**Site Specific Advisory Board Initiative
Evaluation Survey Results
Supplementary Appendix:
Summary of Individual Site Results**

August 1996

The U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Environmental Management

HH
DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

DISCLAIMER

**Portions of this document may be illegible
in electronic image products. Images are
produced from the best available original
document.**

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

**Site Specific Advisory Board Initiative Evaluation
Survey Results, Supplementary Appendix:
Summary of Individual Site Results**

INTRODUCTION

This Appendix presents results of the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Initiative for each of the 11 sites that participated in the survey. These individual results are a supplement to the June 1996 Summary Report which presented overall survey results.

Results are presented in 11 sections, arranged alphabetically by site. Each section includes a series of figures and tables that parallel those presented in the Summary Report. To facilitate comparison, figures are presented both for the individual site and for the overall long survey. The sequence of sections is:

- Fernald
- Hanford
- Idaho
- Los Alamos
- Monticello
- Nevada
- Pantex
- Rocky Flats
- St. Louis
- Sandia
- Savannah River

**Fernald Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Fernald

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Fernald
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Fernald
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Fernald
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 5a. Fernald
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Fernald
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Fernald
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Fernald
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Fernald
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Fernald
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Fernald
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Fernald
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Fernald
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Fernald
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Fernald
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	16	80.0%	0	0%	4	20.0%	20	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board has effective leadership	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	10	47.6%	7	33.3%	4	19.0%	21	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	20	95.2%	0	0%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	20	95.2%	0	0%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	21	100.0%	0.00	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	20	95.2%	0	0%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	18	90.0%	1	5.0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	19	95.0%	1	5.0%	0	0%	20	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0%	21	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	18	85.7%	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	21	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
The Board helps define site problems	18	90.0%	2	10.0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	19	95.0%	0	0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	19	95.0%	0	0%	1	5.0%	20	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	20	95.2%	0	0%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	18	90.0%	2	10.0%	0	0%	20	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0%	21	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	15	71.4%	5	23.8%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	19	90.5%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%	21	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	16	76.2%	2	9.5%	3	14.3%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0%	21	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	12	60.0%	7	35.0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	19	90.5%	2	9.5%	0	0%	21	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	18	85.7%	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	21	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	20	95.2%	0	0%	1	4.8%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	16	76.2%	4	19.0%	1	4.8%	21	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	18	85.7%	3	14.3%	0	0%	21	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	17	81.0%	2	9.5%	2	9.5%	21	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	2	9.5%	5	23.8%	14	66.7%	21	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Fernald	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	17	94.4%	1	5.6%	0	0%	18	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	3	14.3%	13	61.9%	5	23.8%	21	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	7	33.3%	11	52.4%	3	14.3%	21	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	10	47.6%	10	47.6%	1	4.8%	21	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	19	90.5%	2	9.5%	0	0%	21	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	15	71.4%	4	19.0%	2	9.5%	21	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive form.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Fernald	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	17	85.0%	2	10.0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Like each other	15	75.0%	5	25.0%	0	0%	20	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	16	80.0%	4	20.0%	0	0%	20	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	16	80.0%	3	15.0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	19	95.0%	1	5.0%	0	0%	20	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	18	90.0%	2	10.0%	0	0%	20	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	16	80.0%	4	20.0%	0	0%	20	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	20	100.0%	0	0%	0	0%	20	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	12	60.0%	7	35.0%	1	5.0%	20	100%
Provide one another mutual help	15	75.0%	5	25.0%	0	0%	20	100%

