



Final Work Plan #7 Report

Submitted by the Community Analysis Committee

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board

July 2018

Summary. The Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) Work Plan #7 is a requirement to pulse southern Nevada communities and seek levels of interest and concern about the Environmental Management (EM) Nevada Program and to formulate recommendations for outreach improvement. The project required the formulation of an ad hoc committee of the NSSAB, the Community Analysis Committee; development of a survey and project plan, and plan implementation after approval of the NSSAB and the EM Nevada Program.

Responses to a committee-developed survey were in four areas: (1.) interest level, (2.) concern level, (3.) outreach improvement recommendations, and (4.) miscellaneous information about community location, demographics, and other responder comments.

Within the survey, there is a page of informational narrative about the EM Nevada Program prior to the survey questions. The survey questions ask responders to rate each of 18 questions as one of five levels, 1-5. An index rating of 3 would be a neutral rating. Likewise, 2-4 would be Medium, less is Low and more is High.

Interest. (This index would be the average of the indices reported by each community area or community)

Concern. (Again, this index would be the average of the indices reported by each community area)

Outreach Improvement Recommendations.

The priority listing of the summarized survey recommendations is shown below with three areas tied for the highest priority – Radio Coverage; Public meetings, and Local TV.

Recommendation Topic(s)	Ranking	Requests
Radio Coverage; Public meetings, Local TV	1	11
More information; Groundwater	2	8
Safety & Health	3	7
Social media; News media	4	6
--	5	5
Waste disposal; Transportation	6	4
Air	7	3
Newsletters; Site visit; Air; emails	8	2
Monitoring; Industrial facilities	9	1

Raw recommendation numbers from the surveys, Committee approved recommendations and Committee derived recommendations from interface with the public are listed below:

There were more than 130 raw unprocessed recommendations that came directly from the surveys. The raw recommendations were then developed into those approved by the

Committee. On the basis of other community-level interactions, community-derived recommendations were developed.

Introduction. Starting in November 2017, an eight-person Community Analysis Committee within the NSSAB was established with two liaisons and six NSSAB members to plan, implement, and report on the work plan requirements of recommending improvements to the EM Nevada Program outreach activities. All were volunteers. The eight-month effort extended over more than a dozen communities in southern Nevada and provided more than 180 individual surveys. This final report is provided to aid the EM Nevada Program in more efficiently and effectively focusing its outreach program. While the Community Analysis Committee feels that the EM Outreach is effective, it can improve and benefit from the work plan results and recommendations.

Requirement. The work plan requirement was, from a community perspective, to develop a plan for gathering information from fellow community members regarding their EM interests and to gauge their level of concern regarding EM activities. The requirement was also to provide recommendations for how the EM Nevada Program could shape its outreach based on the results of the community feedback.

Method. The method used was developing a survey that would collect work plan requested data, and then by a combination of face-to-face contact and survey use to pulse nearby southern Nevada's many community residents, to compile and analyze results, and then to report those findings and make recommendations. Use of paper surveys and a web-based survey application, SurveyMonkey, was the primary source of information.

Plan. The Community Analysis Committee's initial task was to develop a plan and schedule for the work plan that included an individual survey. That plan and schedule was approved by both the NSSAB and then by the EM Nevada Program. At the community level, each Community Analysis Committee member would accomplish individual efforts by informing the community of the effort and meeting with interested residents. Additionally, it would be to meet with key community members, respond to questions they might have, and obtain their thoughts and suggestions via the written paper survey (or on-line).

Implementation. Implementation of the plan was accomplished by:

- Informing the community by means of: letters to the local newspapers; public service announcements; posting notices; presentations at group meetings, schools, colleges, senior centers, etc.
- Conducting one-on-one information sessions and overseeing survey-taking.
- Conducting additional one-on-one information sessions with key community members to include community officials, chamber of commerce, civic clubs, fire/police, etc.

- Posting notices of the outreach improvement effort with the website information; so those interested may participate in the survey effort.

More Detailed Survey Results.

- Overall Summary. The full reporting is provided in the surveys and of interest. However, many of the responses to the question related to outreach recommendations do not provide useful information. Results of survey comments and recommendations ranged from directly responding, to negative comments about the government and the DOE, to proposing alternative technology for waste remediation, to requesting more transparency in outreach messages.

There were three categories of recommendations identified in the report. Raw survey-provided response to Question #18; Committee supported survey recommendations; and Committee-derived recommendations from survey results and community interaction during Committee analysis.

