

**TAKING THE REPORT-BACK FUNCTION SERIOUSLY:  
THE OAK RIDGE SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC OUTREACH  
PROGRAM**

**Steven Kopp, Marianne Heiskell, Chuck Jenkins**

**ABSTRACT**

Despite the many well-documented successes of citizen advisory boards (CABs), particularly in the environmental arena, two of the most often heard public criticisms are, “I don’t know what the Board does” and “I don’t feel that the Board represents me or my views.”

Are these legitimate complaints? At what point does a CAB cease to be a representative voice of the community from which its members are drawn? Is it inevitable that after some indeterminate amount of time has passed, members become isolated from their constituencies?

This paper will examine the underlying causes of these critical perceptions and how they are related to the report-back function. It will show how the report-back function, driven by an aggressive public outreach program, can dispel these perceptions and in the process build credibility and trust as well as improve the quality of a board’s advice and recommendations.

We will consider two levels of report-back. Our primary focus is report-back from a CAB to its stakeholders. The second level is report-back from agency ex officio members to the sponsoring agency.

We will use the Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB), a CAB chartered by the U.S. Department of Energy, as a model of how a successful public outreach program can be organized and implemented relatively quickly and inexpensively, with the primary requirement being time on the part of Board members and support staff. Based on subjective and objective measures, the Oak Ridge effort has yielded favorable results, demonstrating successful implementation of the report-back function.

We will begin with a look at the different models of board membership selection and the implications for report-back. Next, we will examine false assumptions and misconceptions about report-back that will stymie outreach efforts and result in predictably negative consequences. We will walk through the planning and implementation steps of a CAB public outreach program and discuss some of the tools and methods used successfully by the ORSSAB. We’ll look at how to equip members individually to carry out the plan. Briefly, we will describe a second type of report-back—from agency ex officio to agency decision-makers. Finally, we will discuss how to measure results of the report-back effort.

Our goal is for readers to come away with a greater sense of the importance of report-back programs, including how such programs can benefit their boards and stakeholders and how they can be successfully planned, implemented, and evaluated.

**INTRODUCTION**

**The Oak Ridge SSAB—Who we are; how we operate**

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) is a citizens’ advisory board (CAB), chartered by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Its mission is to provide independent citizen input and advice to DOE regarding the management and cleanup of hazardous and radioactive wastes on the Oak Ridge Reservation in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

## **WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

An independent (non-ORSSAB) screening panel selects nominees for Board membership from a pool of applicants using a range of demographic criteria to ensure balance and diversity. Among the demographics considered are race, gender, age, domicile (applicants must live in one of the seven counties most directly impacted by operations at the Oak Ridge Reservation), economic status, and occupation. When filling vacancies, the selection process is weighted in favor of candidates who most closely match the demographic profiles of the departing members—again in an effort to maintain diversity and balance.

This is considered a “blind” process in that the identities of the applicants are concealed until the process is completed. Following phone interviews with “finalists,” the panel deliberates and develops a short list of recommended candidates, based on the number of existing Board openings. This list is forwarded to DOE for consideration and formal appointment by the Secretary of Energy.

The ORSSAB conducts business under a set of bylaws and standing rules, which incorporate the principles of *Roberts Rules of Order*. Decisions are made by majority rule, although consensus is sought whenever possible on all major decisions and recommendations. Board subcommittees, or “project teams,” are tasked with developing and bringing recommendations to the full Board. Team meetings, which are open to the public, are held to review specific DOE programs, projects, and activities and to develop recommendations. Findings and recommendations are then reported back to the full Board at its next regular monthly meeting. All meetings are widely publicized—notice is published in local newspapers, in a DOE monthly newsletter and calendar mailed to interested stakeholders, and on the ORSSAB web page located at [www.oakridge.doe.gov/em/ssab/](http://www.oakridge.doe.gov/em/ssab/). Meeting notices are also recorded on a toll-free information line and posted at the DOE’s Information Resource Center located in Oak Ridge.

Public participation and input are solicited and encouraged through a variety of mechanisms. These include scheduled public comment periods at the monthly meetings and public participation in all project team meetings. Interested stakeholders are involved in a variety of other ways, which will be reviewed later in this paper. The ORSSAB has established a public outreach project team, as further evidence of its commitment to engage the public in its recommendation development process.

### **MEMBERSHIP MODELS AND THEIR EFFECT ON REPORT-BACK**

DOE SSABs employ one of two common models of membership selection, each presenting its own set of advantages and disadvantages for report-back.