**Hanford Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Hanford
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Hanford
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Hanford
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Hanford
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. Hanford
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Hanford
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Hanford
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Hanford
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Hanford
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Hanford
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Hanford
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Hanford
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Hanford
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Hanford
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Hanford
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	70	83.3%	9	10.7%	5	6.0%	84	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	74	89.2%	7	8.4%	2	2.4%	83	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	39	47.0%	11	13.3%	33	39.8%	83	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	48	57.8%	17	20.5%	18	21.7%	83	100%
The Board has effective leadership	67	80.7%	10	12.0%	6	7.2%	83	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	10	11.9%	21	25.0%	53	63.1%	84	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	27	32.5%	35	42.2%	21	25.3%	83	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	51	60.7%	16	19.0%	17	20.2%	84	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	62	72.9%	14	16.5%	9	10.6%	85	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	68	81.0%	8	9.5%	8	9.5%	84	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	72	85.7%	5	6.0%	7	8.3%	84	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	67	79.8%	7	8.3%	10	11.9%	84	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	64	76.2%	14	16.7%	6	7.1%	84	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	72	85.7%	5	6.0%	7	8.3%	84	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	61	72.6%	13	15.5%	10	11.9%	84	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	75	90.4%	4	4.8%	4	4.8%	83	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	65	78.3%	13	15.7%	5	6.0%	83	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	41	49.4%	36	43.4%	6	7.2%	83	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	35	42.2%	24	28.9%	24	28.9%	83	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	48	57.1%	18	21.4%	18	21.4%	84	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	61	72.6%	15	17.9%	8	9.5%	84	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	64	75.3%	5	5.9%	16	18.8%	85	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	60	72.3%	12	14.5%	11	13.3%	83	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	46	54.8%	9	10.7%	29	34.5%	84	100%
The Board helps define site problems	67	80.7%	13	15.7%	3	3.6%	83	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	42	50.6%	20	24.1%	21	25.3%	83	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	57	68.7%	15	18.1%	11	13.3%	83	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	61	73.5%	13	15.7%	9	10.8%	83	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	51	61.4%	14	16.9%	18	21.7%	83	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	50	61.0%	14	17.1%	18	22.0%	82	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	30	36.1%	25	30.1%	28	33.7%	83	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	56	66.7%	17	20.2%	11	13.1%	84	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	30	36.1%	28	33.7%	25	30.1%	83	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	28	33.7%	35	42.2%	20	24.1%	83	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	29	34.5%	27	32.1%	28	33.3%	84	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	51	62.2%	17	20.7%	14	17.1%	82	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	62	74.7%	19	22.9%	2	2.4%	83	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	10	12.0%	54	65.1%	19	22.9%	83	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	29	35.4%	22	26.8%	31	37.8%	82	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	45	53.6%	27	32.1%	12	14.3%	84	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	55	64.7%	20	23.5%	10	11.8%	85	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	31	37.8%	34	41.5%	17	20.7%	82	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	59	70.2%	16	19.0%	9	10.7%	84	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	31	36.5%	17	20.0%	37	43.5%	85	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	48	56.5%	21	24.7%	16	18.8%	85	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Hanford	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	58	78.4%	1	1.4%	15	20.3%	74	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	6	7.1%	28	33.3%	50	59.5%	84	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	10	11.9%	22	26.2%	52	61.9%	84	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	8	9.5%	25	29.8%	51	60.7%	84	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	67	78.8%	11	12.9%	7	8.2%	85	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	50	59.5%	14	16.7%	20	23.8%	84	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	62	72.9%	12	14.1%	11	12.9%	85	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Hanford	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	37	44.0%	24	28.6%	23	27.4%	84	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	47	56.0%	28	33.3%	9	10.7%	84	100%
Like each other	27	32.9%	33	40.2%	22	26.8%	82	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	22	26.5%	28	33.7%	33	39.8%	83	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	53	63.1%	21	25.0%	10	11.9%	84	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	61	72.6%	13	15.5%	10	11.9%	84	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	47	56.0%	25	29.8%	12	14.3%	84	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	61	72.6%	16	19.0%	7	8.3%	84	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	37	44.0%	25	29.8%	22	26.2%	84	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	36	42.9%	20	23.8%	28	33.3%	84	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	53	63.1%	17	20.2%	14	16.7%	84	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	49	58.3%	26	31.0%	9	10.7%	84	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	41	49.4%	27	32.5%	15	18.1%	83	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	27	32.1%	35	41.7%	22	26.2%	84	100%
Provide one another mutual help	44	52.4%	29	34.5%	11	13.1%	84	100%