The significant selected recommendations for outreach improvement are as follows:

- In Amargosa Valley and Indian Springs, DOE should continue to use email, newspaper, radio, and TV for the outreach notification and specifically for updates about the contamination at NNSS, the remediation work in process and planned, and related information.
- In Beatty, DOE should continue to provide periodic information about any threats to health, especially the status of the groundwater.
- In Boulder City, DOE should provide more information on groundwater, waste disposal, and transportation of radioactive waste using City TV and periodic releases to the Boulder City Review newspaper.
- In Death Valley, Tecopa, Shoshone, and nearby California, DOE should continue the use of nearby public meetings and social media, add radio public service announcements, and some type of newsletter to periodically inform about matters that may affect health and safety now and in future years.
- In Goldfield, with only one response and no recommendations, DOE should be guided by the response in the Beatty area.
- In the Las Vegas Valley, DOE should continue current path and make more of an outreach to local Public Broadcasting System.
- In Mesquite, DOE should maintain its current approach for outreach.

- In Moapa Valley, DOE should maintain its current approach for outreach.
- In Pahrump, DOE should consider increasing the number of open meetings held while maintaining its current outreach approach.
- In Panaca, DOE should maintain its current approach for outreach.
- In Tonopah, based on no survey response, DOE should be guided by the response in the Beatty area.
- **Compilation Overall.** (There were a total of 182 surveys completed and the compiled SurveyMonkey results are in the attachment.)
- **By Community.** Survey results from those ten SurveyMonkey defined communities are as follows. Each of the community reports requires review in order to appreciate the full summary report.

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 1 Community: Amargosa Valley

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	4	5
Soil contamination	5	5
Groundwater onsite	5	5
Groundwater off site	5	5
RW Disposal	5	5
RW Transportation	5	5
Historic/Cultural	4	4
EM Outreach	5	4
Totals	38	38
Average	4.75	4.75

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers: 9
2. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods. As listed in the survey report.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	3	Contamination information
2	1	Nye County compensation
2	1	Updates/status of contamination
2	1	Radio & TV
2	1	Email. newspapers

4. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the transmittal report.

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 11 Community: Beatty

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.55	3.55
Soil contamination	4.36	4.45
Groundwater onsite	4.73	4.64
Groundwater off site	4.82	4.73
RW Disposal	4.09	3.91
RW Transportation	4.0	3.73
Historic/Cultural	4.36	4.27
EM Outreach	4.27	4.36
Totals	34.18	33.64
Average	4.27	4.21

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers: 10
2. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
 - a. Being close to the source, continue to provide information at the same frequency about any potential threats to our health, especially the status of our groundwater now and in the future.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	3	Water; health
2	2	Public Meetings
3	1	Radiological waste; Monitoring; flyers; contamination

4. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the report.

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 12 Community: Boulder City

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.36	3.00
Soil contamination	3.64	3.09
Groundwater onsite	4	3.55
Groundwater off site	4.09	3.64
RW Disposal	4.47	3.73
RW Transportation	4.64	3.82
Historic/Cultural	3.27	2.82
EM Outreach	3.73	3.09
Totals	31	26.74
Average	3.88	3.24

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

Raw recommendation numbers: 12

Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.

5. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	2	Public meetings
1	2	TV & Radio coverage
1	2	Transportation
2	1	Groundwater
2	1	Education in Schools & Colleges

6. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the report/transmittal letter.
- Recommend that local Boy/girl Scout organizations be contacted and coordination be made to make several EM Nevada Program individuals available as Energy or Nuclear Science speciality badge mentors.
 - While it is recognized that the high level nuclear waste depository is not a mission of the EM Nevada Program, the public continues to ask questions. Responding to questions about the Yucca Mountain storage with, "It's not our mission." takes away from the outreach presenter credibility. Therefore, it is recommended that the current more detailed DOE position about storage be sought and available. Do we have a Fact Sheet for Yucca Mountain?

