown up by the time DOE is done
- Reading rooms – so people can look at all the documents

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE might want to provide funding to support a legal team that would represent the community. The members would need to be paid. They could look at whether the cleanup would comply with the environmental regulations like the Clean Water Act. Perhaps a non-profit could help, like Sierra Club or NRDC.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I would be interested in exploring the possibility of creating a cultural learning center on the SSFL, a Native American Land Conservancy, to let the Native Americans tell their own story. The cave drawings on the site are sacred to our people. Any sensitive cultural resources on the site should be under our care, not someone else's. We may have other sites on the SSFL that we don't presently know about, like burial sites and other cave paintings. We have been restricted from accessing places that are sacred to us for 60 years. We should not have to ask permission to visit these places in the future. They should be our places and we should have the authority to restrict the access of others. If many more people are going to be on the site in the future, we will need to be able to protect the sites from vandals. We know how to look for sites of historical significance. Our ancestors used sites along creeks, where there was water and food.

It would seem conceivable to me that there may be locations on the site that should be entombed – that cannot be cleaned up and that might cause more harm if they are disturbed. The goal should be to avoid harming people and the environment during cleanup. SSFL was the largest source of contamination in Ventura County. The government has betrayed the people's trust by putting us at risk.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I don't have any concerns. It is unfortunate that DOE was not able to do the cleanup work based on the Environmental Assessment. It would have been good to continue the cleanup on an aggressive schedule and get the site closed down.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I don't have any concerns about that. DOE has all the documentation and a qualified contractor. They do have a very short timeframe in which the EIS must be developed. The situation is pretty complex. There is a possibility that they will make some mistakes in interpreting the data give the schedule, but there will be an opportunity for internal review and we should be able to catch any inadvertent mistakes.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I don't have any concerns about DOE's public participation work. They used to host quarterly meetings awhile back. They provided a proactive opportunity to provide information to the community. I think DOE has done a decent job.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should do what is required, no more and no less. They should have open communication with the public and make decisions transparently.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should tell the public the alternatives they intend to evaluate, provide an opportunity for the public to make suggestions, and then DOE should decide whether those suggestions have merit (or not).

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should tell the public what issues they plan to evaluate and then see if the public has additional ideas. DOE should not do extra work unless the ideas are good ones; their decision process should be science-based.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 34.

DOE should do whatever is required and nothing more. Extra activities cost extra tax dollars.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Tours
- More open-ness
- More frequent communication with the public

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Attachment B, Interview 34.

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

None.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

We are hearing that DOE plans to rehash the old data, and prepare no new data on which to base their analysis. I am sure they will try to put the best light they can on whatever data they want to use. They will have to pay for the cleanup, which will give them an incentive to try to say things are not as bad as they really are. I have heard stories about how in the past they deliberately burned vegetation so that screening would find less contamination than it would have otherwise. After you hear stories like that, it is hard to trust them. I do think they will try to use the data that presents them in the best possible light. There are so many stories about past practices. They hid contamination. They disposed of contamination improperly. Employees have been convicted of improperly handling wastes.

DOE needs to prepare this EIS using a fair and open process. The public should have a right to comment on it. They will expect to be listened to and to have their concerns acted upon. The community should have an opportunity to comment on the plans to cleanup the site, before any work begins. For years, DOE has done whatever it wanted to do and asked for the public to comment later – after the fact. DOE should provide an opportunity for the community to have a voice in how the site will be cleaned up before they make decisions about how they will implement the cleanup.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

They should look at all of Area IV. In the past, we have heard that they intend to only clean around the working areas, right around the facilities. But there have been many times when contamination, radioactive waste has been found in places where it wasn't supposed to be. They should look all over the entire area and cleanup everything they find. They should do a full and comprehensive survey of the entire area. They will need to show that the contamination is gone before people will believe them. There have been so many problems over the last 20 years, people aren't just going to accept that contamination DOE claims to have cleaned up is actually gone without some proof.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

They have tried to limit their interactions with the public in the past. DOE got so sick of Dan Hirsch manipulating information, they just stopped participating. They just walked out for nearly ten years. Walking away effectively meant that they lost communication with the public and the public had only one source of information, the activists.

Walking away backfired on them because they no longer had a venue for a relationship with the community. They lost all of their credibility. They have tried recently to go back in, to re-open a dialogue with the community. But many, many people continue to think he is the only game in town.

We have had to walk the fine line between what's real and what the activists claim. We know that not everything they say is true. But there were plenty of real problems up there. People died dumping contamination illegally. People have been convicted of criminal activities. I don't believe everything that I have heard, but most people believe enough of what they have heard that DOE has no credibility.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I am sure they will follow NEPA and CEQA. But that won't be enough.

They will have to go the extra mile. They will need to really involve the community. People will want to have, expect to have an opportunity to be involved, to review all relevant documents and have the opportunity to provide comments. They will expect to see evidence that DOE understood their comments and took them to heart.

DOE should begin with an understanding that the public won't necessarily trust the data that DOE presents. They will want to know when the data was gathered, who gathered it, and how it was gathered. If the public doesn't trust the data, they won't trust the EIS.

As my father used to say, respect is gained by ten, lost by one. Trust is the same way. They have lost the community's trust and it will take a lot to gain it back.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

This will be crucial. In the past, DOE has evaluated a limited set of alternatives. Typically, one that is a no-action alternative, which is not acceptable. Then they will evaluate one that is outrageous. The result is that only one alternative is really viable, and the public doesn't really feel like they have an opportunity to choose. DOE should use public input to identify 4 or 5 real options, alternatives that really represent a range of approaches that are viable. If the public has an opportunity to help identify those alternatives, they will feel truly involved.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I am not an expert on NEPA – but I am guessing DOE already knows the issues that they will need to consider based on the laws. However, NEPA is supposed to allow the public an opportunity to help identify the issues, which means they won't really be satisfied if it feels like the list of issues has already been determined.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to stay involved after the draft EIS. There is a fine line – DOE should not allow the EIS to become a circus. They need to move on with the actual cleanup, but they can't move so fast that the public has no opportunity to be involved in the decision making process. A lot of people will get involved right away, as soon as they can. But there are always a few people who don't hear about it right away. If it feels to them that the decision has been pre-determined, it won't be very satisfying.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – That seems like a pretty inefficient way to do things. I could see the benefit it is helped people to understand things, though.
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – I wonder how much these are really used by the public
- d. Periodic informational briefings – It will depend a lot on who presents the information. They could be worthwhile if the person is perceived as being objective and trustworthy. Otherwise, this could be a PR nightmare.
- e. Informational fact sheets – That's a good idea
- f. Periodic newsletters – Another good idea
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – That wouldn't be a bad idea
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – Perhaps these could be presented like a debate. The problem is that Dan Hirsch has been the only source of information for so long. DOE never presents their own side of the story. If the presentations could be controlled so that both sides of the story are presented to the public, then it could be very informative.
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – A moderator is really necessary. Public meetings can really get out of control. I have seen meetings that last for hours, that never stick to the agenda. A strong moderator can help keep things on track. I don't know about the court reporter and transcript these days – everyone brings a video camera anyway.
- k. Public open houses – These do not work here. I have seen the idea fail too many times. People just don't trust the folks presenting information and they don't like that they can't hear everything being said.
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – Those could really help. They have been asking for a place at the table for so many years. It would be great if DOE could sit down and ask for help, really listen to folks. They would like to help figure out where sampling should occur, for example.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – All documents should be available to the public, even if they don't want to read them. The process should be wide open.

- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – That wouldn't go over well. The community would see this as an affront to the Workgroup. If DOE wants to ask citizens for advice, they should ask the Workgroup.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Workshops
- Public reading rooms – they allow a sense of transparency by making documents available to the public
- Public meetings that are well run

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Its so hard for members of the public to know what they need to know. Dan Hirsch has been the only source of information for so long. They trust him because he is the only one who answers their questions, the only one who even makes an attempt to explain things to them. He provides accessible information.

By contrast, DOE doesn't even respond, even when he provides bad information! They must learn how to effectively refute the bad information he puts out there. They should not let Dan Hirsch go on the attack. He can get really out of control so that he will do anything he can to destroy them. DOE loses every time. But not because he is right.

The challenge is this. DOE must have good intentions. If they just try to fluff it over, then it will make everyone mad. They should not sit there trying to decide what information to present. They should make it all available.

DOE may need to go to Dan Hirsch and maybe the other Workgroup members, like Jonathon Parfrey. They need to figure out a way to go to the enemy, admit they have made mistakes, and ask him to help move forward with the cleanup together. He can be reasonable. They need to admit that they have made mistakes and ask for his help in moving forward. He should not be allowed to continue to rehash everything. Everyone should try to focus on the positive and constructive, on moving forward with the cleanup.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

One problem is that this issue gets hijacked. People who are really focused on stopping development, preserving open space, or on the future use of the site stop talking about how it should be cleaned up. They take advantage of this situation, frankly.

We have tried to be fair and impartial. We have not been overzealous in going after DOE, like some other elected officials have been. We try to stay above the fray. We would like to see DOE be honest and accountable to the public.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My home is 1.5 miles from the Boeing Santa Susana Field Lab (BSSFL). My tract is near Dayton Canyon Creek. The creek comes from BSSFL and across the Centex property. I have been concerned about this fact and therefore have been attending BSSFL work group meetings; Department of Energy (DOE) meetings; and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) meetings; etc. for over seven years. The following is a list of my concerns:

The DOE originally supported a limited clean up of the area as opposed to what was really needed, a much more stringent operation following Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) standards. The DTSC has allowed filtering of samples taken at the site which I believe invalidates the test results.

In 1959, a sodium-cooled nuclear at BSSFL had a partial melt down. It released more radioactivity than the Three Mile Island incident. At one time there were 10 experimental reactors on the site.

Rocketdyne has tested rocket engines at BSSFL for over 60 years. The hazardous chemical Trichloroethylene (TCE) was used to clean the rocket engines after the testing. It was allowed to go into the subsurface of the site. A Boeing engineer estimated there was 800,000 gallons of TCE in the subsurface of the facility.

I believe that TCE has migrated down to the Centex property; the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's (LADWP) Chatsworth Reservoir and other areas in West Hills. The Boeing Corporation stated in a letter there had been a migration of TCE extending 1500 feet beyond the NE corner of the site.

A health risk assessment carried out by a team of scientists from UCLA and the University of Michigan found that the people in neighborhoods within a two mile radius of the BSSFL experienced a higher rate of cancer than people living further away.

The Centex Sperling Project. This property is a 359 acre parcel of which 106 acres will be graded in order to build 151 homes. My tract is directly across the street from the Centex property. The grading for the project will move 3.5 million cubic yards of material. I believe there are hazardous chemicals and radioactive materials on the site brought down by storm waters coming from the BSSFL (which is approximately 1,000 feet higher than the Centex property). When the grading gets underway, dust and debris will be sent airborne, which will most assuredly spread hazardous chemicals and radioactive material into the inhabited adjoining areas.

The Centex Corporation was obliged to make a contract with the DTSC to do soil sampling on 106 acres out of 359, since this had not been done as part of the original Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Centex Corporation hired All West Remediation (AWR) to do the soil sampling. This gave Centex control of the contractor. An independent contractor should have been put in place instead of one whose obvious bias became evident as the testing progressed under DTSC observation.

Centex claimed that only low levels of perchlorate (a hazardous chemical) were found on the property except for a large amount in one area. Centex claimed someone planted that pocket of perchlorate in a criminal act. Nothing ever came of the claim.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

Since the current U.S. Presidential Administration has been in office there has been orchestrated a distortion of the sciences and other disciplines throughout many federal agencies.

The Boeing corporation has withheld records claiming it didn't have them or couldn't find them. When pressure applies, Boeing suddenly discovered the records and made them available. The DOE and the DTSC have a history of ignoring or hiding information thereby giving unfair advantage to the Boeing Corporation. The DTSC, in the case of the Cextex Sterling property, has made promises to the concerned stakeholders and not followed through with them.

The DTSC had two evaluations made of the AWR's Radiological Survey Report. One evaluation was made by Auxier and Associates; the other evaluation by the U.S. EPA. The DTSC in both cases did not request a sampling survey. My understanding is when the EPA is requested to review this type of report normally the agency is requested to do sampling as standard operating procedure.