**Idaho Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Idaho

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Idaho
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Idaho
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Idaho
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. Idaho
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Idaho
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Idaho
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Idaho
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Idaho
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Idaho
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Idaho
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Idaho
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Idaho
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Idaho
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Idaho
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	32	94.1%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	34	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	32	97.0%	1	3.0%	0	0%	33	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	26	78.8%	4	12.1%	3	9.1%	33	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	25	75.8%	4	12.1%	4	12.1%	33	100%
The Board has effective leadership	29	87.9%	2	6.1%	2	6.1%	33	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	7	20.6%	11	32.4%	16	47.1%	34	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	15	44.1%	16	47.1%	3	8.8%	34	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	29	85.3%	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	34	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	31	91.2%	2	5.9%	1	2.9%	34	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	32	94.1%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	34	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	31	91.2%	3	8.8%	0	0%	34	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	27	79.4%	5	14.7%	2	5.9%	34	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	31	91.2%	2	5.9%	1	2.9%	34	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	31	91.2%	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	34	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	31	91.2%	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	34	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	29	87.9%	3	9.1%	1	3.0%	33	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	27	81.8%	5	15.2%	1	3.0%	33	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	23	69.7%	10	30.3%	0	0%	33	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	20	60.6%	10	30.3%	3	9.1%	33	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	31	91.2%	3	8.8%	0	0%	34	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	23	67.6%	8	23.5%	3	8.8%	34	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	30	88.2%	2	5.9%	2	5.9%	34	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	28	84.8%	3	9.1%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	28	82.4%	2	5.9%	4	11.8%	34	100%
The Board helps define site problems	22	66.7%	9	27.3%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	23	69.7%	8	24.2%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	26	78.8%	3	9.1%	4	12.1%	33	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	27	81.8%	4	12.1%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	22	66.7%	7	21.2%	4	12.1%	33	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	19	57.6%	12	36.4%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	13	39.4%	16	48.5%	4	12.1%	33	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	30	88.2%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	34	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	20	58.8%	10	29.4%	4	11.8%	34	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	19	55.9%	11	32.4%	4	11.8%	34	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	23	67.6%	7	20.6%	4	11.8%	34	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	18	54.5%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%	33	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	27	81.8%	5	15.2%	1	3.0%	33	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	19	57.6%	12	36.4%	2	6.1%	33	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	22	64.7%	11	32.4%	1	2.9%	34	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	10	29.4%	20	58.8%	4	11.8%	34	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	27	79.4%	4	11.8%	3	8.8%	34	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	23	67.6%	8	23.5%	3	8.8%	34	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	18	52.9%	14	41.2%	2	5.9%	34	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	23	67.6%	6	17.6%	5	14.7%	34	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	25	73.5%	6	17.6%	3	8.8%	34	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Idaho	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	27	93.1%	0	0%	2	6.9%	29	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	12	35.3%	11	32.4%	11	32.4%	34	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	14	41.2%	16	47.1%	4	11.8%	34	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	6	17.6%	22	64.7%	6	17.6%	34	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	25	73.5%	6	17.6%	3	8.8%	34	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	24	70.6%	4	11.8%	6	17.6%	34	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	28	82.4%	3	8.8%	3	8.8%	34	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Idaho	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	25	73.5%	4	11.8%	5	14.7%	34	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	23	67.6%	9	26.5%	2	5.9%	34	100%
Like each other	11	32.4%	15	44.1%	8	23.5%	34	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	12	35.3%	14	41.2%	8	23.5%	34	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	24	70.6%	7	20.6%	3	8.8%	34	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	28	82.4%	6	17.6%	0	0%	34	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	25	73.5%	8	23.5%	1	2.9%	34	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	24	70.6%	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	34	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	23	67.6%	7	20.6%	4	11.8%	34	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	21	61.8%	8	23.5%	5	14.7%	34	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	20	58.8%	11	32.4%	3	8.8%	34	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	25	73.5%	8	23.5%	1	2.9%	34	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	27	79.4%	5	14.7%	2	5.9%	34	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	20	58.8%	9	26.5%	5	14.7%	34	100%
Provide one another mutual help	26	76.5%	6	17.6%	2	5.9%	34	100%