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 14 Community: Death Valley

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	4.07	3.57
Soil contamination	4.5	4.21
Groundwater onsite	4.71	4.43
Groundwater off site	4.93	4.79
RW Disposal	4.64	4.14
RW Transportation	4.64	4.29
Historic/Cultural	4.43	4.0
EM Outreach	4.29	3.57
Totals	36.21	33.0
Average	4.53	4.13

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers: 20
2. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
 - a. Develop a periodic article about environmental progress at the NNSS for submission to local communities electric/water suppliers to be added to the utility bill one or two times per year to be a part of outreach.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	5	Newsletter
2	3	Radio
3	2	Community meetings;
4	1	social media; safety & Health

4. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. These are comments from interactions with the public as well as those that may be given with each of the survey questions. As listed in the report and below.
 - a. We recommend that continuing the use of community public meetings and social media, add radio public service announcements and some type of newsletter to periodically inform us about matters that may affect our health and safety now in the near and far future years.

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 1 Community: Goldfield

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	5	4
Soil contamination	5	4
Groundwater onsite	5	4
Groundwater off site	5	5
RW Disposal	5	4
RW Transportation	5	5
Historic/Cultural	5	4
EM Outreach	5	4
Totals	40	34
Average	5.00	4.25

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers: 0
2. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below. NA

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic

4. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the report.

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 34 Community: Las Vegas Valley (LV, NLV, and Henderson)

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.24	2.68
Soil contamination	3.59	3.12
Groundwater onsite	3.65	3.44
Groundwater off site	4.03	3.79
RW Disposal	3.56	3.41
RW Transportation	3.56	3.41
Historic/Cultural	3.76	3.18
EM Outreach	3.65	3.18
Totals	29.04	26.21
Average	3.63	3.27

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers. 18
2. Compile meaningful recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
2	2	Public meetings
1	7	TV & Radio coverage
2	2	Transportation
3	1	Groundwater
3	1	Education in Schools

4. Other comments of interest to the EM Program. There is approximately 10 percent response of apathy. Other than handholding and being spoon-fed. This is a lost group.

Submitted by: Steve Rosenbaum

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: Community: Mesquite

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.32	2.88
Soil contamination	3.54	3.16
Groundwater onsite	4.00	3.48
Groundwater off site	4.14	3.70
RW Disposal	3.71	3.38
RW Transportation	3.66	3.43
Historic/Cultural	3.80	3.27
EM Outreach	3.70	3.43
Totals	29.87	26.73
Average	3.73	3.34

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers. 63
2. Compile meaningful recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	12	Groundwater Concern
2	6	School Presentations
3	10	Transportation Issues
4	30	Doing OK
5	5	Website not easy to use

4. Other comments of interest to the EM Program. It appears that younger (under 45) has more interest and concerns.

Submitted by: Richard Twiddy

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: Community: Moapa Valley

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.50	3.08
Soil contamination	3.73	3.50
Groundwater onsite	4.08	3.85
Groundwater off site	4.17	4.08
RW Disposal	3.96	3.88
RW Transportation	3.85	3.67
Historic/Cultural	3.96	3.62
EM Outreach	3.81	3.81
Totals	31.01	29.49
Average	3.88	3.69

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

1. Raw recommendation numbers. 42
2. Compile meaningful recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
3. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	12	Groundwater concern
2	10	School Presentations
3	6	Transportation Issues
4	10	Be Truthful
5	4	Ease of Website Access

4. Other comments of interest to the EM Program.

Submitted by: Richard Twiddy

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 25 Community: Pahrump

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3.96	3.08
Soil contamination	4.16	3.48
Groundwater onsite	4.32	3.72
Groundwater off site	4.6	4.08
RW Disposal	4.56	3.68
RW Transportation	4.6	3.92
Historic/Cultural	4.28	3.84
EM Outreach	4.24	3.52
Totals	34.72	29.32
Average	4.34	3.67

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

5. Raw recommendation numbers: 26
6. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
 - a. Ensure that the Pahrump area is informed of ongoing remediation, monitoring and groundwater studies with an associated cost emphasis.
 - b. Continue use of all electronic and available print media as well as open meetings to inform Pahrump area of new information and provide reminders of previously supplied information.
7. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below.

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic
1	4	General Contamination; Health & Safety
2	3	Groundwater
3	2	Radio, TV, Internet
4	1	Reuse; Newspapers; email; public meetings, cost

8. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the report transmittal. (Recommend that we continue to be kept informed about the status of environmental matters at the NNSS that may have an impact to our community's health and especially those relating to groundwater and the transport of radioactive waste through or near our Nye County community.)

Submitted by: Francis L. Bonesteel, Charles L. Fullen and Dina M. Williamson-Erdag of Pahrump

Community Survey Consolidation and Results

Number of Responders: 1 Community: Panaca

Summary Table Indices: From SurveyMonkey report.