In the “representative” model, stakeholder organizations are allotted specific seats on the board. These entities are in turn responsible for choosing individuals to fill those seats. The Hanford SSAB is a good example of this model. In the nonrepresentative, or “at-large,” model, interested individuals submit applications for membership. These are typically screened using certain demographic or other criteria to ensure balance and diversity. This is the Oak Ridge model. Falling somewhere between these two models is the less common practice of allotting seats to specific demographic categories—race, gender, ethnicity, etc. The Savannah River Site SSAB follows this model.

Report-back under the representative model is relatively straightforward. The relationship is linear and members understand precisely who their constituencies are. With the at-large model, members represent only themselves and do not presume to speak for any particular segment of the stakeholder population. Members may be representative *of* identifiable constituencies but not *representatives from* those constituencies.

## WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ

As a result, report-back responsibilities are more vague and less intuitive to members. And yet, since *everyone* shares a responsibility to report back to *all* constituencies, an effective report-back effort under this model will tend to unify rather than segment or isolate the various stakeholder constituencies.

### COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

CABs often must confront a common set of misconceptions regarding the need for an aggressive report-back effort. If not recognized and addressed, these misconceptions can lead to neglect of report-back, hampering the CAB's effectiveness and damaging its credibility with stakeholders, regulatory agencies, and the sponsoring agency. Following are some of the misconceptions board members, as well as sponsoring agency officials, may hold.

*Raising the drawbridge* – Upon selection to a CAB, new members bring their “outsider” ideas and views to the process. After a short period of service, however, some individuals may begin to mentally raise the drawbridge, so that “outsider” views can no longer get in. They may be inclined to look to members-only in their search for ideas and perspectives worth considering. Group-think sets in and a wall separates the board from its public—harming the quality, credibility, and acceptance of the board's efforts.

*“Passive” versus “active” communication* – “If we publicize our meetings and people choose not to come, why worry?” Board members may tend to believe that because a minimum level of public outreach is all that is legally required, it is therefore all that is really necessary. They may have doubts about the purpose and the potential of public outreach. Or, they may think the work of the board is so complex, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to communicate it effectively to the lay public.

*“Everyone who matters already knows about who we are and what we're doing”*—Or, put another way, those stakeholders who are already participating must be the only ones who care about what the board is doing. A CAB can quickly lose touch with its communities if it falls into this trap. For most CABs, it is not uncommon to see the same members of the public at every meeting. Everyone seems to notice a new face in the crowd, but that does not mean that nobody else cares about the issues or about how the board does its job. Still other stakeholders may not be aware of what “stake” they “hold” in the process. Successful CABs must continually reach beyond “the usual suspects” to inform and engage all stakeholders.

Agency ex officio members may share with board members many of these same misconceptions. In addition, they may feel threatened by report-back because they can influence but not shape or control message. They may be reluctant to support an initiative that they fear may be used to undermine the agency's position. And yet, the opposite is likely true. An agency demonstrates confidence in its programs as well concern for its community by empowering the board to conduct public outreach.

The sponsoring agency may also contend that board outreach is somehow redundant to the agency's overall public involvement program. Rather, they are likely to be complementary. In Oak Ridge, DOE's public involvement program has even gone so far as to jointly sponsor public meetings with the ORSSAB on such topics as cleanup budgets and priorities.

As stated, to provide credible recommendations, the CAB must go beyond simply inviting and informing, to actively engaging the public. Doing so typically results in a greater degree of public involvement and awareness, which in turn helps ensure that the board maintains:

- an understanding of the problems as perceived by the broader public,
- an understanding of which issues the public considers important,

## WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ

- an understanding of diverse viewpoints on the issues,
- the ability to educate the larger public on DOE issues,
- the ability to report back to the public on DOE responses to board recommendations, and
- a talent pool of new membership applicants.

Failure to do so can have serious consequences:

*The public may perceive that the board has been co-opted by the sponsoring agency*—SSABs are federally chartered and agency-funded. In Oak Ridge, as elsewhere, members may be current or former DOE subcontractors. This may give rise to the complaint that the board is not a truly independent body and that members are influenced or controlled by DOE. Lack of public outreach only reinforces this view.

In addition to public outreach, the ORSSAB has addressed this issue directly—taking steps to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest in the recommendation development process. Per the Board's Standing Rules, any member who may have a perceived conflict of interest on an issue is required to publicly disclose the relevant circumstances and to abstain from participation. Also, because the ORSSAB does not allot memberships to organizations, potential organizational conflicts of interest may be precluded.