**Los Alamos Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Los Alamos
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Los Alamos
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Los Alamos
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Los Alamos
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. Los Alamos
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Los Alamos
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Los Alamos
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Los Alamos
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Los Alamos
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Los Alamos
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Los Alamos
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Los Alamos
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Los Alamos
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Los Alamos
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Los Alamos
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	11	50.0%	6	27.3%	5	22.7%	22	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	19	86.4%	1	4.5%	2	9.1%	22	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	10	45.5%	5	22.7%	7	31.8%	22	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	9	40.9%	2	9.1%	11	50.0%	22	100%
The Board has effective leadership	10	45.5%	6	27.3%	6	27.3%	22	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	1	4.5%	9	40.9%	12	54.5%	22	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	7	31.8%	11	50.0%	4	18.2%	22	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	11	50.0%	5	22.7%	6	27.3%	22	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	7	31.8%	14	63.6%	1	4.5%	22	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	13	59.1%	3	13.6%	6	27.3%	22	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	9	40.9%	6	27.3%	7	31.8%	22	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	11	50.0%	6	27.3%	5	22.7%	22	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	11	50.0%	7	31.8%	4	18.2%	22	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	17	77.3%	4	18.2%	1	4.5%	22	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	11	50.0%	6	27.3%	5	22.7%	22	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	13	59.1%	8	36.4%	1	4.5%	22	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	12	54.5%	6	27.3%	4	18.2%	22	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	12	54.5%	8	36.4%	2	9.1%	22	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	14	63.6%	4	18.2%	4	18.2%	22	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	11	50.0%	8	36.4%	3	13.6%	22	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	6	27.3%	10	45.5%	6	27.3%	22	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	13	59.1%	5	22.7%	4	18.2%	22	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	6	27.3%	8	36.4%	8	36.4%	22	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	5	22.7%	9	40.9%	8	36.4%	22	100%
The Board helps define site problems	6	27.3%	9	40.9%	7	31.8%	22	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	7	31.8%	6	27.3%	9	40.9%	22	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	9	40.9%	11	50.0%	2	9.1%	22	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	4	18.2%	9	40.9%	9	40.9%	22	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	10	47.6%	5	23.8%	6	28.6%	21	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	4	18.2%	5	22.7%	13	59.1%	22	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	7	31.8%	7	31.8%	8	36.4%	22	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	10	45.5%	9	40.9%	3	13.6%	22	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	7	31.8%	8	36.4%	7	31.8%	22	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	1	4.5%	16	72.7%	5	22.7	22	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	8	36.4%	12	54.5%	2	9.1%	22	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	4	18.2%	10	45.5%	8	36.4%	22	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	7	31.8%	14	63.6%	1	4.5%	22	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	3	13.6%	16	72.7%	3	13.6%	22	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	5	22.7%	15	68.2%	2	9.1%	22	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	3	13.6%	16	72.7%	3	13.6%	22	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	6	27.3%	10	45.5%	6	27.3%	22	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	2	9.1%	12	54.5%	8	36.4%	22	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	5	22.7%	13	59.1%	4	18.2%	22	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	9	40.9%	8	36.4%	5	22.7%	22	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	17	77.3%	3	13.6%	2	9.1%	22	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Los Alamos	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	11	64.7%	1	5.9%	5	29.4%	17	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	4	18.2%	12	54.5%	6	27.3%	22	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	7	31.8%	7	31.8%	8	36.4%	22	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	2	9.1%	16	72.7%	4	18.2%	22	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	15	68.2%	2	9.1%	5	22.7%	22	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	11	50.0%	4	18.2%	7	31.8%	22	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	11	50.0%	8	36.4%	3	13.6%	22	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Los Alamos	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	14	66.7%	3	14.3%	4	19.0%	21	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	13	61.9%	5	23.8%	3	14.3%	21	100%
Like each other	6	28.6%	8	38.1%	7	33.3%	21	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	7	33.3%	7	33.3%	7	33.3%	21	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	11	52.4%	6	28.6%	4	19.0%	21	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	13	61.9%	6	28.6%	2	9.5%	21	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	11	52.4%	5	23.8%	5	23.8%	21	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	15	71.4%	4	19.0%	2	9.5%	21	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	9	42.9%	10	47.6%	2	9.5%	21	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	7	33.3%	6	28.6%	8	38.1%	21	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	12	57.1%	8	38.1%	1	4.8%	21	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	11	52.4%	4	19.0%	6	28.6%	21	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	9	42.9%	7	33.3%	5	23.8%	21	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	12	57.1%	4	19.0%	5	23.8%	21	100%
Provide one another mutual help	11	52.4%	7	33.3%	3	14.3%	21	100%