The LADW&P's Chatsworth Reservoir. The reservoir is located close to my tract and is near the Centex property. The reservoir was drained in 1969. I believe it was closed because of hazardous chemicals and radioactive material being swept down from the BSSFL by storm waters and also the migration of TCE from BSSFL.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

In the past the DOE stopped sending people to the work group meetings. Instead they had their own public meeting, sometimes working in tandem with Boeing employees. Now the DOE has begun attending work group meetings. This is a good beginning.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I am opposed to the concept of making the BSSFL into a park or a recreation area. It should not be used in any manner that would expose anyone to that site. I believe even with a thorough cleanup, the dangers will always remain there to some degree.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I believe the State of CA should give permission for the EPA to go ahead with its Superfund action so that the agency can have control of the cleanup of the site.

The public should be allowed the opportunity to participate in the identification of alternatives. Experts such as Bridge the Gap President, Dan Hirsch and others with scientific expertise should be included by both the DOE and the DTSC in discussions of planning and policy making so that they can share their views and not be excluded or ignored as has been the practice up to this point.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

See # 5 above

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The DOE should send a copy of the draft EIR or at least a definitive summary of the report to all stakeholders on the expanded mailing list. The DOE and the DTSC should design presentations so they are understandable to the general public.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – it would be good to do this at the West Hills Neighborhood Council meetings
- e. Informational fact sheets – if mailed and on the Internet
- f. Periodic newsletters – if mailed and on the Internet
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – These should be optional, some people wouldn't want to take the risk
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – On the burn pits
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – as long as DOE doesn't use PowerPoint
- k. Public open houses – No harm in that
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.

n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – If the Workgroup got to select the members

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Keeping the public informed as the EIR process proceeds and earnestly listening to oral and written feedback. Up to this point the DOE and DTSC have only going through the motions

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

The DOE should offer an explanation up front how the EIR funding can be assured based on the work needed to complete the BSSFL EIR.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

It is apparent to me that politics has and is presently influencing the DOE and DTSC policies. An Inspector General is needed for both agencies to insure that politics is not driving either agencies' actions. (Interviewee subsequently sent a message stating that "You can delete my suggestion since thinking it over it would just add another layer of bureaucracy.")

The DOE's EIR needs to go beyond the site's boundaries and look at all the areas that have been affected by Area 4's activities in the surrounding communities.

I have serious reservations about Science Applications International Corporation. I feel there is a problem with SAIC after reading an investigative report on its previous activities cited on Google.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I think the EIS needs to be prepared by an independent company that has no connections to Rocketdyne. The report should be developed in an inclusive manner. The quantitative data should be fully disclosed. Every hazardous material that has been released in the environment should be fully disclosed, along with warnings as to the environmental impacts and health impacts of those materials.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I know there have been tests that have been done on the water supply. The results of those tests should be considered.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

No.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should focus their attention on informing the public, educating the public. They should also provide an opportunity for the public to voice their opinions and concerns.

All information about the risks associated with the hazardous materials should be fully disclosed. The public needs to know if they are at risk.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The challenge is that the public are not experts in how to cleanup hazardous materials. I think the biologists, the environmental engineers, everyone and anyone who has subject matter expertise about any aspect of the contamination and the potential effects on humans and other species of that contamination should consider carefully how to reduce the risks. There should not be any disruption in the ecosystem. The public should have a voice, but the experts need to focus on minimizing harm to people and the ecosystem.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Any discoveries they make in looking for contamination should be shared with the public. Soil contamination is an example. A major wildfire went through Box Canyon in 2005. There was a lot of smoke and the fire remobilized contaminants that had been immobilized in the vegetation. After the fire, a lot of people were diagnosed thyroid problems, various cancers, and retinal blastoma.

Attachment B, Interview 37.

That really scared people.

DOE should fully disclose everything that is known about the contamination and the effects in can have on human health and the environment. DOE needs to tell everyone within a wide radius of SSFL. The site has an impact on a large geographic area and a lot of people.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should seek to fully disclose all environmental impacts that they have caused over the years. They need to present this information in an objective manner. They should disclose all contamination that poses risks to humans and other species.

In addition, if cleanup is done, DOE should tell the public what will be done with the waste that is removed.

Finally, local residents need to be informed as to how their property values will be affected as a result of the cleanup.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – for the West Hills Neighborhood Council that would be a good idea
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.

- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – if DOE could find enough people to serve on it

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

It's hard to trust DOE in this situation. They should make every effort to conduct an open process and to fully disclose information.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE needs to provide an explanation of why they need to do an EIS. What has happened to get them to this point? How do we know that Boeing isn't doing their own cleanup and hauling the hazardous materials away in the middle of the night?

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

If it is proven that thyroid problems, various cancers, and retinal blastoma in the community are linked to the contaminants that have been found at the SSFL, what kind of actions will be taken to help reduce the burden of health care costs and financial hardships that resulted from exposure?

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I worked at or closely affiliated with Area IV at SSFL for 32 years and I retired in 1994, shortly after the Northridge Earthquake. I was involved in nuclear activities for my entire career. Most of the time I worked there, I worked on secret or top secret projects. We were not allowed to talk about what we were doing, even with other people who worked up there. We could talk with the other people who were working on the same project.

How prepared is DOE to open up and talk openly about what was going on up there. They have not been forthcoming in the past. This has led to a misunderstanding on the public's part about what happened up there.

My biggest concern is that DOE will fail to be forthcoming. If they continue to be vague, just going through the motions of preparing the EIS will result in a very negative response from the public.

Unless DOE is ready for full and open disclosure of everything they know, then the public will be very negative. By contrast, once people believe that DOE is being forthcoming, the public will be more receptive to the EIS. DOE must do a better job of communicating with the public.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I don't know of anything I can yet talk about off-hand. Some information may still be classified and I don't believe I am not at liberty to openly discuss everything I know. If they (DOE) go over the record, they will find everything they need to publicly release. They really must consider all of the record. So many activities up there were classified. There were many built-in barriers to communication. So much of what we did was classified. There was a reason for the secrecy at that time. But that means that each project and program was isolated and information was not shared. For that reason, DOE will need to do a very careful review, project by project in order to develop a worthwhile EIS.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I know there have been notices about meetings (DOE and company-sponsored) but they generally provide very short notice. Sometimes they hold the meetings a long way away from me. I live in Los Angeles. Most of the workers lived much closer to the site than I do. Most of the public participation is now held in Simi Valley which is pretty far away for me. It would be better if they held multiple meetings in multiple locations and they announced them further in advance.

I have felt invited to all public meetings, but what I have seen is that the negative activists seem to be much more organized than the supporters. The format of the meeting hasn't encouraged a sharing of personal opinions. I haven't felt we (both the pros and cons) were encouraged to discuss openly with each other.

Also, DOE seems to present their Plan and the only option they give the public is “take it or leave it.” They tell the public what they are going to do, just dump it on the public, and fail to encourage discussion.

4. What do you think DOE’s objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

Well, I think the EIS and the way it is prepared should be tied to the end objective. I don’t know if DOE knows what their end objective is. Some people think SSFL should be a safe reserve of public land. Others think that it should be used for commercial or even residential purposes. The final objective needs to be carefully explained. The timing, schedule, and total cost of the cleanup should be determined only after the final objective has been clarified and agreed upon by all parties.

The whole crux of the crisis up there has shifted from nuclear to the residual effects of the chemical contamination related to the rocket testing. The rocket testing was completely outside of Area IV.

I am a little concerned that it may not be possible to cleanup Area IV alone, independent of the other areas. Area IV impacts the northern portion of the total site and any contamination that leaves the Area IV boundaries goes down towards Simi Valley. Most of the rocket testing effects go towards the San Fernando valley. And the impacts of the two programs are quite different.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for “scoping” the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I don’t know. Of course the public needs an opportunity to comment and their comments should be given serious consideration. Unfortunately, the public may not know enough to suggest alternatives. It would probably be best for DOE to share the alternatives that they have already identified and then provide an opportunity for the public to react to those alternatives. It’s possible that someone might come up with a good idea they haven’t considered.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The environmentalists have a long shopping list of concerns. Most of those concerns have been identified in studies to date.

It would probably be best if DOE presented what they know they will have to consider and then solicit ideas for additional issues.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The EIS itself will have details about how the site will be cleaned up. The final response back to the public should explain how the cleanup will be performed to achieve the final objective. The public will want assurances that the cleanup will be implemented as intended. DOE will also

Attachment B, Interview 38.

need to clearly explain financial considerations, including the timing and availability of the necessary funding and personnel.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – I think that would be good but it would have to be well publicized. Use will probably vary tremendously and it will be difficult to staff
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – That would be hard for such a very large area
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – That's a very good idea. The challenge will be making sure that people know about them, their inventory, and their accessibility
- d. Periodic informational briefings – That would be a big chore. I don't think its necessary. Maybe DOE could offer to do briefings for organizations like Neighborhood Councils upon request.
- e. Informational fact sheets – They are nice but would probably end up in the trash
- f. Periodic newsletters – They would be wasteful as they would probably end up in the trash
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) They could do an open house up there, but it would be a big chore to explain the current physical status versus what has already been removed. But it might be helpful to have people see what's still there.
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – This is a great idea as it can easily be updated and changed
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – In the past, technical presentations were usually given at technical meetings.
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – One or two, maybe three at the most over the duration of the EIS. Most of the buildings have already been removed. Tours shouldn't be necessary on a regular basis, but maybe just before the public meetings.
- k. Public open houses – That's an interesting idea. Maybe they could be done at the beginning of the public meetings, or in the lobby
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – I don't think that would work very well. Given who would probably participate, the workshop could be very lengthy and the results could be biased.

Attachment B, Interview 38.

- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – The supporting documents should be put in the information repositories rather than presented
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This is a good idea in theory, but it would be very difficult to select a group that would be helpful to DOE. If people didn't want to be constructive, it wouldn't be worthwhile.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- The information repository
- The most important thing is that DOE should prepare and present a schedule and scope for the public acceptance

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

One thing that has not been consistently handled well is good media coverage. DOE should focus on establishing a good relationship with the local and regional newspapers. They should also include scientific journals. That's one area where DOE could get more support for their technical approach.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

This interview is well thought out. I am interested to see what other people tell you.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I don't have any concerns. I am familiar enough to be aware of the status of the site. They just need to get the EIS done. There is nothing out of the normal up there. I worked up there a long time and I am perfectly healthy.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No, I don't think so. I worked there for a long time and I know how much documentation there is. DOE has access to all of that documentation. I worked on the Environmental Assessment for Area IV and they have all the information they need to do an EIS. There are some pretty vocal groups that want DOE to do more studies (e.g., regional health studies). I don't think those studies are necessary.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I guess I don't have any concerns.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I've been to some meetings, when I worked up there. They were always unsatisfying. It was like a fencing match with no conclusions. DOE will need to decide who they want to involve if they want to involve the public. I suppose they could do a random sample survey if they really wanted to get a reflection of the community. Most of the community reads the newspaper and the papers want headlines. Like when they found debris in the area of a new development. It had just a small amount of a potentially hazardous chemical, not anything that was really very bad. They used that in their attempt to stop the development

I remember one meeting a woman said her husband used to walk their dog up in the hills. Her husband and the dog both died of cancer. She believes SSFL caused their cancer. I worked up there a long time and I don't have cancer.

The public that attends those meetings don't really reflect the whole community. I don't think the general public agrees with the activists. A lot of people who live near me know someone who worked up there and I think they are not very worried about it.

DOE needs to think about whether they are going to let the activists speak for everyone.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public will expect a range of alternatives, ranging from cleanup to meet DOE and EPA standards to cleanup to remove all radioactivity. The public should have an opportunity to comment on the whole range. The public should help define the level of cleanup that is needed. The public will have to be satisfied, so DOE should allow comment on the alternatives they will consider. Those with strong opinions will respond.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I suppose DOE could share the list of issues they think need to be evaluated and get the public's reactions to that list. Another thought would be to ask community groups to identify what they think should be considered. Service groups, church groups, they might like to provide suggestions. DOE could provide someone to explain the EIS process and let people respond. That might help get a more representative sample of the community.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

I suppose a normal public announcement. DOE should put the document in the libraries and have a public comment period. They could have a meeting to present the draft and invite comments. They could ask for written comments so that the meeting wouldn't be so difficult.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – That would probably help some
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – I don't know. This doesn't seem important enough to do something. I suppose it might reach a few more people.
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – I haven't used those myself, but I suppose it helps make the document available
- d. Periodic informational briefings – That would be a good idea, like at the Neighborhood Council meetings
- e. Informational fact sheets – These could help explain things so that people would have a better understanding
- f. Periodic newsletters – This would be the best method of information distribution. They should be concise, have connections to additional information, and have easy e-mail response capability. Nearly everyone has e-mail now. They would have to sign up with their e-mail address. Perhaps there would be an initial mailing so that people could provide their e-mail address on-line. Those not signing up could be reached and provided the opportunity to sign up by providing copies of the newsletters to local libraries and neighborhood councils. These could include a graphic that shows the status of the project.
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – That might be a good idea. If people see things, they might have a better idea of what is up there.
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – That's a good way to make information available

Attachment B, Interview 39.

- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – It might not be a good idea to do this in a public meeting, not everyone would understand the information. Maybe it would be better to post this information on the website
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – These are not appealing to me.
- k. Public open houses – That seems like a better idea. They could be in public settings, like a mall. That way maybe people would stop in to learn more.
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – That’s an interesting idea.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – These could be put on the Internet website. Maybe DOE could set it up so that people could click on a button to submit comments (if they wanted comments on the document). If they had questions about the document, they could call the toll-free telephone line.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – It would be good if they could get a real cross section of the community. They could maybe take some of the heat off DOE. Another idea might be a technical advisory committee.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Internet website
- Toll-free telephone line for asking questions
- Newsletters (distributed via email) that provide the status of the project
- Maybe they could provide the opportunity for contrary opinions to be expressed on the website too, or maybe blogs

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

No, it’s hard to do it in this situation.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I don't have any real concerns. We have a good working relationship with the Department of Energy as well as the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

We have already provided them with all of our information. They should look at everything they have been given by all the other agencies.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

It is a bit odd, even overwhelming how much is going on. There are so many opportunities for people who are interested in SSFL. I understand why the SSFL Workgroup was formed, but it could be a bit overwhelming to have the EIS going on as well.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

They should focus their attention on disseminating information, good information. DOE should make every effort to explain why they believe the cleanup won't have significant impacts.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I am not an expert on that.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I don't know about that either. DOE needs to know that there will be a huge amount of interest and a lot of people are going to want to be involved.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should have an opportunity to comment on the draft document. It would be great if the public could offer comments that would be germane. That might not be possible.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

Attachment B, Interview 40.

- a. Telephone hotline – That might be a good idea
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- Definitely
- d. Periodic informational briefings - Definitely
- e. Informational fact sheets - Yes
- f. Periodic newsletters – Couldn't hurt
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – Those could be helpful
- h. Internet tools for sharing information - Absolutely
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – Its hard to say
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
-Those could be helpful
- k. Public open houses – DOE has been doing those and I think they work as well as can be expected
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – Another one that its hard to say whether it would help
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – It sounds like a reasonable idea, but the SSFL Workgroup might get offended

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Open houses
- Internet
- Information repositories
- Formal public meetings

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

DOE should try to get the public involved as early as possible and explain what they are doing.

Attachment B, Interview 40.

DOE might want to look at how to involve the neighborhood councils. They would provide access to real community members rather than interest groups/activists.

Boeing has been slow to provide information to the public. It just makes people suspicious. DOE should get information out in a timely way.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

Boeing recently released some information, much after the fact. It didn't go over well. DOE should be very up-front, provide information as soon as possible. They should not hide anything.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I don't have any concerns at all. I worked at SSFL; I managed an engineering group for ten years. I consider the big fuss to be much ado over nothing. I don't think DOE needed to use taxpayers' money to do this EIS. It's a waste of tax payers' money. DOE has already thoroughly studied and planned the clean-up at the SSFL.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

No, I don't think there is anything they will overlook. They have already collected so much information. The magnitude of the problem does not warrant this additional level of effort they are putting into this. It's as if you drop a bread crumb on the floor and bring out a cleaning crew and a dump truck to clean it up.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

My biggest concern is that DOE has been on the defense way too much. They have been allowing the activists to use bad science – they don't challenge it. The fact that they haven't responded to the bad science just encourages the activists, emboldens them. DOE needs to improve the quality of the science and educate the public. The public has very little knowledge about radiation, radioactive materials and their effects on people, and in particular, the very small amount of radioactivity at the SSFL. DOE has done a very poor job educating the public. They have just done too little to counter the outrageous claims.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I've never prepared an EIS myself. I know they are very large and very detailed. I live very close to SSFL. I think DOE should keep people who live nearby well informed about the status of the EIS, provide status reports. The public needs to know how much it will cost to produce the EIS. If the public wants a very large and detailed EIS, the public should know what that document will cost to prepare. They should have public meetings to tell the public what they are doing and how the document is coming along.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The EIS could become someone's life work. They could evaluate an absurd number of alternatives. The potential cost of evaluating all those alternatives doesn't make sense. It would be common sense to define an alternative of either end of the spectrum and define a reasonable approach somewhere between. Then DOE should then let the public react to the options, for example, by having public presentations or status reports by mail or Internet with the opportunity to respond. There needs to be a project manager or some individual who has responsibility to keep the EIS project under control and within budget and schedule.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

Maybe DOE could explain what they propose to consider at a public meeting, present the whole list. Then they could let the public react to the list. DOE could also create an Internet mailing list and send out issues for comment to people on the list. Not everyone can physically come to a public meeting.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should provide an opportunity for the public to comment in writing to the Draft EIS. DOE could have a meeting to explain the results of the analysis and answer questions. Then people could submit their comments in writing. DOE should also make this information and comment opportunity available via the Internet for people who cannot come to a public meeting.

DOE should have a public meeting later to share what comments they received and what they did with the comments. Some comments will be off scope and some will be absurd. DOE will accept some comments and incorporate them into the document. At a public meeting they could explain all of the comments they got and how they responded to them.

The process should be open and transparent. But DOE should also be scientifically honest. They need to demonstrate some backbone.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – That's not a bad idea, but its not that good an idea either
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets – These should be very focused and available via the Internet
- f. Periodic newsletters – That would be OK
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – That's the best idea yet. The tours should drive by the locations that are known to contain some radioactivity so people see that they look no different than the rest of the Area IV.
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – The Internet is vital for people who cannot come to public meetings. A blog might be a good idea but it would require a full-time manager to control off-color language and outrageous personal attacks.

Attachment B, Interview 41.

- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – These would be helpful if they were focused on specific problem areas in Area IV. What is really needed is general quality education to the public on radiation, health physics, and nuclear materials. Education like the old Atomic Energy Commission did so well.
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – That sounds like overkill
- k. Public open houses – Those might be doable. DOE should provide cookies to get people to come. Most people won't come, they have other or more important things to do
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – Most members of the public don't really know enough to really be helpful. I suppose it's possible, if DOE asked for help on things they could really use help on.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – In the interest of open-ness, this isn't a bad idea
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This would politicize the issue even more. The advice wouldn't be based on science. The activists would use the opportunity to get up on their soap-box. The idea of an advisory group sounds good on the surface, but advisory groups have no authority or responsibility or accountability, so they become outlets for grandstanding.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Periodic public meetings at a local hotel
- Internet – its accessible to everyone
- Try to do a better job of educating the public on the science of radiation
- Reading rooms in the public library

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

The only suggestion that I would have is DOE should demand sound science. I went to a meeting where a UCLA medical researcher made some erroneous claims. Boeing countered, but DOE didn't. DOE should have challenged these conclusions. The activists are not always in the right. We had a joint project with the University of Missouri to develop a new method for separating nuclear elements from reprocessing waste. The activists filed a law suit to stop our R&D project but their claims were totally without merit. The judge ruled in our favor. We fought their claims with science. DOE needs to do that more. DOE needs to learn how to play both offense and defense. They just let the bad ideas float around until people start believing them. The small amount of contamination at the SSFL should not have taken this long to clean up.

There has already been so much done in sampling and planning to clean up Area IV. The level of contamination doesn't really warrant the attention this site gets. Most of the public doesn't

Attachment B, Interview 41.

really understand radioactivity. It isn't as simple or automatically dangerous as the press and activists have claimed. DOE needs to provide more education for the public.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

I think DOE can do a good and credible job to gain the confidence of the public.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I do not.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I have not been party to any of the public participation activities at the SSFL. I am aware that some people living near the site have a high level of concern and I have heard that DOE has been less than forthcoming. I attribute that to an air of mistrust. DOE should strive for full disclosure. That will make the public and the critics happier.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

The most important objective should be to achieve full disclosure. DOE should provide a place for the public at the table. The issue is one of trust. DOE will regain the public's trust through enhanced communication and interaction.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should provide a place for the public at the table. The alternatives that are evaluated in the EIS should reflect the public's interests and concerns.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should evaluate the issues that they know they have to evaluate according to the National Environmental Policy Act. DOE should give strong consideration to any issues suggested by the public.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

My assumption is that the public will have an opportunity to react to the Draft EIS and provide comment on it.

Attachment B, Interview 42.

I suspect the public will want to stay involved, even throughout the implementation of the cleanup program.

There is lingering public distrust. DOE will have to continue to bend over backwards to regain the public's confidence.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – These should be face to face
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters – I could take or leave them
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – I don't think that would be necessary
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – Maybe for a small segment of the public
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – That's not a bad idea
- k. Public open houses – Those can work under certain circumstances, perhaps at specific milestones in the process so that DOE can share information with the public
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis. Those might work under certain circumstances if DOE can identify what it could use public input for
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS. That might be good for the technically-oriented people
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – That would be very labor intensive. This might be a good way to build public trust. Given the level of controversy at SSFL, it might be a way to get buy-in for the clean-up plans

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

Attachment B, Interview 42.

- Community advisory group
- Workshops
- Open process, well explained, with feedback to the public on what DOE did with their input

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

As a Simi Valley resident, my biggest concern is that the DOE will have to overcome the misleading information that is already out there. There are activists who have been involved with the clean-up issues at SSFL for some time who have effectively painted a picture that SSFL is currently posing an imminent threat to the community. Unfortunately, their attempts to influence land-use decisions and/or public policy has resulted in slandering the reputation of safety and clean living in my community and needlessly threatened property values. I know of instances where it has harmed the community's ability to attract new residents and employees.

DOE has not done a good job of educating the public regarding the extent and types of contamination that has occurred at SSFL and how that contamination does, or does not, impact on the health of the surrounding community.

For instance, many of our community leaders in public office, and by extension many in the public, believe that the contamination at SSFL puts members in the surrounding communities at risk where they live. My understanding is that the risk levels of radiation are expressed as risk to someone who lives at the site of the contamination over a 30-year period. But these risks are reported in the press and quoted by government officials as being a risk shared by those in surrounding communities even though there is no mechanism that I am aware of to spread that risk outside of the immediate contamination area. The risks need to be expressed in terms of the locations of that risk. The risk associated with the contamination or cleanup at SSFL might be unacceptable if someone lived there – but no one will live there.

In addition, government officials and the public seem to be unaware of the relative risk of radiation in their natural environment. They are unable to weigh the relative risks due to natural radiation exposure and other risks (auto deaths, smoking, obesity, etc.) to the risks of the contamination at SSFL. I believe this would put it in context for most people. For instance, if one were to truly want to protect the citizens of Simi Valley, they would ban private automobiles from the city and put up parking lots at the east and west ends, forcing folks to bicycle or use public transportation within the community. This would provide much greater benefit than any clean-up at SSFL since each year there are one to several traffic related deaths in Simi Valley while the clean-up levels that are debated for SSFL are for 1 in 100,000 or 1 in 1 million over a 30 year span! And that is only assuming that 100,000 or 1 million people were living on the site of the contamination! The risk of the contamination needs to be put into perspective.

Of course, everyone wants to see SSFL cleaned up as much as possible. But the clean-up levels should make sense and not result in needlessly destroying the natural esthetic beauty of the SSFL.

DOE could improve on the way that it communicates about the contamination by providing a better explanation of the locations that it is found, and what the sources of the contamination are. My perception is that the contamination is mostly associated with the buildings that the nuclear work was performed in with only a few exceptions. My understanding is that most of the contamination goes away as those buildings go away. If this is true, it is not a universally known fact. Other than the buildings, is the contamination found in small, isolated locations, or spread over a large area?

Will removal of the buildings and facilities effectively remove all of the contamination? If not, why not? Will removal of the buildings and facilities effectively release the contamination to the environment? Will we be better off if the contamination is disturbed, or left in place?

Attachment B, Interview 43.

Another concern I have is that when DOE issued the stop work order, it meant that Boeing couldn't hold onto the folks who would have been the best choices for doing the cleanup – those that had been there a long time, knew what had happened and had the training to deal with it. SSFL has lost a lot of institutional knowledge. DOE's attempts to out-source work (to save money) will mean that the contractor hired to do the cleanup will not have adequate knowledge to do good job. This may not be the job for the lowest bidder!