Topic	Interest Index	Concern Index
Industrial facilities	3	3
Soil contamination	3	3
Groundwater onsite	5	5
Groundwater off site	5	5
RW Disposal	3	3
RW Transportation	5	5
Historic/Cultural	3	3
EM Outreach	4	4
Totals	31	31
Average	3.88	3.88

Recommendations. Provide recommendations as follows:

9. Raw recommendation numbers: 0
10. Compile meaningful survey recommendations in a form that is implementable by the EM Nevada Program and as you feel approvable for approval by the Committee. Meaningful Comments would be those relating to outreach communication about topics and methods.
11. Provide a table of your prioritized survey recommendations as shown below. NA

Priority	Requests	Recommendation Topic

12. Other comments of possible interest to the EM Nevada Program. As listed in the report.

Submitted by: Dick Stephans

- Table of Community Results to include index of interest and concern (with 3.00 being neutral) and Key Take Away Messages from respective community area SurveyMonkey data*. As shown in the following table, community areas are groupings of either close, like communities or areas so small that they fit well in that grouping, or those widely separated and few responses.

Community Area	Number of Responders	Interest Index *	Concern Index*	Key Take Away Messages*
Las Vegas Valley including Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson	34	3.63	3.27	Continue current path and provide more outreach to public broadcasting.
Beatty	10	4.27	4.21	Provide periodic information about any threats to our health, especially the status of our groundwater.
Death Valley Area	13	4.53	4.13	Continue the use of nearby public meetings and social media, add radio announcements and some type of newsletter.
Moapa Valley including Glendale, Logandale, Overton, Moapa Reservation	26	3.88	3.69	It appears the Moapa Valley area is getting sufficient information regarding EM Nevada Program activities at the NNSS.
Mesquite including Bunkerville and Arizona Strip	56	3.73	3.34	It appears the community area is getting sufficient information regarding EM Nevada Program activities at the NNSS with the biggest issue being groundwater off site.
Pahrump	24	4.34	3.67	It appears the Pahrump area is getting sufficient information regarding EM Nevada Program activities at the NNSS.
Boulder City	12	3.88	3.24	Best through newspapers, public meetings, etc.; Tell us whether there is any near or longer term danger to the residents; use city TV.
Goldfield	1	5.0	4.0	No response
Panaca	1	3.88	3.88	No response
Amargosa Valley	1	4.75	4.75	Public needs updates on contamination, movement of contamination, and remediation/compensation of contamination. For example how the Feds plan on compensating Nye County for the millions of gallons of water contaminated under the NNSS. Email, newspaper, radio, and television.

Recommendations. Survey Question #18 was a request for added comments and recommended communication methods. The responses from the public varied from “none” to those not applicable as an outreach improvement recommendation,” to valid and meaningful potential outreach recommendations. Meaningless comments were not further considered.

In all the raw unfiltered survey recommendations numbered more than 130.

On single surveys, the potential recommendations also varied from zero to a half-dozen or more. As an example, one response stated, “Tell us whether there is any near or long-term

danger to the residents; use city TV; provide an annual report to the Library.” (Actually it was found that an Annual EM Nevada Program Report is already sent to that Library).

Based on the survey results and interacting with various community individuals, recommendations for how the EM Nevada Program could better shape its outreach were compiled in three groupings -- Raw survey input, prioritized survey input based on numbers number of requests, Committee recommendations based on public interaction included:

Raw Recommendations. These are not listed here, but are available in the individually collected surveys or at the attached Combined SurveyMonkey Results.

Committee-Supported Recommendations. The agreed to committee-supported recommendations are shown below: (As the inputs are received and sent back and forth, they are reviewed and judged and adjusted for inclusion by the entire Committee.)

- Reach out to groups that already have presentation/lecture series – Rotary, VFW, Senior Citizens Centers, colleges, Audubon, etc. to inform about speakers, video titles, tours that are available. Snail mail for those in rural communities.
- Use social media/ websites – Public broadcast announcements, PBS documentaries, news stories from a local perspective, online periodicals.
- The public should be aware of the scope of the ongoing remediation at NNSS. They should also be informed of the cost to remediate and monitor the site, especially the groundwater studies.
- Focus the main effort on communities and locations areas in closer proximity to NNSS Area 5 Radioactive Waste Acceptance Complex.
- Focus more on transportation and low-level waste generators.
- Focus more on groundwater transport and health hazard to personnel.
- Reduce the level of concern about air hazard, industrial facilities.
- Gauge focus to a particular community area based on its proximity to the NNSS.