**Monticello Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Monticello
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Monticello
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Monticello
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Monticello
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 5a. Monticello
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Monticello
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Monticello
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Monticello
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Monticello
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Monticello
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Monticello
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Monticello
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Monticello
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Monticello
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Monticello
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	21	67.7%	5	16.1%	5	16.1%	31	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	23	82.1%	5	17.9%	0	0%	28	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	10	37.0%	7	25.9%	10	37.0%	27	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	20	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board has effective leadership	18	64.3%	7	25.0%	3	10.7%	28	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	9	29.0%	10	32.3%	12	38.7%	31	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	14	45.2%	12	38.7%	5	16.1%	31	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	19	63.3%	8	26.7%	3	10.0%	30	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	11	35.5%	8	25.8%	12	38.7%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	22	71.0%	3	9.7%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	21	67.7%	6	19.4%	4	12.9%	31	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	22	71.0%	5	16.1%	4	12.9%	31	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	18	58.1%	7	22.6%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	18	58.1%	7	22.6%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	19	61.3%	6	19.4%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	20	71.4%	7	25.0%	1	3.6%	28	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	21	75.0%	2	7.1%	5	17.9%	28	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	16	57.1%	10	35.7%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	14	50.0%	11	39.3%	3	10.7%	28	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	23	74.2%	3	9.7%	5	16.1%	31	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	17	54.8%	9	29.0%	5	16.1%	31	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	16	53.3%	11	36.7%	3	10.0%	30	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	23	82.1%	2	7.1%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R)	10	32.3%	15	48.4%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The Board helps define site problems	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	18	64.3%	8	28.6%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	11	39.3%	9	32.1%	8	28.6%	28	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	0	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	20	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	13	41.9%	7	22.6%	11	35.5%	31	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	14	50.0%	10	35.7%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	25	80.6%	4	12.9%	2	6.5%	31	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	19	61.3%	7	22.6%	5	16.1%	31	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	16	51.6%	12	38.7%	3	9.7%	31	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	18	58.1%	5	16.1%	8	25.8%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	21	67.7%	7	22.6%	3	9.7%	31	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	22	78.6%	2	7.1%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	15	53.6%	11	39.3%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	15	48.4%	9	29.0%	7	22.6%	31	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	18	58.1%	10	32.3%	3	9.7%	31	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	27	87.1%	4	12.9%	0	0%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	11	35.5%	11	35.5%	9	29.0%	31	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	24	77.4%	7	22.6%	0	0%	31	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	26	83.9%	3	9.7%	2	6.5%	31	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	13	41.9%	10	32.3%	8	25.8%	31	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Monticello	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	19	79.2%	1	16.7%	4	4.2%	24	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	12	38.7%	12	38.7%	7	22.6%	31	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	10	32.3%	14	45.2%	7	22.6%	31	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	8	25.8%	16	51.6%	7	22.6%	31	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	25	80.6%	6	19.4%	0	0%	31	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	20	64.5%	4	12.9%	7	22.6%	31	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	23	74.2%	6	19.4%	2	6.5%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Monticello	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	9	30.0%	12	40.0%	9	30.0%	30	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	13	43.3%	9	30.0%	8	26.7%	30	100%
Like each other	8	26.7%	14	46.7%	8	26.7%	30	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	6	20.0%	13	43.3%	11	36.7%	30	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	16	53.3%	9	30.0%	5	16.7%	30	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	14	48.3%	12	41.4%	3	10.3%	29	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	18	60.0%	8	26.7%	4	13.3%	30	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	13	43.3%	12	40.0%	5	16.7%	30	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	22	73.3%	4	13.3%	4	13.3%	30	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	12	40.0%	9	30.0%	9	30.0%	30	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	18	60.0%	8	26.7%	4	13.3%	30	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	13	43.3%	9	30.0%	8	26.7%	30	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	13	43.3%	13	43.3%	4	13.3%	30	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	7	24.1%	15	51.7%	7	24.1%	29	100%
Provide one another mutual help	17	56.7%	9	30.0%	4	13.3%	30	100%

**Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Nevada

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample

Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Nevada
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Nevada
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Nevada
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 5a. Nevada
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Nevada
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Nevada
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Nevada
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Nevada
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Nevada
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Nevada
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Nevada
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Nevada
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Nevada
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Nevada
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	17	68.0%	3	12.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	17	68.0%	3	12.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	8	32.0%	4	16.0%	13	52.0%	25	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	12	48.0%	5	20.0%	8	32.0%	25	100%
The Board has effective leadership	13	52.0%	6	24.0%	6	24.0%	25	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	1	4.0%	4	16.0%	20	80.0%	25	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	17	68.0%	7	28.0%	1	4.0%	25	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	11	44.0%	6	24.0%	8	32.0%	25	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	10	40.0%	8	32.0%	7	28.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	16	64.0%	5	20.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	16	64.0%	5	20.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	19	76.0%	3	12.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	19	76.0%	6	24.0%	0	0%	25	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	19	79.2%	5	20.8%	0	0%	24	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	19	76.0%	3	12.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	18	72.0%	3	12.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	21	84.0%	2	8.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	10	40.0%	11	44.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	9	36.0%	8	32.0%	8	32.0%	25	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	19	76.0%	3	12.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	17	68.0%	6	24.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	17	68.0%	5	20.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)(R) *	11	44.0%	9	36.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	11	44.0%	5	20.0%	9	36.0%	25	100%
The Board helps define site problems	10	40.0%	8	32.0%	7	28.0%	25	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	2	8.0%	8	32.0%	15	60.0%	25	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	8	32.0%	10	40.0%	7	28.0%	25	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	14	56.0%	8	32.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	11	44.0%	9	36.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	13	54.2%	8	33.3%	3	12.5%	24	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	10	41.7%	5	20.8%	9	37.5%	24	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	22	88.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	25	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	19	76.0%	6	24.0%	0	0%	25	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	10	40.0%	13	52.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	11	44.0%	12	48.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	10	41.7%	12	50.0%	2	8.3%	24	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	20	80.0%	5	20.0%	0	0%	25	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	8	32.0%	14	56.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	14	56.0%	10	40.0%	1	4.0%	25	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	6	24.0%	16	64.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	16	64.0%	6	24.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	14	56.0%	9	36.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	16	64.0%	8	32.0%	1	4.0%	25	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	16	64.0%	6	24.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	20	80.0%	2	8.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Nevada	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	17	73.9%	1	4.3%	5	21.7%	23	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	10	40.0%	10	40.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	7	28.0%	12	48.0%	6	24.0%	25	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	7	28.0	17	68.0%	1	4.0%	25	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	17	68.0%	8	32.0%	0	0%	25	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	16	64.0%	4	16.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	19	76.0%	3	12.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Nevada	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	5	20.0%	10	40.0%	10	40.0%	25	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	11	44.0%	6	24.0%	8	32.0%	25	100%
Like each other	9	36.0%	9	36.0%	7	28.0%	25	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	6	24.0%	11	44.0%	8	32.0%	25	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	12	48.0%	10	40.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	20	80.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%	25	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	9	36.0%	11	44.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	10	40.0%	10	40.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	16	64.0%	6	24.0%	3	12.0%	25	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	6	24.0%	5	20.0%	14	56.0%	25	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	12	48.0%	8	32.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	9	36.0%	9	36.0%	7	28.0%	25	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	7	29.2%	13	54.2%	4	16.7%	24	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	6	24.0%	7	28.0%	12	48.0%	25	100%
Provide one another mutual help	12	48.0%	9	36.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%