I worked at SSFL. I've seen how things are handled and I trust that everything that is done as a result of this EIS will be done safely.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

The EIS should evaluate the risks and costs of leaving everything where it is compared to completely cleaning everything up. There should be a fair comparison of those two alternatives.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE has been inconsistent. They have demonstrated a lack of creativity in their outreach efforts. They have not attempted to communicate with the broad community – they focus all of their attention on the activists. When LA public schools needed to talk to people about contaminants in the schools, they talked to the broad public. They reached out to the entire community, and people reacted well to that approach. DOE should not focus so much attention on the activists. Their outreach should go directly to various members of the community and community groups. Examples: Realtors, Hospitals, Schools, Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Church Groups, Neighborhood Councils, etc.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

Involve the entire community, not just the activists. Try to get input from a breadth of the community.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I don't know what's typical, but I think DOE should go to the neighborhood councils. They are very engaged in their communities, and they get involved in all sorts of issues. They are a good cross-section of the more engaged members of the community, but they have a broad set of interests – rather than being solely focused on SSFL. They can participate while keeping it in perspective.

DOE should evaluate the costs, risks, and effectiveness of no cleanup at all as well as alternatives that could extend from removal to pouring steel and concrete over the entire affected site. Performing this Trade Study should result in the most practical and effective solution.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should provide the opportunity to make suggestions of issues that should be evaluated. The public will need to understand what the likely alternatives will look like. The will need to have a full understanding of each alternative so that they can imagine what the likely impacts of each alternative might be. The public should have an opportunity to suggest impacts that maybe DOE hasn't thought about. Some of the interested folks, including some of the more practical activists, have been involved a very long time and they may have good ideas.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the draft EIS. The public should be notified later as to how DOE responded to each comment received. DOE should make an effort to make sure that the public understands how and why DOE chooses it path forward.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – Probably less effective then other methods
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – I don't see any value in this
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – this makes sense
- d. Periodic informational briefings – Absolutely, but don't just do the usual periodic public meetings, also do the outreach by going to various community groups (like Neighborhood Councils, Chamber of Commerce, Schools, Hospitals, Churches, Service Orgs.)
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters – if these went out to people that are known to be interested
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) Absolutely
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – this is good because people can find information whenever they want it (day or night)
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) Yes, on all aspects.
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – They have to have these – although they can turn into an absolute circus

Attachment B, Interview 43.

- k. Public open houses – these are better than the formal public meetings
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – That’s a good idea
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – This would not work for the general public, but some people might be interested.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – EPA’s workgroup provides a format for those members of the public that have been beating their own drum for years. It does not provide a broad cross-section of the community. This might be worthwhile if DOE could convene their own and include a broader cross-section of the community.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Tours
- Outreach to the broader community – business groups, education, health care, neighborhood councils, more grassroots folks

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

In the past, DOE has chosen to focus all of its attention on just a few people. It’s always the same people, and they have specific concerns. This over-emphasizes those individuals’ perspectives and under-emphasizes everyone else’s concerns. This should not continue.

DOE should brief the neighborhood councils. They should do more outreach to different groups: realtors, health care providers, educators, business groups, the Rotary. I have heard women say that their doctors recommend more frequent mammograms because they live close to SFFL. That is absurd and a waste of money. It just scares people for no reason. Health care providers need a better understanding than that. Teachers are also a good source of information and should be educated.

When DOE doesn’t provide good information, it means that anyone will rely on the information that is available – and that information may not be factually correct. When there is no information, the impact of those who do provide information is amplified.

DOE should talk directly to the public and be very forthcoming. They should provide accurate information that people can understand. DOE needs a good spokesperson.

A lot of people have heard something that scares them, but they don’t have enough information to know whether or not to be scared. They don’t attend the Workgroup meetings so it won’t do any good for DOE to focus on providing information in that setting. They may be otherwise engaged in community activities, like attending PTA meetings or whatever. DOE should try to reach those people.

Attachment B, Interview 43.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My biggest concern is that they get all the records they need to do a thorough analysis. They also need to get a good look at every square inch of the hill. We found barrels of waste that had bullet holes in them in Dayton Canyon and also big chunks of building foundations – which proves that they did not dispose of everything properly. (She showed me photographs of barrels with holes as well as large pieces of concrete that had been found in Dayton Canyon.) Back in the old days, it was fairly common for folks at SSFL to dump stuff in manholes.

Perchlorate is a substance that is regulated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control. The standard is 6 parts per billion. There is documentation showing perchlorate in local water wells at 62 million parts per billion.

I was diagnosed with bladder cancer and I am certain that the cancer was caused by exposures I experienced when I worked at SSFL. I was hired as a secretary there when I was 20 years old. No one told me how to protect myself nor how dangerous it was to work there. The National Institute of Safety and Health evaluated my case and determined that I was not eligible for receiving compensation. They claimed that only 3% of my cancer could be attributable to the exposure I had received despite the fact that they have no data on which to calculate my dose. They used data from other sites to calculate my dose. How ridiculous, how positively criminal is that?

UCLA did a death study of cancer cases among the SSFL workforce; bladder cancer does not look like that big of a problem as bladder cancer is very survivable. Just because not very many workers have died of bladder cancer does not mean that not very many worker have been diagnosed with it. The greatest percentage of cancer is bladder cancer in the workers.

I have done a lot of research into the health effects of SSFL and I remain very concerned. There are elevated levels of all kinds of cancer in this community, along with thyroid problems. A tritium plume found by the EPA in 1989 is the largest tritium plume found at a DOE site. Tritium is very hazardous to humans. Fully one-third of the wells in Simi Valley have perchlorate in them. There were buildings all around this area that supported SSFL. As a result, it is hard to say whether it was SSFL that caused problems or other support facilities.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

I've become aware that it was common to open the doors of the reactors during operation to vent radiation so that they could lower radiation.

DOE should look around Buildings 28, AE6, and 621.

The last thing I heard, they were reportedly saying that they did not know the source of the tritium. The largest plume of tritium at a DOE site in the entire country is here.

DOE has not been able to find a significant number of documents. I am told by folks that have worked there that they recorded everything that occurred in log books. Can you believe they can't find the log book for the sodium burn pit. It's hard to believe.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

I've been very discouraged because Boeing was using the DOE folks as puppets. They don't know anything! Sometimes I know more than they do, if you can believe that!

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should make every effort to keep the public informed and release documents for public comment in a manner that allows people plenty of time to review the documents within the time allowed.

They should do what they normally do, but do it well.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

It is hard to imagine how they could actually clean it up – it is such a mess up there. People all over the valley have health problems, thyroid problems and cancer. In order to protect the people in this community, they need to do everything that can be done to effectively clean up.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

I think they are still keeping secrets. They should change that and come clean.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

The public should be involved every step of the way. DOE should make a special effort to include Dan Hirsch throughout the implementation of the cleanup program.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – People may want to share what they know
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – I don't know how useful these are although they are probably necessary
- d. Periodic informational briefings – at the SSFL Workgroup meetings

Attachment B, Interview 44.

- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) – People should not go up there – it is too hazardous
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?) – Especially with maps
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses – I have never liked that meeting format. They don't tell the truth and we can't hear what's being said around the room.
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – if the documents have been written by Boeing, they cannot be trusted
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Public meetings – with detailed information, maps, and handouts
- An ongoing advisory board

Whatever is done, there should be notices about all activities in the newspaper. The LA Daily News is good, the Times does not do a good job covering SSFL.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Be honest, brutal and honest. Acknowledge the truth and quit covering things up. Don't let Phil Rutherford speak for the department. He has lied to the public in the past.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

There is a long list of the health concerns. Did you know they blew up some of their own scientists in 1994! A grand jury reviewed the case and awarded \$60 million in damages after finding that what they had done was illegal.

Attachment B, Interview 44.

The site operators had wells on site for drinking water for the employees for several years. They saved \$50,000 a year – the budget they were working with was exorbitant, and that was the corner they chose to cut. The lives of the workforce were deemed expendable. Some of the workers I know tell that some of the workforce at Rocky Flats and Hanford were trained at SSFL. Dominic Sanchini (director at Rocky Flats) was trained here.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

There has never been any testing for contamination on south side of the mountain (Woolsey). They have tested on the north side. When we asked why, they said no one had ever asked them to test on the south side. That's ridiculous, because no one asked them to on the other side either. There are numerous wells that have never been sampled. They said they don't know where the wells are located. But we know, and they have never asked us. If they don't know the extent of the contamination, how can they clean it up.

It took 49 years before Rocketdyne released the information they had about the weather on the day of the 1959 meltdown. They had a weather station up there, but for years they denied that they did. Then they finally admitted there was a weather station, but they said all the records were gone. So then, they found the records. The wind was blowing this way. They should have been looking for contamination on this side of the mountain a long time ago.

There were actually three meltdowns at SSFL. There was way more contamination released than they have ever been willing to admit. They tell us there is nothing to worry about. But they can't show us any documentation of what they did with the contamination that occurred. If they can't prove that it was dealt with, we can't believe they have taken care of it.

I have an aerospace background. I know the deals that are cut between the federal government and their contractors. DOE says that they are responsible for Area IV, not the other areas. But Boeing was working for the federal government when it did what was done in the other areas. How could DOE, the federal agency they were working for, allow that to happen.

It is pointless to do as EIS for cleanup of Area IV when DOE allowed contamination to occur in all of the areas. If they aren't going to clean up all of the contamination that they are responsible for, then they won't be protecting the public.

There are ten artesian wells in the San Fernando Valley. None of them can be used. Now everyone has to drink water from the Colorado River. Why? There are plumes of contamination in the ground water. Where did the contamination come from? We know it came from SSFL. What else could have caused that contamination? DOE allowed that to happen and will not take responsibility for making sure that it is completely cleaned up. The federal agency in charge up there allowed that to happen and did nothing to protect the public.

Chatsworth Reservoir used to be much bigger than it is now. It was drained – they said because of the earthquake, but that doesn't make any sense. And they drained it before the earthquake! It isn't safe anymore. There used to be wildlife and waterfowl around the lake; there isn't any more.

DOE should clean up to EPA standards. Why should they be allowed to leave more contamination behind? EPA should be allowed to declare the entire SSFL a Superfund site and clean it up properly, to EPA standards. If the site is not cleaned up to EPA standards, it will fall very short of the community's expectations. DOE hasn't participated in the SSFL Workgroup meetings; its like they don't care.

There is no way they are ever going to convince people that the place is clean.

Attachment B, Interview 45.

Why did they ever open this area up for residential, especially based on what they know. When Rocketdyne was built, the area was never supposed to be residential. Why did they start allowing residential development? They should be freeze on new development.

In the Environmental Assessment, DOE said that SSFL would be all cleaned up. Yet we later found out that they were planning to leave 99% of the contamination in place. They thought it would be okay to build homes on top of that! Hundreds of trucks have been up and down that road hauling away the 1% of the contamination that was removed over a period of 20 years. How many thousands of truck loads over how many years will it take to haul away the rest of the mess?

They brought nuclear waste from other sites to SSFL, they washed the radiation off here. So we got that mess as well.

When I moved here, all I knew about SSFL was that they used to do rocket testing up there. No one knew about the melt downs. There were no containment domes over the reactors. More radiation was released than was released from Three Mile Island. Can you imagine people wanting to live near Three Mile Island?

There are many more cases of breast cancer, of bladder cancer, of thyroid problems than there should be. The government is turning a blind eye on us.

The EIS should find that no one should be living here. They should close the place down, pay us for our property, and move us all away. If they want the public to believe the EIS, then they should have Gregg Dempsey write it. We won't believe anyone else.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

They should ask the people walking or hiking at Sage Ranch about dead animals. They should ask everyone what they know.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

DOE has passed up many, many opportunities to listen to the public, but has chosen not to participate in those opportunities. It is not clear why they want to listen now.

We asked to be added to the mailing list. They have never sent us anything.

We have talked to Phil Rutherford numerous times. He has made many promises that he has not kept.

DOE works for Boeing, not the American public. They do what Boeing wants them to do, not what the public wants. DOE hasn't cared about the residents, ever. If they cared, they would want to protect our health.

DOE has lied to the public, flat out lied. No one trusts DOE.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should tell the truth. They should stop lying. They have a history of not being responsive to the public. We are tired of being lied to. They should do what they say they are going to do.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

The public should be informed about the options that are being considered. I don't honestly think there are any other alternatives, but it's possible that someone might have a brilliant idea.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The public will say they are concerned about potential traffic impacts. There will be thousands of truckloads of nasty stuff going up and down the road. Some of the truck loads won't be covered. It will be dangerous. We already know they don't care about us. There are perhaps 1,100 people who live along this road. They don't care about us.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

They should have two public meetings every month. The meetings should be well publicized. They should have meetings at various times, including daytime, evenings, and weekends to allow people with different work schedules attend.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline – if it were answered by a real person
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – that's an interesting idea. They could put information in shopping centers, at fairs, at the farmers market
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings – if they did this, it should be on a set schedule so that people can plan around it
- e. Informational fact sheets – as long as they are short and written in lay terms
- f. Periodic newsletters

Attachment B, Interview 45.

- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?) That's an interesting idea. Why would anyone want to go up there?
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – Not everyone uses the Internet
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses - not unless they are going to be responsive to the public's requests. Usually these are designed to be self-serving (help DOE tell there side of the story)
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis – only if DOE really intends to use what people do
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – For this to work, the group must be truly independent. Otherwise they wouldn't be trusted. Maybe DOE could build a new group using the existing SSFL Workgroup

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- Public meetings
- Honesty
- Don't bring Boeing or Pratt Whitney to public meetings
- Live up to their commitments

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

None

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

No.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

My primary concern is the ongoing cover-up of information about SSFL. Even now, much of the public is unaware that the lab is there. They do not know what happened there or the health risks that are associated with the site.

There are millions of documents related to the site, but only a very small number have been released to the public. Many documents are available on line, but it is a lot harder to read on-line documents that may be 200 or more pages in length. Some documents are turned the wrong way; others are redacted.

No one helps new people come up to speed about SSFL. It is overwhelming to try to come into this without anyone assigned to educate the newcomer and to try to get them up to speed. I have lived here for 30 years and I did not know about the reactors up there until two years ago. The average person knows nothing about SSFL.

I think the most important thing that DOE can do is to provide the public an opportunity to visit the site. I have never been to AREA IV. I do not know what buildings are still there.

The community does not know what is currently going on at the ETEC site (AREA IV). We do not know how badly the site is still contaminated with radioactive contaminants. We do not know what other parts of the SSFL have been contaminated by accidents in AREA IV.

I am also greatly concerned that the people that are charged with the cleanup – deciding what the remediation goals are, are not necessarily qualified to make that decision. There are meetings with the DOE, EPA, DTSC, Boeing, and some community members to determine background and the preliminary remediation goals of the site. But how many of the people sitting at the table looking at those numbers are actually health physicists, doctors, or people who know what the public health implications are for each individual contaminant of concern let alone their synergistic affects?

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

The most important thing to look at would be the court documents related to the many lawsuits have been settled, including the Capello and the Brandeis-Bardin lawsuits. The information presented by the parties in those lawsuits has been sealed, but DOE should release that information.

On May 21, there was an Open House hosted by DTSC about the Area I Burn Pit. They moved the burn pit a ½ mile away from its original location. The new pit had six liners. Components that are known to have burned there formed dioxins. That information should be addressed in the EIS. We do not know if materials from AREA IV that were radioactive ended up in the AREA I Burn Pit. AREA IV seems to have had their own Burn Pit where radioactive contaminants and mixed waste were put into a burn pit.

An expert panel has been formed to oversee the surface water run-off at Outfalls 8 and 9. The panel's findings should be included in the EIS.

There are numerous logbooks that address the accidents that they have had at SSFL, but those documents have not been released to the public. These records should be reviewed.

Attachment B, Interview 46.

I think it is very important for the DOE to sample all of the SSFL and the peripheral properties as well as the natural pathways for radionuclides. That includes the Chatsworth Reservoir, Chatsworth Park South, and the Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park because they all lie on the same geologic formation, or the runoff naturally runs in that direction. Other areas that need to be sampled include Bell Canyon, Dayton Canyon, Woolsley Canyon, Box Canyon, Black Canyon, Runkle Canyon, Ahmanson Ranch, Sage Ranch, and Brandeis – Bardin.

I received a document many years ago, that said that I was in the prevailing winds area of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory. Today, I believe that document referred to the radionuclides. Therefore, I believe that sampling for radionuclides must extend well beyond AREA IV. The winds change – I have seen documents that say that the radionuclides could have been carried as far as 50 miles away. Therefore, sampling should be carried out based on wind patterns. I have seen documents that specifically show those wind patterns. Sampling stations on some documents go out to Thousand Oaks.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

Until the EIS process began, I believe that I had only been to one or two meetings that were hosted by the DOE and / or Boeing. Phil Rutherford was at the front of the room at least one meeting. I think that Boeing was hosting the meeting regarding the dismantling of a particular building in early 2007. That actually was not clear to me at the time – who hosted the meeting.

Thomas Johnson has been attending the SSFL Workgroup meetings.

I don't think that the community is being effectively notified of these meetings. I am told that the meeting notices are being published in the newspaper. I haven't had the time to read the newspaper for quite a while.

I do get notifications of the meetings by letter. But that is because I have signed up to be on the mailing list. I do not know how many people are notified by mail by the DOE – people in the two-mile radius? In the five mile radius? In the ten mile radius? What about in the prevailing wind areas?

I believe that DOE could do a lot better job helping newcomers get up to speed. People like me try to walk into a discussion that has been going on for 20 years and no one is helpful to those of us that have not been around the whole time.

It would be nice if someone were to prepare a summary document presenting the factual history of operations at SSFL. ETEC does have a nice website; there are some good videos on there. But there is too much information, and much of it is highly technical.

There has to be a summary that can get people up to speed. It needs an introduction / background section. They also need to be very careful about their use of acronyms.

Information materials should be written so that an average person can understand them, someone who does not have a background in physics or chemistry.

The terms ETEC and Area IV are used almost interchangeably. That can be confusing to a new person. Most people just go to Wikipedia because it is easier. But I have no way of knowing if the information on Wikipedia is accurate or not. When you read things on Wikipedia, things on

agency sites, and things on the community members' sites, it all becomes muddled together. You do not know who is accurate if the agencies never correct the community members. And sometimes the community members know more than the agency representatives on some issues. Those sorts of inconsistencies can really confuse those of us who have not been around a long time.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

I have asked for a site tour of Area IV. A number of people have toured Area IV, but I never have. It is very difficult to know what is there as opposed to what used to be there. I really think they should provide an opportunity for a tour before the scoping meetings so that we can have a good idea of what is left that needs to be cleaned up. If there are some areas that are highly radioactive, then we should avoid those areas on a tour.

I think that all members of the community who want to attend the technical meetings to determine the "Background" numbers and PRGs for the site should be allowed to participate. They should be educated as to what the terms mean if they do not understand them. And they should be made aware that PRGs at this time are hypotheticals – that since no one really knows what is there to clean up, and no one knows where these COCs all are, then they can't know just what can and cannot be remediated.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

I think that the public needs to be more informed and engaged in this process. The remediation of the site has been prolonged because certain members of the community have insisted on certain clean up standards. I do not know if these standards are achievable because not one agency has ever had a discussion about background and remediation goals that I have found to be informative or educational. I believe that all of the meetings that I have attended have been shouting matches about what has not been done in the past, and about how the community feels about Boeing and the DOE. I think that time would be better spent looking at COIs or COCs and talking about what is there. For example, the community should be informed about what is suspected as being present at this time. At what levels are the instruments capable of detecting a COC? What would you have to do to clean up that COC? I never hear those discussions.

The public needs to be informed of what COCs are currently there. We need to know the risks of remediation – and what will the risk be if a structure is left in place? We need to be able to weigh these risks to the employees who will do the remediation work, the risks to the community while the remediation is being done, and the risks to the community after the work has been completed to a level that is achievable.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

The community members who want to be involved in the determination of background levels and remediation goals should be allowed to attend all technical meetings. If the community members are left out of this process, they will not be able to understand these same numbers

Attachment B, Interview 46.

when they are presented during other stages of the remediation process. The community needs to understand what kinds of numbers are achievable – not what hypothetical numbers are preliminary remediation goals. The community needs to be informed as to what COCs are known to be present as a guideline, which ones are above the EPA's PRGs, and what it will take to clean them up.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

I think that the public needs to be greatly involved. For example, the companies CDM and SAIC are new to the site. They do not know the site history as well as some community members. Employees of the DOE are not even as familiar with the site as many community members.

Boeing, Rocketdyne, and the DOE have created a situation in which the community does not trust them to do an effective cleanup. Therefore the whole cleanup process needs to be highly transparent, and the process needs to include all members of the community that choose to participate.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings – LA is too big for that to work
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents – To tell the truth, I do not know anyone who has ever used one. I only know one person who does not have email. I think the Internet would be a better way to distribute information.
- d. Periodic informational briefings – That would be very important. Every month or two, tell the public the status of the project
- e. Informational fact sheets – Maybe that would be helpful. They could help people come up to speed.
- f. Periodic newsletters – These should only be mailed to people who request them; they should be sent via email to everyone else. Maybe DOE could set up a list serve that would confirm delivery for the e-mailing list.
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour) – I would like to see what is there now, and I would like to know what was where before.
- h. Internet tools for sharing information – Critical - The biggest challenge is that there are too many websites, too much data, and not knowing where to look at a particular time. Looking for documents is much like watching the first Harry Potter movie when envelopes are falling out of the sky. Each agency website has

Attachment B, Interview 46.

information of value. I rarely use the community members' websites anymore. I tend to search the agency sites or GOOGLE if I want to find information on a particular topic. The agencies should not rely on the community members who have websites to accurately post calendar or other information in a timely manner. The agencies should direct email all community members when there is a new post of information on the ETEC or other agency sites that is important to communicate to the community such as meeting dates or dates for public response.

Everyone should have access to the same information. Some people think it is a waste of time to listen to basic presentations. I have been asking a lot of basic questions. Some members would probably like to have a more technical presentation in a smaller group, but if I do not have the opportunity to hear the same information, I will never catch up. Everyone should be invited to attend every presentation.

- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript) – A transcript is very important. We can all review it later to remember who said what. For every public meeting, DOE should give a presentation, then answer questions, then provide an opportunity to comment. Two minutes is too short. Five minutes would be better. DOE always has their meetings in Simi Valley. More people live on the other side. They should have their meetings in Chatsworth. The time of the meetings also matters. They should have a major informational meeting at a large venue on a Saturday or an evening. It would be great if California EPA, DOE, DTSC, the federal EPA - everyone was present. Once they figure out who the lead agency will be for the cleanup of the whole site there should be a meeting like a conference open to everyone in the area. It should be advertised. It should include the government officials, all of the agencies, and the community. We all need to be in the room at one time.
- k. Public open houses – DTSC had one a couple of weeks ago.
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis. This might be good to get everyone on the same page.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS – this would only be worthwhile if someone was available who could explain the information to the public
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group – This idea has caused a lot of controversy. It would be very difficult to design such a group to everyone's satisfaction. DTSC has a CAG in their plans, which was supposed to be formed if 50 people signed a petition. I am told that Christina Walsh got 50 people to sign, but the people thought they were all going to be on the CAG. DTSC said that is not how the EPA rules create a CAG. The CAG would be comprised of government representatives, Boeing, NASA, DOE, DTSC, the Water board, Native Americans, environmental groups, and community members. The DTSC would have to advertise to the community about the CAG. Former Boeing employees and current Boeing employees would become a part of the CAG. That would not leave many positions for community members.

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

- 1) Site tours
- 2) A shared meeting with all of the agencies participating – including DOE, NASA, EPA, DTSC and the Water Board – a symposium or workshop that would last more than a day, where all the issues could be discussed by everyone. Hundreds of people might want to participate. It could be held at an indoor auditorium, maybe on a university campus
- 3) A panel of experts at the PHD level – including a health physicist, chemist, and a physician who is an environmental health specialist with expertise in cancer or autoimmune disorders – that can review documents and help the public understand what DOE is saying in their documents
- 4) The internet website
- 5) Document storage – a place where all the reference documents are stored, with a helpful and knowledgeable resource librarian that knows all the documents and can help people find what they are looking for. The public libraries are open at odd hours. Their librarians have to assist with all of the guests. Their librarians may not understand the materials.

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

Have one-on-one meetings with interested parties and or individual site tours. Group site tours are not very satisfying. An overall group tour in the beginning may be ok. But people tend to talk all at once. Individual tours may be better later for those who want more information.

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

I am glad to see they are making an effort to involve the public. I would appreciate getting a large map of the site if they have one that I could have.

An ideal situation would be to have a facility that everyone is welcome to use that could house all relevant reference documents. The agencies could hire a librarian who would know all of the documents and could help people find what they were looking for. It could have maps and pictures for people to look at. The librarian would have to be knowledgeable. It would have to have long hours of operation and helpful staff.

If there is no on-going work at Area IV, I do not understand why we cannot take cameras on tour in AREA IV. Photos help people remember when there is so much information. I do know that there is still work being done in other areas of the SSFL.

1. What concerns do you have about DOE's plans to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the cleanup of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory?

DOE is a corrupt agency. They have a history of ignoring the public and of breaking environmental laws. They are hostile towards the community. I have no confidence that an honest Environmental Impact Statement will be completed.