Committee-Derived Recommendations. The following are additional recommendations from the Committee that are not directly based on the specific survey results. The Committee found that while survey inputs were important and key, in many cases, they had to be clarified and explained based on public interactions. **The following are those clarified recommendations based more on one-on-one interviews or other interaction with the public during the period of Community Analysis Committee operations.**

Since miscellaneous data collected is not directly a part of Work Plan #7 requested information, it is available, but is not reported. Such miscellaneous data includes the residence of each person responding to the survey and demographics of each respondent to include age, sex, and ethnicity. Responses to demographics questions were optional.

- Continue the level of excellent community outreach.
- During interactions with the public, Department of Energy, and other presenters should be prepared to hear and respond to feasible alternatives to environmental management and be able to respond with factual information.
- Prepare a one-page or three-fold handout of EM Nevada Program informational sources listed in one location – speakers, topics, websites, tour information, etc. Send it to each Southern Nevada Chamber of Commerce with a request to further provide to local civic and service organizations, churches, veterans groups, senior centers, and libraries with a suggested transmittal letter.
- If they aren't available, consider establishing EM Program Nevada summer internships for high school seniors or college students. If they are available, advertise.
- Using the results of the Survey that asks for information, consider having an electronic meeting of southern Nevada community contacts to “advertise” the free EM Nevada Program related informational opportunities available from the NNSS. It might be helpful to first identify those contacts and then tabulate in one location the full spectrum of media and information sources and how to secure those sources.
- The SurveyMonkey web-based application proved to be a powerful tool and the data should be considered by EM Nevada Program management for any further inquiry. There may be other uses of the survey data that the Community Analysis Committee has not envisioned that the EM Nevada Program may find of interest, such as an application of the demographics information.
- Explore having personal assistants such as Amazon Echo (Alexa), Google Home (Hey Google), or other similar devices supplied with apps to provide information about the EM Nevada Program and periodic updates.
- Reach out and provide information about the availability of free speakers, videos, handouts, and other material for local civic and service groups who schedule informational presentations.
- Use a full spectrum of email, news outlets, social media and advertisements.

- Develop and periodically distribute spot public service announcements, on radio and TV.
- Inform educators about the availability of speakers and teaching aids for schools and colleges.
- Ensure outreach staff have details about the status of cleanup to include approximate amounts per year, commercial site in Beatty, NV vs. DOE, and completion forecast by 2030.
- Cover dangers of waste transportation to include routing, accident history, and prevention program.
- Tell us how to secure speakers and other information for local communities.
- To enhance educational outreach in Southern Nevada, develop an EM Nevada Program educational exhibit booth with existing and new handouts that assist educators in teaching about the legacy of the NNSS and its remediation and provides free educational assistance tools. Coordinate with the Clark County School District and college departments that teach environmental science to develop a relationship and inform about an environmental educational source. Arrange and advertise an “Educator Tour” of the NNSS and use the event as another way to educate the educators about the NNSS overall and specific to site environmental matters.
- Coordinate with Vegas Public Broadcasting System and the National Atomic Testing Museum to ensure that they know the resources available for the preparation of documentaries and exhibits related to environmental management and the NNSS.
- Issue a NSSAB news release that provides survey work plan information (a follow-up to the article previously published) with results of the Board and EM Nevada Program actions or pending actions in order to provide further outreach.
- While the work plan recommendations are based primarily on top-level survey results data, EM Nevada Program management may wish to go more deeply into the results for additional output.
- It is recommended that EM Nevada Program management compile a set of typical Q&As based on previous public interaction feedback to provide to speakers or others who perform outreach in order to better prepare them for the experience.
- Develop a virtual reality tour of Area 5 to include transportation, receipt, processing and waste disposal, monitoring of air and groundwater and emergency response. Make the output available to the public and educational institutions.

- Depending on signal availability, consider closer (and more constant) tracking of radiological waste shipments in Nevada using GPS means so that the information could be made available real time to the NNSS Command Center at Mercury and others to verify locations, assist first responders, and ensure proper routing.

Attachments

- 1) Approved Plan & Schedule
- 2) Survey and Combined SurveyMonkey Results
- 3) Survey Results by Community or Community area as compiled by SurveyMonkey. (Due to bulk, the individual records are available separately and electronically within the NSSAB Office.)
- 4) Lessons