



MEETING MINUTES

Environmental Management Public Information Review Effort (EMPIRE) Committee

October 1, 2008, DOE Nevada Support Facility
232 Energy Way, North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Members Present: Walt Wegst, Chair; Kathy Bienenstein;
Stacy Standley

U.S. Department of Energy: Kelly Snyder, DDFO

Facilitator: Rosemary Rehfeldt, Navarro Research and Engineering, Inc.

The Committee's meeting agenda and objectives were to:

- 1) Review and comment on three EM videos:
 - *"Innovation, Remediation, Restoration: All In A Day's Work for Industrial Sites Workers"*
 - *"Waste Management at the Nevada Test Site, Version 3"*
 - *"Journey to the Nevada Test Site Radioactive Waste Management Complex"*
- 2) Outline discussion items and comments from video review and list recommendations
- 3) Decide and agree on what the next review items will be
- 4) Set the next meeting date, time, and location

Before the committee began its video review, they asked Kelly Snyder if the videos have been available to the public. Ms. Snyder replied that they are and they are available in some public libraries in Southern Nevada, through the Nevada Site Office (NSO) web site, the Clark County Resource Library, or can be ordered through DOE NSO EM. She informed the committee that the videos are not used much; they are outdated, require updating, and the DOE welcomes ideas from the CAB on these issues.

The EMPIRE Committee suggested the possibility of creating a fact sheet listing all of the videos that are available. The fact sheet can include:

- ◆ A list of videos with their descriptions and length
- ◆ Information on how to obtain a video(s)
- ◆ Although it's not possible to launch the videos from the NSO web site because of size, perhaps "previews" can be viewed on the web site, and then information to request a copy can be made available

The committee began to watch the fourth of six EM videos that they will be reviewing. The video, entitled: *"Innovation, Remediation, Restoration: All In A Day's Work For Industrial Sites Workers,"* runs approximately 17 minutes and 30 seconds. After viewing the video, the committee made the following comments:

- ◆ Nicely done; the most professional video so far
- ◆ The “cowboy” is a nice touch
- ◆ Throughout the video, it is hard to understand the “cowboy’s” narration; his voice is not clear
- ◆ The “cowboy” mistakenly called a “kangaroo rat” a “mouse”
- ◆ Workers at the site need to be coached for speaking on camera
- ◆ Words printed on the screen:
 - Are the same color as the background; hard to see and are distracting
 - The words are not shown on the screen long enough to read
- ◆ When the amount of dollars that have been saved is mentioned – specifically \$1.5 million – this is compared to what?
- ◆ You can tell that the narrator is reading, he does not sound natural; he mispronounces “Nevada”
- ◆ Mission: words should appear on the screen
- ◆ Slogan: words should appear on the screen
- ◆ Title: is too small, make the print larger; standardize with the other videos and add the date of the video
- ◆ Update site remediation numbers; the word “today” is used – without a date on the video it’s hard to tell how old the video is

The next video entitled, “*Waste Management at the Nevada Test Site, Version 3,*” runs approximately 9 minutes. After viewing the video, the committee made the following comments:

- ◆ The video is well-narrated and understandable
- ◆ Video is well done and professional
- ◆ None of the videos explain that the Nevada Test Site is divided into “areas”
 - It would be helpful to include an “area” map
 - Can eliminate additional questions from viewers
 - It would be helpful for viewers to see that most of the subsidence craters are not near the roads
- ◆ As stated for all the EM videos – standardize the opening and closing, as well as:
 - National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) versus Department of Energy (DOE) can be confusing to individuals that do not understand the difference – people relate to DOE as opposed to NNSA
 - It is important to use DOE’s seal throughout all of the EM videos
 - Use a “modern-looking” font – that’s large enough to see and will make the video’s title stand out

The seventh and final video reviewed was, “*Journey to the Nevada Test Site Radioactive Waste Management Complex,*” which runs approximately 1 minute and 56 seconds. This video is a continuous “loop” video that is used at trade shows, symposiums, internal open houses, etc. The following comments were made:

- ◆ There is a short segment that shows a pit with words on the screen about the dimensions of the pit – this segment – which is necessary because it shows the monitoring wells and the groundwater in relation to the pit – definitely needs to be narrated so that the viewer understands what he/she is looking at

- ◆ The background music is acceptable in this video because this is a continuous loop video
 - The music is the right volume – it does not drown out the speaker
 - The music is an “attention grabber,” especially at trade shows
- ◆ This video should be used along with fact sheets in a staffed booth
- ◆ As mentioned for other videos – consistency is needed in the beginning and end – standardize to match all other videos
- ◆ The narration in this video is well done and understandable

The committee requested that an outline be created that includes comments from all of the EM videos that have been reviewed. This outline will be e-mailed to the EMPIRE Committee for review before a recommendation letter to DOE is created. Upon committee approval, a letter will be drafted and sent to the Board for review, to be approved at the November 12, 2008 Full Board meeting.

The committee decided that the next item for their review will be the NSO EM web site. Kelly Snyder will make hard copies of the site's pages for the committee to review. The committee would like to meet on November 19, 2008 at 4:00 or 4:30 p.m., pending meeting room availability. The CAB office will contact the committee to finalize a meeting date, time, and location.

As a final comment, the committee expressed that they were pleased with EM's response to their recommendations, particularly the spreadsheet that outlined each recommendation, and the explanation of why a recommendation was accepted. They were also impressed by the fact that when a recommendation was partially accepted, a thorough, understandable explanation was given.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.