They already know what alternative they are going to use for the cleanup and it is based on political considerations.

2. Is there any information that you have or that you know about that you want to make sure DOE considers during development of the EIS?

There are tons of documents that they should be looking at. Most of the documents are their own documents. These include documents that they have suppressed and documents that they never acknowledged.

The decisions about how DOE will clean up the SSFL will be political decisions. They will adopt a lax cleanup standard. They will violate the law. They will not cleanup the site.

Accomplishing any more than that would require a complete change in attitude and that isn't going to happen.

3. Based on your experience in keeping track of activities at Santa Susana Field Laboratory, what concerns do you have about how DOE has conducted public participation activities in the past?

The way that DOE has conducted public participation in the past has been a complete fraud. DOE does not listen to the community. It is all one-way communication. They are dishonest. They misrepresent the facts for their own benefit.

4. What do you think DOE's objectives should be for involving the public in the development of this EIS?

DOE should genuinely attempt to hear the public. They should listen to the community and do what the community says. They should do genuine public participation.

5. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, federal agencies are responsible for "scoping" the EIS – which involves developing a range of reasonable alternatives for addressing the purpose and need for federal action. What role do you think the public should have in framing the alternatives that will be evaluated by DOE for this EIS?

DOE should work with the public to define alternatives that are driven by the public. They should follow the law.

6. During scoping for this EIS, DOE will also seek input from the public regarding the potential impacts of the various alternatives. What role do you think the public should have during development of the issues that should be evaluated?

DOE should listen to the public and do what the public says.

7. DOE will likely use the input received from the public during scoping to prepare a draft EIS along with technical documents and reference materials. Consistent with

requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE will conduct a public comment period following publication of the draft EIS. What role do you think the public should have after the publication of the draft EIS?

DOE should listen to the public and do what the public says.

8. Which of the following possible public participation activities would be worthwhile, from your perspective (check all that apply)

- a. Telephone hotline
- b. Information kiosks in public settings
- c. Information repositories or public reading rooms with relevant reference documents
- d. Periodic informational briefings
- e. Informational fact sheets
- f. Periodic newsletters
- g. Public tours of Area IV (what would you like to see on a tour?)
- h. Internet tools for sharing information
- i. Detailed technical presentations (about what subjects?)
- j. Formal public meetings (with a meeting moderator, court reporter, and a transcript)
- k. Public open houses
- l. Workshops with an opportunity to sit down with DOE staff to do work needed for the analysis.
- m. Periodic opportunities to review supporting documents related to the EIS.
- n. An ongoing citizen advisory group.

This interviewee did not want to reflect on the list of possible activities, responding that “DOE consistently refuses to meet with me, to talk with me. They want to violate the law. They intend to look only at Area IV in the EIS. They are setting themselves up to get sued again.”

9. Which three to five of the possible activities do you think would support the most appropriate role for the public during development of the EIS?

NA

10. What other advice would you give DOE for doing a good job of involving the public for the EIS?

“DOE should sit down with me. Senior officials, not public affairs staff, should sit down with me and other members of the public with technical backgrounds. If they really don’t want to get sued again, that’s what they need to do.”

11. Who else do you think I should talk to during the development of my recommendations to DOE?

Answers are not included for this report to protect confidentiality of those individuals who were mentioned.

12. Is there anything else you would like to tell me today?

DOE will just ignore the public’s comments like they always do.

545 Shoup Avenue

Suite 312

Idaho Falls, ID

83402

208.523.6668

July 21, 2008

Stephanie Jennings
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 10300
Canoga Park, CA 91309

Dear Ms. Jennings,

As you know, I have a contract to provide public participation services to the U.S. Department of Energy in support of efforts to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Remediation of Area IV at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory.

One task under my scope of work called for me to conduct community interviews and then develop recommendations for how DOE should conduct public participation activities based on what I learned in those interviews. As per your direction, I developed the list of interviewees on my own, based on publicly available information and the suggestions of those with whom I talked. I have conducted 49 interviews involving a total of 58 people to date.

Following each interview, I transcribed my notes and requested the approval of those I interviewed. To date, I have received approval from all but six people. I am still hopeful to get approval for the balance of the interviews so that I can include them in my final report.

I know you are anxious to receive the results of the interviewing process. Accordingly, I am transmitting preliminary recommendations, based on the approved interviews. My full report will also include the full transcription of all interviews and a question-by-question analysis of the responses.

I hope you will find the attached preliminary recommendations to be helpful to you as you move forward with your plans.

I enjoyed the interviewing process immensely. The public surrounding SSFL is amazingly well informed and very interested in the future of the site. Almost everyone was happy to meet with me and expressed appreciation that they had been contacted for the interviews. Many expressed a desire to help DOE move forward with planning for cleanup that will address their concerns. They are not – by any means – uniform in their perspectives, opinions, concerns, or interests, but they do share an interest in helping DOE to move forward with cleanup.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the recommendations.

Warm regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Wendy Green Lowe".

Wendy Green Lowe
ions

Preliminary Recommendations for Public Participation Activities to Support Development of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Remediation of Area IV, Santa Susana Field Laboratory

The scope of work under my contract with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) included community interviews to develop a more informed understanding of the various individuals and groups surrounding the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) and their issues and concerns. The interview process was designed to learn about community perspectives on the cleanup and to learn how stakeholders would like to be involved during development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the cleanup of Area IV at SSFL. This report provides preliminary recommendations derived from the results of the interviewing process.

Background

My purpose was not to interview everyone – but to try to ensure that all different perspectives are represented. I started with a short list of names that I could glean from a quick search of the Internet. One question asked people to recommend additional folks that I should contact; that question has yielded many excellent suggestions. Eventually, I conducted 49 interviews with a total of 58 people. Four people refused to allow me to interview them, but everyone else was accommodating of the request. Following each interview, I transcribed my notes and forwarded those notes to the interviewee(s) for review and approval. All but six of the interview summaries have been approved at this time. The following table provides summary numbers for various categories of individuals that I have interviewed to date:

Category of Interviewee	Interviews Conducted (People)
Agency representatives (federal, state, and local agencies)	10 (11)
Current employees	5
Elected officials/staff of elected officials	6 (8)
Former employees	4
Local business community	3
Native Americans	2
Neighbors	7 (9)
Other	1
People with environmental or health concerns	11 (15)
Total	49 (58)

I am aware that DOE needs to move forward with plans for the public participation activities that will be implemented to support the development of the EIS. Accordingly, I am submitting these preliminary recommendations at this time. A full report, including all of the approved interview summaries, an analysis of the responses to each question asked, and final recommendations, will be submitted as soon as possible.

There are extremely diverse perspectives among the individuals that I interviewed. Some people believe that there is extensive contamination remaining in the environment, posing grave

threat to the health and safety of the adjacent community. Others believe that most of the contamination has already been cleaned up. Some believe that a thorough EIS is needed in order to consider a full range of alternatives to cleanup the contamination. Others believe that the preparation of the EIS is effectively delaying the cleanup effort with no additional benefit to the community. Given these disparate perspectives, DOE will need a comprehensive public participation program to help achieve agreement within the community regarding the most appropriate path forward for the cleanup program.

Following are my recommendations to DOE for conducting public participation during the development of the EIS and continuing through the implementation of the cleanup program.

Overall Goal

I understand that DOE's overall goal is to prepare a legally defensible EIS for the cleanup of Area IV at SSFL. While the public understands that DOE must prepare an EIS (indeed, many believe that DOE is preparing an EIS only because the agency was ordered to do so by a federal judge), it is clear that what most people really want is a thorough cleanup of the entire SSFL and all surrounding areas that have been contaminated by SSFL activities. They seek a cleanup that will effectively protect the environment and the health and safety of the adjacent communities into the foreseeable future.

I recommend that DOE define its goal relative to the EIS with an eye on the final goal: to define a path forward for cleanup of Area IV at the SSFL that is publicly acceptable, protective of the environment and adjacent community, and implementable within DOE's constraints.

The environmental activists have demonstrated the ability to use legal mechanisms to accomplish their objectives. Development of more effective ways to address their concerns in the decision-making process will be required to assure that the final decision can be implemented without legal challenge. An ineffective public participation program will only serve to further delay the implementation of the cleanup program, which is not what anyone wants to see.

DOE's Decision-Making Process

The public has little understanding of how DOE will make decisions related to the cleanup of Area IV of SSFL. Many people believe DOE is only preparing an EIS to comply with the federal judge's orders, that DOE is just "checking a box."

I recommend that DOE develop a clear explanation of the decision-making process that it will use to determine how it will implement effective cleanup of Area IV and the role that the EIS will play in that process. To the extent that DOE's final decision will rely on other considerations (beyond the information to be presented in the EIS), those considerations should be disclosed as soon as possible.

Legal and Regulatory Framework

Many people expressed an understanding of the legal requirements that appears to me to be inconsistent with DOE's interpretations of its responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). While I lack legal expertise regarding the relationship between NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I interpreted from the interviews that there may be fundamental differences in approach between the two regulatory regimes. For example, many that claimed knowledge of CEQA expressed the belief that DOE's plans (to prepare an

EIS for a program that it will also be responsible for implementing) constitute a conflict of interest.

The EPA has determined that the entire SSFL is eligible for inclusion on the National Priorities List (and cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act – or Superfund). The State of California has requested time to consider whether more effective cleanup might be accomplished another way. In the meantime, hazardous waste across the entire site is being cleaned up in accordance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

The complexity of environmental laws may prove confusing to the public. Interviewees who work for Boeing expressed concerns about the possibility of such confusion translating into a perception that the site is out of compliance with laws and regulations.

I recommend that a DOE prepare an explanation of the laws and regulations it believes it must comply with during preparation of the EIS.

Some people believe that the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC) will prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the entire SSFL in compliance with CEQA before the SSFL can be released to the State of California (if Boeing goes ahead with its plans to donate the property to the state). These folks believe that DOE can be compelled to conduct additional cleanup at that point in time if DTSC finds such cleanup is necessary.

I recommend that DOE explore opportunities for coordination with DTSC to assure that the current EIS will support final cleanup efforts of Area IV at the SSFL.

Level of Public Involvement for the EIS

The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) defines five different levels of public involvement (see http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf). DOE typically conducts public participation activities on the Consult Level while preparing EISs. The distinction between the Consult Level and the Involve Level is that the Involve Level provides the opportunity for more frequent engagement of the public in the decision-making process (rather than only at specific junctures in the process). In addition, techniques employed at the Involve Level provide the opportunity for various segments of the public to have a better understanding of the way other segments perceive the issues.

Given the fact that many stakeholders are extremely interested in the cleanup of Area IV, I think deeper and more frequent involvement will be critical to establishing a more effective relationship between DOE and the public. In addition, given the extremely diverse perspectives on SSFL within the broader community, I think DOE should provide an opportunity for interested parties to develop a better understanding of each other's concerns and interests. In the absence of full dialogue, DOE will not be able to make everyone happy.

I recommend that DOE plan and conduct the public participation program for the EIS at the Involve Level of the IAP2 Spectrum. In other words, DOE should plan for frequent opportunities for the public to participate throughout the decision-making process.

(DOE more typically provides public participation opportunities only at specified junctures in the process specified under NEPA.)

Many people reported frustration with public meetings where interested parties are afforded only brief opportunities to provide comments to DOE;¹ they would appreciate an opportunity for dialogue among DOE and the varied interested publics surrounding SSFL. Others expressed

¹ Some expressed frustration that SSFL Workgroup meetings are similarly structured.

discomfort with the long gap in time between scoping and public comment on a draft EIS, suggesting that waiting so long would contribute to the public's anxiety about site cleanup. More frequent interaction would help the public understand that DOE is still working on the EIS and the development of such a complicated document will take a long time.

I recommend that DOE design public participation activities to provide an opportunity for members of the public to discuss differing perspectives together as well as with DOE.

Objectives for Each Public Participation Event

I recommend that DOE clearly explain its objectives for each public participation activity, particularly as each activity relates to DOE's decision-making process. DOE should avoid oversimplifying the purpose of any activity. Vaguely defined objectives could result in segments of the public who do not understand what DOE will do as a result of engaging the public. While it may be tempting to communicate a willingness to receive any and all comments, DOE will likely end up without an appropriate way to be responsive to some concerns.

Broad Cross-Section of the Public

While a large number of people typically participate in public participation opportunities related to SSFL, I am told that there are also many who do not. For example, there is a contingent of former employees who have been reticent to participate. Some of the neighbors I spoke with admitted not participating out of fear of being perceived as lacking knowledge or because they have other, more urgent priorities. Many of those who do not routinely participate expressed concern that DOE is only hearing from one segment of the community.