Finally, continued funding for the ORSSAB is in no way tied to the positions the Board takes or the recommendations it makes on DOE-related issues. The agency takes very seriously Section 5(b)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which states in part:

*...the advice and recommendations of the advisory committee will not be inappropriately influenced by the appointing authority or by any special interest, but will instead be the result of the advisory committee's independent judgment; ...*

DOE's own formal SSAB guidance further reinforces this directive.

*The public may perceive that the board simply expects (rather than tries to earn) their trust*—When CABs fail to do outreach, they are unwittingly sending the message that stakeholders should simply trust them to do the right thing—in which case the opposite may happen. If the public never hears about what their board members are doing, they may conclude that they are simply doing as they please, without regard to outside opinion.

*The quality of the board's output will suffer.* As it becomes more insular and isolated from its various publics, group-think sets in and creative “out-of-the-box” problem solving deteriorates.

Each of the above is attributable not to weak board members or flawed technical efforts but to weak or nonexistent public outreach efforts. Conversely, these problems can be remedied through a properly planned and executed report-back program, which can help establish a board's *reliability* as an information source and its *credibility* as a representative voice. Also, board members should understand that addressing or preventing these misconceptions is solely their responsibility. Neither agency representatives, nor consultants/facilitators, nor support staff can take their place in building credibility and trust with the general public.

### **BRIDGING THE GAP—ORSSAB REPORT-BACK EFFORTS**

Recognizing the need for a stronger report-back effort, the ORSSAB created a Public Outreach Project Team, whose work began in earnest in the summer of 1998. The team began by defining its mission,

## **WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

establishing goals, brainstorming ideas for achieving the goals, and developing a work plan that included projecting resource needs and a timetable for implementation.

Goals included raising public awareness of the Board and its role; communicating Board focus areas and recommendations; promoting public participation in the DOE Environmental Management (EM) program in general and in Board functions in particular; and, making Board and project team meetings more stakeholder-friendly.

The supporting activities identified and implemented by the team included:

- Proactively scheduling presentations to targeted stakeholders groups, including civic clubs, labor unions, neighborhood groups, and school groups. Presenters use a standardized presentation, but to the extent possible, will tailor it to the particular audience. Message content typically includes a description of the EM program, how it impacts stakeholders, why and how the SSAB was established, how it operates, who comprises its membership, current issues and recent recommendations, and how citizens can learn more and get involved in the EM program, generally, and in the SSAB specifically.
- Proactively scheduling briefings for federal, state, and local elected officials and their staffs – again using standardized presentations geared toward the particular public official's interests or role in the process.
- Issuing news releases and advisories and promoting Board members' availability for media interviews.
- Sponsoring community forums on specific topics of widespread interest. In some case, such forums are sponsored jointly with the DOE's public involvement program.
- Broadcasting meetings on local cable television.
- Conducting meetings outside the immediate Oak Ridge area to encourage participation of stakeholders from other impacted areas.
- Participating in conferences and symposia.
- Conducting a stakeholder survey. The survey is designed to ascertain which issues the public considers most important, how the Board is perceived in terms of credibility and effectiveness, and whether the public believes their interests are adequately represented. (See Appendix 1)
- Publishing a quarterly newsletter, brochure, monthly calendar, annual report, and Board fact book. In addition, the Board's Web site was upgraded to make it a more valuable resource to Board members as well as the broader public. It now includes Board and team meeting schedules, agendas and minutes, text of Board recommendations and reports, on-line versions of all Board publications, and interactive features such as on-line surveys and membership applications.
- Adding a high school student representative to the Board.

The presentation initiative is considered a key report-back element of the Board's outreach program. This effort began with a thorough stakeholder assessment, resulting in a list of groups and organizations that have the greatest stake in EM, and therefore SSAB, activities. To better focus resources, the organizations were sorted into a "short list" – those considered high priority – and a "long list" for future consideration. The lists included high school and college classes, union locals, civic organizations, local government bodies such as city councils and planning commissions, economic development organizations, chambers of commerce, the League of Women Voters, professional societies, an "environmental justice" community, and environmental groups. Presentation "offer" letters were mailed to each short-list organization, and follow-up calls made to confirm a date and time.