**Pantex Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Pantex
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Pantex
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Pantex
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Pantex
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 5a. Pantex
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Pantex
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Pantex
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Pantex
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Pantex
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 10a. Pantex
Group/Team work skills

Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills

**Figure 11a. Pantex
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Pantex
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Pantex
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Pantex
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Pantex
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	18	64.3%	4	14.3%	6	21.4%	28	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	21	80.8%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	26	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	18	69.2%	3	11.5%	5	19.2%	26	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	10	38.5%	2	7.7%	14	53.8%	26	100%
The Board has effective leadership	18	69.2%	5	19.2%	3	11.5%	26	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	5	17.9%	6	21.4%	17	60.7%	28	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	15	53.6%	10	35.7%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	24	85.7%	4	14.3%	0	0%	28	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	15	53.6%	7	25.0%	6	21.4%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	17	60.7%	5	17.9%	6	21.4%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	21	75.0%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	6	22.2%	8	29.6%	13	48.1%	27	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	19	67.9%	2	7.1%	7	25.0%	28	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	13	46.4%	7	25.0%	8	28.6%	28	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	19	73.1%	4	15.4%	3	11.5%	26	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	17	65.4%	7	26.9%	2	7.7%	26	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	17	65.4%	7	26.9%	2	7.7%	26	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	13	50.0%	8	30.8%	5	19.2%	26	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	23	85.2%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	27	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	20	74.1%	6	22.2%	1	3.7%	27	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	17	60.7%	2	7.1%	9	32.1%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	16	61.5%	3	11.5%	7	26.9%	26	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	9	32.1%	6	21.4%	13	46.4%	28	100%
The Board helps define site problems	20	76.9%	4	15.4%	2	7.7%	26	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	9	34.6%	5	19.2%	12	46.2%	26	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	5	19.2%	5	19.2%	16	61.5%	26	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	18	69.2%	5	19.2%	3	11.5%	26	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	15	57.7%	3	11.5%	8	30.8%	26	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	11	39.3%	12	42.9%	5	17.9%	28	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	11	42.3%	9	34.6%	6	23.1%	26	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	23	82.1%	2	7.1%	3	10.7%	28	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	18	66.7%	9	33.3%	0	0%	27	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	15	53.6%	10	35.7%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	14	50.0%	9	32.1%	5	17.9%	28	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	16	61.5%	8	30.8%	2	7.7%	26	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	5	20.0%	16	64.0%	4	16.0%	25	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	20	71.4%	7	25.0%	1	3.6%	28	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	15	53.6%	13	46.4%	0	0%	28	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	4	14.3%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	15	53.6%	5	17.9%	8	28.6%	28	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	17	60.7%	7	25.0%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	22	78.6%	3	10.7%	3	10.7%	28	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	18	64.3%	6	21.4%	4	14.3%	28	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Pantex	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	16	69.6%	1	4.3%	6	26.1%	23	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	8	28.6%	12	42.9%	8	28.6%	28	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	5	17.9%	19	67.9%	4	14.3%	28	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	28	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	20	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	15	53.6%	10	35.7%	3	10.7%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Pantex	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	12	44.4%	5	18.5%	10	37.0%	27	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	11	39.3%	4	14.3%	13	46.4%	28	100%
Like each other	8	28.6%	6	21.4%	14	50.0%	28	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	6	21.4%	5	17.9%	17	60.7%	28	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	8	28.6%	10	35.7%	10	35.7%	28	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	13	46.4%	4	14.3%	11	39.3%	28	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	12	42.9%	8	28.6%	8	28.6%	28	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	17	60.7%	9	32.1%	2	7.1%	28	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	18	64.3%	6	21.4%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	15	53.6%	7	25.0%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	11	39.3%	9	32.1%	8	28.6%	28	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	14	50.0%	9	32.1%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	13	46.4%	9	32.1%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	15	53.6%	9	32.1%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Provide one another mutual help	11	39.3%	9	32.1%	8	28.6%	28	100%