Some expressed opinions that are in agreement with the environmental activists who do participate regularly; others do not agree. One ramification is that those who regularly attend public meetings have assumed that everyone agrees with them. My interviews revealed a more complicated reality.

Suggestions for specific groups that DOE should reach out to during the EIS include the business community, educators, and health care providers. Another suggested that DOE should more actively reach out to regulatory agencies and elected officials.

I recommend that DOE more actively seek out the participation of a broad cross-section of the community and support open dialogue among all participants. Through such dialogue, DOE will have an opportunity to define a sustainable and publicly supported path forward for effecting cleanup.

Extent of Contamination

It is widely believed that DOE:

- Hasn't acknowledged the dispersal of contamination from the original location (where it was generated)
- Underestimates the extent of contamination that poses risks to the environment and the adjacent community
- Wants to minimize the extent of contamination in order to minimize the cost of the cleanup.

The public has little confidence that DOE has shared all information that is known about past contamination. Many believe that DOE cannot proceed with developing an appropriate EIS without first conducting a full site characterization. The public cannot possibly support a

cleanup program if they believe the cleanup will not address all contamination. Full disclosure of what is known about the extent of the contamination will be critical to gaining the support of the community for the final decisions related to the cleanup program. Full disclosure will also help the DOE regain the public's trust.

I recommend that DOE arrange for soil and groundwater sampling to enhance current knowledge of the nature and full geographic extent of contamination to be addressed by the cleanup effort.

I recommend that the results of this sampling effort be shared with the community.

I recommend that DOE consider the possibility of involving the public in this sampling effort to increase confidence in the results of the sampling effort. The above could be accomplished by providing an opportunity for members of the community to accompany staff implementing the sampling program.

I understand that sampling may not be completed until after the scoping period for the EIS. I expect that there may be members of the public who feel they are not able to suggest alternatives for consideration until the full extent of the contamination is disclosed. ***I recommend that DOE host a public meeting to share the results of the sampling program and provide another opportunity for members of the public to suggest alternatives at that point.***

Scope of the Cleanup

There is widespread frustration that the EIS will only address Area IV and that DOE intends to focus its cleanup within Area IV boundaries. Many people believe that not all contamination that originated in Area IV remains in Area IV and that historical activities were not nearly as segregated between the various areas in the past as they are now. For example, many report knowledge that radioactive material from Area IV was taken to the Area I burn pit in the past.

I recommend that DOE strive to develop a clear explanation of how the investigation and cleanup of the rest of SSFL and surrounding areas will be accomplished. Development of such an explanation may require cooperation with other parties². A consistent message from all relevant parties would be extremely well received. I don't think that simply stating that DOE isn't responsible for contamination found elsewhere will satisfy the public's concerns.

Standards for Cleanup

It is widely believed that DOE does not intend to reduce risks to a level that is acceptable to the community. Many stakeholders expressed concerns about DOE's plans to achieve a risk standard of 10^{-4} as a result of the cleanup. It is widely believed that the EPA requires that cleanup efforts at Superfund sites accomplish a risk standard of 10^{-6} .

I recommend that DOE provide an opportunity for dialogue with the community about the risk standards that will be used for the cleanup program. Representatives of EPA should be included in that discussion. Alternatively, DOE could evaluate alternatives in the EIS that would accomplish different risk reduction levels. In either case, I would recommend against dismissing the possibility of cleaning up to the stricter standard prior to full evaluation in the EIS.

² Including NASA, Boeing, the EPA, and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

DOE's Credibility with the Public

There are widespread perceptions that DOE:

- spins information to serve its own purposes
- has not been forthcoming and open with the public
- has refused to release (or lied about the existence of) documentation that is believed to exist
- has not told the full or accurate story of what has transpired at Area IV over the history of the site
- has not treated the public with respect.

I recommend that DOE embrace the opportunity to involve the public in the development of the EIS by providing a clear explanation of a transparent decision-making process it will use and then affording as many opportunities for the public to participate in that process as possible.

Regaining the public's trust will take time and it will require DOE staff to have in a trustworthy manner. I recognize that current DOE staff may have done little to contribute to the legacy of mistrust. However, they should work hard to understand the situation and accept that regaining public trust will be difficult.

It is my understanding that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) convened the SSFL Workgroup to provide an opportunity for dialogue with interested stakeholders about their concerns at SSFL. It is widely believed that the DOE representative to the Workgroup (over a period of several years) had little regard for the public and behaved in a manner that implied that he thought participation at Workgroup meetings was a waste of his time. I further understand that DOE stopped participating in the SSFL Workgroup a few years ago. This development was received as an act of abandonment or betrayal – it deeply offended the members of the Workgroup and those who regularly attend their meetings.

DOE's recent return to the Workgroup is definitely a step in the right direction. Although many people continue to express anger at DOE, most people I spoke with seemed prepared to give DOE another chance.

Because EPA still has higher credibility with the public, several people suggested that that EPA should prepare the EIS or supervise the preparation of the EIS. One EPA employee, Gregg Dempsey, is mentioned by name by many as being trustworthy, I was told he does not always say what people want to hear, but he is believed to be candid and forthcoming.

I recommend that DOE consider negotiating a role for Gregg Dempsey on the team that will prepare the EIS. Perhaps he could be retained as a technical reviewer. If such an arrangement could be made, I think it would lend tremendous credibility to the EIS.

Other steps that could help to restore DOE's credibility might include:

- demonstrating a willingness to share all relevant information, even that which might not reflect well on DOE
- demonstrating respect and courtesy for the adjacent community at all times
- demonstrating a willingness to incorporate community concerns into decisions about how to clean up Area IV.

DOE's contractor at SSFL, Boeing, also appears to have low credibility, at least within the activist community. (Boeing's credibility with many former employees, a specific segment of the public, is much higher.)

DOE has hired an independent contractor to prepare the EIS. ***I recommend that DOE encourage the contractor preparing the EIS to work as independently as possible.***

A final note about DOE credibility: many interviewees urged DOE to be as transparent as possible in moving ahead with the EIS. They would like DOE to be forthcoming about any changes that occur, to report frequently on the progress of the EIS, and most importantly, to share any information that is uncovered, including that might reflect poorly on DOE. ***I recommend that DOE embrace the challenge to be as transparent as possible throughout the development of the EIS.***

Acknowledgement of Community Concerns

There is a widespread perception that DOE has never accepted responsibility for the harm done to the community as a result of past operations at SSFL. Many talk with incredulity about DOE's version of the story about the 1959 meltdown and DOE's denial of health effects (including various cancers, thyroid problems, and retinal blastoma) that are widely believed to be caused by contamination originating from SSFL. Many reported hearing official denial of off-site contamination, the possibility that on-site operations may have posed risks to the community, and the potentially negative impacts of contamination on the community's welfare. Consequently, there is little confidence on the part of the public that DOE will ever acknowledge the community's fears and concerns.

I recommend that DOE:

- ***Admit to past mistakes***
- ***Admit that not all past operations complied with today's standards***
- ***Acknowledge the fears of community members who worry about the potential impacts of historic and current environmental contamination***
- ***Acknowledge the suffering of people who have health concerns that they believe are attributable to SSFL operations.***

The Environmental Activists' Intentions

It would be a mistake to interpret the behaviors of the environmental activists as being opposed to DOE. It is my opinion that most of the activists are keenly interested in helping DOE implement an effective cleanup program that would be protective of the environment and the health and safety of the adjacent community.

I recommend that DOE define a role for the public that would allow the very interested parties to participate constructively in decision-making relative to the cleanup program. I think this would be very well received.

Some people are extremely well informed about SSFL. They report being treated disrespectfully by DOE in the past. ***I recommend that DOE take steps to provide additional opportunities for engagement in the EIS process to the extent possible under NEPA, capitalize on their extensive knowledge, and demonstrate appreciation for these dedicated individuals.***

Framing the Decision to be Supported by the EIS

Although the EIS is being prepared to support decision-making related to cleanup of radioactive and hazardous contamination in Area IV of the SSFL, some members of the public are looking beyond the cleanup to the eventual release of the property for other uses. Interviewees commented on the natural beauty of the area, the presence of important Native American cultural sites, and the unique history of the site (including both the important role it has played in the history of the “space race” as well as a setting for the movie industry).

Some members of the public would likely appreciate an opportunity to help envision a future for the site. ***I recommend that DOE consider hosting a visioning session to allow the public to contribute thoughts to how the site might eventually become an asset to the community.***

Response to Comments

Public agencies engaging the community in decision making make an implicit promise to the public that the input will actually be incorporated in the decision making process. The public will have an expectation that DOE will consider all community input to the extent possible, particularly if DOE communicates an intention to engage the public more fully in this EIS than has been typical in the past.

I recommend that DOE host public meetings to share what they have heard as a result of each public comment period and how they intend to use those comments in the EIS.

Regarding the public’s role in scoping for the EIS, many people suggested that DOE should seriously consider all suggestions from the public for additional alternatives and issues that should be evaluated in the EIS. It was acknowledged that some alternatives may not be possible to implement (i.e., they may not be technically feasible), but there is an expectation that DOE will provide an explanation as to why any alternative suggested by the public is not fully evaluated. ***I recommend that DOE consider any alternatives and issues suggested by the public during scoping to the extent possible.***

Some interviewees commented on how unsatisfying it would be to wait until the Final EIS to learn how DOE has responded to comments. They reported hoping to have an opportunity to comment on the alternative that DOE identifies as the preferred alternative, before DOE’s decision is finalized. If DOE does not identify a preferred alternative in the Draft EIS, not knowing how DOE has considered comments in the decision-making will likely prove disappointing to the public. ***I recommend that DOE consider the possibility of providing an opportunity for the public to comment after the selection of the preferred alternative.*** Such an opportunity might be designed to allow the public to suggest potential mitigation measures that could be implemented to minimize negative impacts on the community,

Frequency of Engagement

The interim between the Scoping Period and the release of the Draft EIS will be too long for most people’s comfort. Many people that I interviewed encouraged DOE to provide frequent, iterative opportunities to participate in the development of the EIS.

I recommend that DOE consider more frequent opportunities to engage the public, including the following possibilities:

- Providing an opportunity to share the results of the “Gap Analysis” (the independent evaluation of available data) and discuss how to address the gaps in the data

- Informing the community about the nature and extent of contamination following completion of sampling to supplement existing data
- Engaging the community in a discussion of the risk levels that will be used for the EIS
- Entering into a dialogue about possible mitigation strategies to address negative impacts associated with implementation of the various alternatives that are evaluated in the EIS.

Some people recommended that DOE host its own meetings on a regular schedule to present the status of efforts to prepare the EIS. Others indicated a preference for DOE presenting the status within the context of other, on-going public outreach efforts. For example, DOE could offer to provide status reports at SSFL Workgroup meetings, Neighborhood Council meetings, meetings of the Tribal Senate, Chamber of Commerce meetings, and/or DTSC workshops. ***I recommend that DOE consider the possibility of providing regularly scheduled status reports, using a consistent format throughout the duration of efforts to prepare the EIS, and possibly throughout the implementation of cleanup efforts.***

Duration of the Public Involvement Program

Many people stated that they expect the public will be interested in the cleanup of Area IV well past the completion of the EIS. In particular, they expressed interest in the implementation of the cleanup and the results of ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of the cleanup. ***I recommend that DOE prepare to continue public participation activities beyond the completion of the EIS.*** One suggestion made by an interviewee was that DOE might want to form a citizen environmental monitoring team to provide an ongoing opportunity for public involvement. This team could also help keep the public well informed regarding the status of implementation of the cleanup effort.

Adequacy of Information on Which to Base the EIS

One question specifically asked folks about information they thought DOE should consider, but might overlook during preparation of the EIS. Many people felt DOE would have adequate documentation on which to base the EIS.

Not everyone felt that DOE has all the necessary information for preparing the EIS, however. The most frequent observation was that former employees had not thoroughly documented past operations. People had heard anecdotes about disposal of radioactive and hazardous materials in a manner that is inconsistent with historical documents. Others reported hearing about handling and disposal practices that were not consistent with current laws and practices. ***I recommend that DOE consider the possibility of inviting former employees to a meeting specifically designed to solicit input that might be of relevance to DOE's efforts to prepare the EIS.***

One former employee I talked with reported that employees were prohibited from sharing information across programs and projects due to the secret, top secret, or classified project classifications. As a result, most employees were knowledgeable about only those projects that they were assigned to work on. This individual suggested that the EIS preparers would have to review all historical documents to get a complete picture of historical activities.