These presentations were, without exception, well received by their audiences. Many have thanked Board members for their time and efforts, and others expressed new or renewed interest in EM issues. Several

## **WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

presentations have resulted in expressions of interest in Board membership. Perhaps most importantly, presenters have received valuable feedback on EM- and ORSSAB-related issues.

As the Board moves into a new planning year, selected organizations will be contacted again with offers of follow-up presentations.

Another pro-stakeholder initiative backed by the full Board has been to address specific, complex issues by creating working groups that are open to full participation by the public. This model has been used successfully on two occasions. The first was to study and make recommendations on future land uses of the Oak Ridge Reservation following environmental restoration (the End Use Working Group). More recently, a group was formed to address long-term stewardship of lands and facilities where contamination, to varying degrees, will remain after DOE has completed its work (the Stewardship Working Group). Both groups had clearly defined missions, goals, and end points in the form of final reports and recommendations that were then forwarded to the full ORSSAB for review and ratification. DOE supported these efforts by appointing technical liaisons and by contracting the services of an independent technical advisor/facilitator.

Unlike the Board's regular project team meetings, in which members of the public may participate but not vote, all working group participants are full voting members—no distinction is made between ORSSAB members and nonmembers.

### **EQUIPPING MEMBERS FOR OUTREACH**

While all members are encouraged to participate on a presentation team, each member is also encouraged to report back informally through social networks such as churches, workplaces, civic groups, and other associations. Each ORSSAB member is given a copy of the standard presentation so that each is well prepared when an opportunity arises. In addition, the public outreach team is now considering offering basic presentation skills training for those who may lack confidence in their public speaking abilities. The goal is to make volunteering for a presentation as successful and pleasant an experience as possible.

### **EX OFFICIO REPORT-BACK TO AGENCY “CONSTITUENCIES”**

While much has been said about report-back to member constituencies, it is equally important to examine the report-back role of the sponsoring agency ex officio to his or her agency. This report-back ensures that a board's input is reflected in agency decisions.

In Oak Ridge, this takes place at two levels—one formal and one informal. The first involves Board recommendations, which are reported or forwarded by the ex officio to the appropriate DOE decision-makers. The typical starting point for this report-back is the DOE Assistant Manager for Environmental Management (AMEM), who also attends the monthly Board meetings. The recommendations then become the subject of discussions between the AMEM and the appropriate program and project managers. Based on these discussions, DOE will draft a response addressing the recommendation from both a policy and technical perspective. The response may also outline specific steps that will be taken to implement the recommendation and a timetable for action.

A second, informal mechanism is also at work. This is a feedback loop in which the DOE ex officio member and the DOE technical liaisons to the Board's project teams are exposed to stakeholders' values and opinion formation through their routine interactions with Board members. These values and opinions are then reflected back to their agency peers and colleagues during policy meetings and technical

## **WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

discussions. In this way, program and project decision-makers stay abreast of stakeholder values and opinions as day-to-day decisions are made and paths forward are chosen.

The SSAB has a reasonable expectation that the other ex officio members representing state and federal regulators report back to their respective agencies in some fashion as well, giving them the benefit of the Board's advice and perspective.

Finally, it is the responsibility of DOE to keep the ORSSAB apprised of the status of their recommendations, both in terms of the initial written response and in any promised action or implementation. Doing so allows Board members to see the tangible results of their work, increasing job satisfaction and providing motivation for continued good work. As any board member will attest, researching complex issues and hammering out recommendations is hard work; thus, members expect responsiveness and accountability on the part of the agency.

### **MEASURING SUCCESS**

Much has been written in recent years about how to measure the success of organizations, including CABs—so an advisory board's *public outreach* program should be no exception.

It is natural for board members to look for tangible results in the form of public attendance at board and project team meetings and news media coverage. Such measures may yield discouraging results, and perhaps unnecessarily so. Outreach activities that raise awareness of the board, its role, and its activities and that allow for on-the-spot feedback will not necessarily increase meeting attendance. In fact, if members of the public feel both informed and heard through whatever outreach mechanism, they may demonstrate trust and confidence by not deeming it necessary to attend the board's meetings. In addition, it is impossible to know how many watch ORSSAB meetings on local cable rather than attend in person.

So if nonmember meeting attendance is a poor gauge of the board's outreach performance, how does one measure success? The ORSSAB has found its stakeholder opinion surveys to be an effective means of answering this question. Is the public aware of the ORSSAB and its role? Do they perceive the Board as effective? Credible? Representative? Open to outside views? Does it communicate with them effectively? The results of these surveys have provided important clues about the effectiveness of the Board's outreach—as well as overall—performance.