In addition, it is widely believed that some members of the community know more about SSFL than DOE staff. This belief relates in part to the fact that the more knowledgeable stakeholders have been involved for a very long time and have reviewed countless historical documents, while many DOE staff have only recently been assigned to work on the EIS. Indeed, it may be impossible for current DOE staff to review all relevant documents and become knowledgeable of all relevant documentation. ***I recommend that DOE acknowledge the extensive***

knowledge within the community by inviting them to share information with the contractor staff that is preparing the EIS.

Specific Techniques for Inclusion in the Public Participation Program

One question asked for reactions to 14 specific techniques that could be incorporated into the public participation program. Following is the ranking of the 14 techniques in order of the number of people who indicated that they thought the technique would be useful for engaging the SSFL community:

Technique	Rank	Number who thought would be useful
Internet tools for sharing information	1	43
Informational fact sheets	2	40
Information repositories	3	39
Periodic informational briefings	4 (tie)	36
Formal public meetings	4 (tie)	36
Public tours of Area IV	6	35
Periodic review of technical documents	7	34
Telephone hotline	8 (tie)	33
Workshops	8 (tie)	33
Periodic newsletters	10	29
Public open houses	11	28
Ongoing Citizen Advisory Group	12	24
Detailed technical presentations	13	23
Information kiosks	14	15

I recommend that DOE consider implementing the top ranked techniques as they were widely supported. Two-thirds or more of the people interviewed responded favorably to the top nine ideas. Smaller numbers of the people I interviewed approved the rest of the techniques, and generally, they would require careful design to be useful on this project.

DOE already has a website for disseminating information about the EIS, which received some compliments during the interviewing process. People suggested that all documents related to the EIS, including reference documents, should be posted on the website. Some recommended that the site be updated frequently or on a specific schedule. An interactive design was recommended to allow interested parties to dig deeper into issues of particular interest. Some suggested that DOE send notices automatically whenever new documents are added to the website.

Informational fact sheets were favored by many people that I interviewed. Based on the interviews, fact sheets should be designed to use clear, simple language in a readable format. One particular topic that was suggested was the history of the site. If this topic were to be addressed in a fact sheet, I would suggest that every effort be made to acknowledge the public's perception of the history.

The information repositories were approved by many. Some noted that fewer people may rely on them since the onset of the Internet, but they continue to be useful to a segment of the community. Efforts should be made to ensure that the holdings are complete.

Many favored the concept of regular, periodic informational briefings. A regular schedule is seen as being respectful and dependable. DOE might want to consider a consistent agenda that allows for reporting on the status of issues discussed in the past as well as identification of new issues, the opportunity for DOE to respond to questions, and the updates on the status of efforts to prepare the EIS. At every meeting, the public should be afforded an opportunity to ask questions and to raise new concerns.

Public meetings should be conducted following formal protocol. While some felt a court reporter would be intimidating, many others observed that having a moderator and a court reporter puts everyone on their "best behavior." Strict time limits were favored by most, and several people suggested that commenters should not be allowed to donate their time to others.

Public tours were approved by many, although a few individuals suggested that tours would only be appropriate if steps were taken to protect tour participants' safety. They would obviously be optional. Timing should coincide with public meetings.

While many people responded favorably to the possibility of providing the opportunity to review technical documents, responses were varied on how this should be accomplished. Many recognized that some stakeholders are adequately well informed to appreciate supporting documents. It is possible that posting such documents on the website would be adequate.

A toll-free telephone hotline was mentioned by many as being a good idea, but only if it were staffed by a real person. Many expressed concern about how long it would take to get answers for questions transmitted via a hotline. Some suggested that responses should be posted on the Internet to allow others to benefit from questions raised.

The concept of public workshops was well received. Many people really liked the idea of being asked to complete a specific task rather than simply providing comments. They responded well to the concept of being able to talk with other members of the public and to the opportunity to actually help DOE with a specific task.

Additional suggestions related to the implementation of all techniques will be included in my final report.

Technical Oversight

The technique that generated the most reactions was that of an ongoing advisory board. Some suggested that all of the SSFL Workgroup members should be invited to serve on an advisory board; others suggested that those folks should be barred from participating. Some felt that any move by DOE to form an advisory board would be seen as disrespectful of the SSFL Workgroup. Many felt it would be extremely difficult to convene a body that would be truly representative of the public.

Some interviewees suggested that DOE consider convening a technical advisory board rather than a citizen advisory panel. Such an advisory body could be designed to include technical experts with the appropriate expertise and/or academic credentials to review and comment on the draft EIS and technical appendices. It could also serve to help DOE develop strategies for communicating technical information to the public. The public could be afforded an opportunity to weigh in on the selection of members for this board.

I recommend that DOE explore the concept of convening a Technical Advisory Board. If Gregg Dempsey has not been tapped for another role on the EIS team, perhaps he could be invited to chair the Board.

Convene a Native American Advisory Board

Various Native American peoples used the site of the present day SSFL historically and they have been restricted from accessing these ancestral lands since the site was established. I spoke with representatives of the Native American community. These individuals expressed focused concerns about potential negative impacts on historical and cultural resources found on the SSFL during site investigations (prepared to support preparation of the EIS) as well as during implementation of the subsequent cleanup.

I recommend that DOE explore the possibility of convening a Native American Advisory Board to support preparation of the EIS as well as implementation of the cleanup program in a manner that would be protective of resources of importance to them.

Members of this board could be invited to accompany contractor staff during site investigations in the vicinity of known cultural resources.

Format for Scoping Meetings

I asked interviewees for suggestions for the role that the public should play during scoping. Essentially everyone agreed that the public should be afforded an opportunity to suggest alternatives for consideration and issues that should be considered during that evaluation. Although some people expressed the opinion that DOE should not have already determined which alternatives will be considered, most people felt that DOE should carefully explain the alternatives that have already been identified, and then invite the public to suggest additional alternatives and/or changes to those alternatives to make them more palatable to the community.

Similarly, many said that DOE should explain the issues it intends to consider while evaluating each alternative, then invite suggestions for other issues of relevance to the community.

In response to other questions, many people suggested that DOE should provide adequate time for each public comment period and should provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions before submitting comments.

While open houses were disdained as a substitute for formal public comment meetings in the SSFL community, many recognized the potential for an open house format for providing information before a formal comment meeting is scheduled to begin.

DOE should carefully explain that the purpose of the scoping meetings is to invite suggestions of additional alternatives and issues for consideration during development of the EIS. ***I recommend that DOE design each scoping meeting to include:***

- ***An open house set-up to provide information*** about each alternative that has already been identified and information about issues that have already been identified for consideration. Technical experts should be available at each station to answer questions.
- ***Followed by a formal public meeting*** to 1) thank people for their interest, 2) present an overview of the EIS and the schedule for its preparation, 3) respond to any questions, and 4) take formal comments from the public.

Alternatives for Evaluation in the EIS

Interviewees reported frustration with DOE when the agency has considered an artificially short list of alternatives – composed of a no-action alternative, a preferred alternative, and another alternative that is so absurd that it is not really an alternative. ***I recommend that DOE seek to identify at least two alternatives for evaluation that are technically feasible and affordable – so that the public comment period on the Draft EIS allows the public an opportunity to indicate a preference among reasonable alternatives.***

The internal team supporting the development of the EIS (including CDM – the contractor hired to prepare the EIS – and DOE) may be qualified to rank alternatives considered in the EIS on technical considerations, in addition to other constraints on the decision-making process like total cost. By contrast, the public can help DOE understand the political viability as well as the potential acceptability of each alternative to the public. DOE should take full advantage of this important perspective. ***I recommend that DOE consider methods for soliciting comments on the Draft EIS in a manner that would allow the public to help distinguish among any alternatives that are deemed acceptable to DOE (technically feasible and affordable). If DOE selects a preferred alternative in the Draft EIS, I recommend that DOE seek public comments on how that preferred alternative might be adjusted to make it as acceptable to the public as possible.***

Informing the Public

In seeking to inform the public to support participation in the EIS, DOE needs to understand that there are numerous levels of knowledge within the public, including:

- People who have been concerned about SSFL for a very long time and have become quite knowledgeable about the site
- People who have worked at SSFL and have technical knowledge and extensive experience
- People who know very little about SSFL but have some concerns based on media coverage.

All of these groups are interested in seeing DOE complete an effective and protective cleanup of Area IV at SSFL. Their information needs are quite different, however, and DOE should plan to address their separate needs. I do not believe that a one-size-fits-all approach to informing the public would support accomplishment of DOE's goals and objectives.

DOE needs to understand that many individuals will not change their minds simply because DOE provides information. These folks will receive information provided by DOE within the context of what they already know and believe.

The activist community has done an amazing job of informing the broader community about SSFL. Huge numbers of historical documents are available through their websites. These groups are perceived by many to be more credible than DOE. At a minimum, DOE should be thoroughly familiar with all information that is available to the public.

I recommend that DOE develop an approach to meeting the information needs of all segments of the broader public.

Quite a few people that I interviewed expressed concerns about DOE's ability to prepare information materials for the public. It was felt that most DOE documents are overly technical. Many people expressed an interest in SSFL, but did not feel that past attempts to convey information had met the needs of people with a lay background.

In addition, numerous people felt that DOE's information materials in the past have not been objective.

I recommend that DOE make a conscious effort to prepare information materials that are appropriate for people who do not have a technical background and to portray information as objectively as possible.

One suggestion made during the interviews is that DOE form a team (including members of the public) to review informational materials to be provided to the public. ***I recommend that DOE consider this concept.***

Additionally, a number of people were concerned about the manner in which DOE presents information at public meetings. It was suggested that presenters must be able to respond knowledgeably to all likely questions and have training in public speaking. It was also recommended that presenters be open and sincere.

I recommend that DOE consider carefully who should present information at public meetings. DOE should seek to balance technical knowledge, public speaking skills, and interpersonal skills.

Easy Recommendations

The following recommendations require little explanation. I can elaborate further, if desired.

1. DOE should provide adequate notice of all public participation opportunities. This means that DOE should announce all public meetings and public comment periods well in advance and use multiple channels.
2. DOE should schedule public participation events in a way that minimizes the potential for schedule conflicts for interested parties.
3. DOE should consider scheduling public meetings on Saturdays and/or evenings to support the involvement of people with normal Monday through Friday working schedules.
4. DOE might want to consider enlisting the help of the various watchdog organizations by asking them to post information about the EIS and opportunities for public participation on their websites.
5. DOE should provide adequate time for the public to prepare comments during public comment periods.
6. DOE should provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions well before the end of all public comment periods to help ensure that comments are well informed.
7. DOE should prepare for all public appearances by practicing responses to likely difficult questions. Unanswered questions are frustrating to everyone.
8. When asked a question at a public meeting that DOE staff is not able to answer, DOE should make sure that an answer is provided directly to the person who asked the question in a timely manner. DOE should also take steps to broadcast any answers to questions to all who were in attendance when the question was asked. It was noted that failing to do so leaves any who observed the question to conclude that DOE never responded.
9. DOE should commit to considering every comment received as a result of the public participation program and to reporting back to the public on the way each comment was addressed.
10. DOE should decide before each public appearance who will be acting as the spokesperson at the event. Make sure that person is well informed.

11. DOE should provide handout materials for all public meetings that allow members of the public take home information that was presented.
12. DOE should attend all SSFL Workgroup meetings, public open houses and workshops hosted by DTSC, and other public meetings to remain well informed about what else is going on at SSFL and emerging public concerns.
13. DOE should take steps to coordinate public participation activities with relevant agencies, particularly regulatory agencies.
14. DOE should make certain that other agencies and elected officials are well informed of all public participation activities.
15. DOE should provide press releases (not just display advertisements) to regional and local news outlets and ask for help in getting the word out about public participation activities. The Acorn was mentioned frequently as a good, local source of news.

Evaluation and Project Flexibility

The community surrounding SSFL is diverse and dynamic. Not all environmental activists are in agreement with each other and no one person is held in high regard by all parties. This report presents my best recommendations based on my current understanding of the situation.

I recommend that DOE periodically evaluate the public participation efforts related to the EIS and critically evaluate the effectiveness of each public event. I further recommend that DOE stay flexible and willing to adjust its plans as time goes on. With an eye fixed on the overall goal – to define a path forward for cleanup of Area IV at the SSFL that is publicly acceptable, protective of the environment and adjacent community, and implementable within DOE's constraints – the specific techniques that are employed will not be as important as the attitudes demonstrated by DOE staff. If DOE staff approaches each public participation activity with a genuine interest in the community's interests and concern, each activity will be more successful. In the end, the public will help DOE find a path forward that will address the community's concerns and that can be implemented without legal challenge.