The ORSSAB also has benchmarked CAB outreach programs at other DOE sites. Based on these findings, the ORSSAB has added several tools, such as issuing its own news releases and advisories, to improve outreach efforts.

Not to be discounted is verbal feedback from the community. This feedback may come during public comment periods at meetings (ORSSAB offers a public comment period both at the beginning and at the end of its regular monthly meetings), and at project team meetings in which non-members are welcome to speak and participate. These exchanges provide some indication of the Board's efforts in communicating with the public. Perhaps just as helpful is talking to folks one-on-one to know what is being said about the Board and its work at the local barbershop or bridge club.

### **MAKING THE CASE**

CAB public outreach and report-back programs may not always be an easy sell—to board members or their sponsoring agencies who may hold misconceptions about their importance and misgivings about their efficacy. Some may simply be reluctant to take time and focus away from the board's core mission. And

## **WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

yet, for all of the perceived uncertainties and the time and effort required, the payoffs are clearly evident. By fostering increased awareness, credibility, trust and respect, report-back efforts can yield impressive long-term benefits—for stakeholders and agencies alike.

### **FOOTNOTES**

*Steven Kopp* is Chair of the Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Site-Specific Advisory Board. He also has served as the Board's representative to the Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee. He is immediate past Chair of the Citizen's Advisory Panel of the Oak Ridge Local Oversight Committee. Professionally, Mr. Kopp is an attorney and Manager of Environment, Health & Safety Services for the Oak Ridge office of the architect-engineering firm Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group Inc.

*Marianne Heiskell* is Contracting Officer's Representative for the U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations. As a former deputy to the Assistant Manager for Environmental Management, Ms. Heiskell served as the Department's ex officio member of the Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board.

*Chuck Jenkins* is manager of public involvement for Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC, the management and integration contractor for DOE Oak Ridge Operations' Environmental Management Program. Of his 17 years of public affairs experience, the past six have been in the field of public involvement, primarily in support of DOE environmental cleanup efforts in Oak Ridge and elsewhere around the country.

**APPENDIX 1**

**Results of the FY99 Stakeholder Survey**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>Do you believe that ORSSAB (a) Represents a credible, independent stakeholder voice?</b>			
Totals	45	10	9

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>Do you believe that ORSSAB (b) Represents your views regarding DOE/EM issues?</b>			
Totals	26	10	20

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>Do you believe that ORSSAB (c) Does a good job of communicating with the public?</b>			
Totals	39	13	12

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>2. Have you attended a Board or project team meeting in the past year?</b>		
Totals	23	41

**WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

<b>Question</b>
<b>3. If so, what prompted your interest in attending?</b>
* Seeing who is getting the job done. MSRE problem.
*Watershed projects-LOC also involved opportunity for information sharing.
* Interesting OR priority in EM System. *Detailed Subject matter.
*Bill Pardue: Civic responsibilities.
*Have not been able to attend, however I am interested. Have met with ORSSAB members.
*Mainly waste management.
*To hear Camilla Warren.
*Its jobs for us all DOE and Bechtel Jacobs wants to do is shut us down.
*I get depressed because I see DOE making cheap short range activities which don't address long range problems, and which will make it more costly to things 20 years from now.
*Environmental problems in every way.
*Community interest.
*EPA presentation on Scarboro Community Sampling plan draft.
*Sense of civic responsibility.
*On-sSite waste disposal.
*Consideration relevant to project I was working on.
*I have been here since 1953 this is home and I want to know what is going on.
*Topics Discussed. *I am interested in Oak Ridge its future and preservation of its nature.
*Stewardship; waste cell

**WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ**

<b>Question</b>
<b>4. What changes to our meetings would make them more stakeholder friendly?</b>
*Like getting your material. Have problem attending juggling with my schedule.
*Make meetings later in the evenings 7:30 P.M. advertise more in the <i>Oak Ridger</i> .
*Seating arrangement needs improving add the use of name tags for attendees.
*Get the place cleaned up; no more radioactive waste from other states; close the incinerator; clean air, ground now!!!!
*Everything is pre-committed on what is happening from DOE. DOE is a joke.
*You “lost” the Ralph Hutchinson contingent which was a major step forward.
*Important for meetings to be reported well in the <i>Oak Ridger</i> ; it is also important to publicize meetings frequently in <i>Oak Ridger</i> .
*Fine as is.
*Better communication of basic facts and how it impacts residents/workers in Oak Ridge.
*The ORSSAB comprises x DOE/Lockheed; upper management too much influence to perpetuate the DOE milk cow and its huge contractor/consultant \$\$\$ projects.
*Honesty, openness and willingness to admit there is a problem.
*Time limits.
*Have different locations different towns.
*Focus on promoting O.R. City issues, Emphasize the positive about what’s already clean.
*Take up problems that fall present like mine...sick workers, MSRE cover ups, releases covered up at Gunitite tanks, Chestnut Ridge.
*Wed. evenings are bad, church activities then.
*Remove DOE strong hold from the Board.
*I do not know, this is a difficult issue. Perhaps some dedicated meetings that will deal mostly with issues and less with formalities.
*Minimize discussion between Board and public during meeting.
*Hold at a more friendly location, have place for public to register, mobilize more of the public.
*Send info notices out in plain English terms, not technical wording about what the meeting concerns
*Adequate information; agenda needs to be sent out in advance of meeting
*Keep a handful of people (always the same people) from dominating the discussions; they intimidate contrary views

WM'00 Conference, February 27 – March 2, 2000, Tucson, AZ

5. Please rate each of the following issues from 1-10 to indicate what you believe ORSSAB should focus on next year	Responses	Avg.
EM budget and prioritization	4,2,10,8,9,10,10,8,5,6,9,10,1,8,3,10,6,9,10,10,10,10,10,5,9,9,10,7,8,5,1,7,10,1,10,5,6,10,10,4,7,10,9,10,3,9,7,10,8,10	7.6
Cost-effectiveness of cleanup decisions	10,7,10,5,9,2,6,8,7,10,7,10,6,4,2,8,4,10,10,9,10,7,6,8,8,5,10,10,7,10,7,6,9,5,2,10,5,6,10,9,10,5,10,10,9,2,5,8,10,8,	7.6
Land and facility stewardship	10,10,10,9,8,10,7,5,9,8,8,10,3,2,3,5,8,5,4,9,7,3,7,10,2,5,9,10,5,8,1,10,10,8,7,7,8,7,10,9,10,8,5,6,10,8,10,9,7,10,8,	7.0
Off-site waste disposal and transportation	1,1,10,4,10,10,4,8,5,9,9,10,7,10,5,9,10,5,10,7,2,3,2,5,1,5,6,2,2,3,10,4,5,10,7,5,8,10,7,6,5,6,7,5,3,3,5,	6.0
On-site waste cell construction	2,6,10,7,8,10,1,8,5,5,3,2,9,4,10,5,2,10,8,10,5,2,3,9,6,8,10,8,2,3,4,3,9,8,7,8,10,10,5,7,7,6,2,7,6,8,8,	6.3
Reindustrialization	10,9,10,3,10,8,2,5,10,6,2,10,10,8,1,5,8,2,5,10,10,6,9,1,6,6,6,3,10,1,2,3,2,6,5,8,5,9,2,8,1,9,7,8,3,8,3,6,5,7,10,9,	6.1
Toxic Substances Control Act Incinerator	1,3,10,2,5,10,10,2,2,5,7,2,10,4,5,7,10,1,10,4,8,6,1,4,9,4,6,4,3,3,6,5,1,5,6,8,7,5,7,3,1,9,1,4,2,3,1,6,10,	4.9
Treatment and disposal of waste	1,5,10,1,5,10,10,3,9,9,6,10,4,10,1,6,8,10,6,10,6,10,6,6,8,10,3,4,7,8,7,10,8,2,2,9,10,8,7,4,10,9,8,7,10,4,3,8,2,5,1,5,10,6,5,	6.6
Waste import/export equity	10,10,6,8,3,8,5,6,5,10,5,8,9,8,10,10,3,10,6,4,1,1,10,2,3,10,2,2,5,10,1,10,10,8,6,9,2,2,5,2,6,9,2,6,5	6.0
Worker and community health concerns	1,4,2,10,3,9,10,1,8,5,10,10,1,10,10,3,6,10,7,5,10,10,8,8,9,9,7,10,5,8,10,6,2,2,3,10,10,2,5,3,10,10,8,8,10,5,8,10,2,1,5,1,4,1,8	6.4
Other	8, "Make Oak Ridge a model for the future." 10, "Oak Ridge image." 10, "Impediments to privatization or private use of existing and underutilized land." 10+, "Get more funding from Congress for cleanup." 7, "Community health assessment."	9.0