**Rocky Flats Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Rocky Flats
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of
information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Rocky Flats
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Rocky Flats
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Rocky Flats
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. Rocky Flats
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Rocky Flats
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 7a. Rocky Flats
Public awareness

Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness

Figure 8a. Rocky Flats
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Rocky Flats
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Rocky Flats
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

Figure 11a. Rocky Flats
Working relations

Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations

**Figure 12a. Rocky Flats
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Rocky Flats
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Rocky Flats
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Rocky Flats
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	39	88.6%	1	2.3%	4	9.1%	44	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	43	97.7%	1	2.3%	0	0%	44	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	37	84.1%	0	0%	7	15.9%	44	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	29	65.9%	8	18.2%	7	15.9%	44	100%
The Board has effective leadership	29	65.9%	4	9.1%	11	25.0%	44	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	11	25.0%	5	11.4%	28	63.6%	44	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	18	40.9%	20	45.5%	6	13.6%	44	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	39	88.6%	3	6.8%	2	4.5%	44	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	36	81.8%	6	13.6%	2	4.5%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	37	84.1%	2	4.5%	5	11.4%	44	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	39	88.6%	5	11.4%	0	0%	44	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	34	77.3%	6	13.6%	4	9.1%	44	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	37	84.1%	6	13.6%	1	2.3%	44	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	38	86.4%	4	9.1%	2	4.5%	44	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	33	76.7%	7	16.3%	3	7.0%	43	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	41	93.2%	2	4.5%	1	2.3%	44	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	37	84.1%	3	6.8%	4	9.1%	44	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	33	75.0%	10	22.7%	1	2.3%	44	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	26	59.1%	10	22.7%	8	18.2%	44	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	30	68.2%	8	18.2%	6	13.6%	44	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	31	70.5%	10	22.7%	3	6.8%	44	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	35	79.5%	4	9.1%	5	11.4%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	35	79.5%	7	15.9%	2	4.5%	44	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	27	61.4%	10	22.7%	7	15.9%	44	100%
The Board helps define site problems	38	86.4%	4	9.1%	2	4.5%	44	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	30	68.2%	6	13.6%	8	18.2%	44	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	27	61.4%	5	11.4%	12	27.3%	44	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	33	75.0%	7	15.9%	4	9.1%	44	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	28	63.6%	9	20.5%	7	15.9%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	25	56.8%	9	20.5%	10	22.7%	44	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	22	50.0%	11	25.0%	11	25.0%	44	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	30	68.2%	9	20.5%	5	11.4%	44	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	18	40.9%	8	18.2%	18	40.9%	44	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	15	34.1%	13	29.5%	16	36.4%	44	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	15	34.1%	10	22.7%	19	43.2%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	25	58.1%	12	27.9%	6	14.0%	43	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	35	79.5%	8	18.2%	1	2.3%	44	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	6	13.6%	28	63.6%	10	22.7%	44	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	15	34.1%	16	36.4%	13	29.5%	44	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	16	36.4%	24	54.5%	4	9.1%	44	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	32	72.7%	8	18.2%	4	9.1%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	22	50.0%	12	27.3%	10	22.7%	44	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	35	79.5%	4	9.1%	5	11.4%	44	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	19	43.2%	10	22.7%	15	34.1%	44	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	23	53.5%	12	27.9%	8	18.6%	43	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Rocky Flats	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	29	82.9%	3	8.6%	3	8.6%	35	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	9	20.5%	16	36.4%	19	43.2%	44	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	18	40.9%	16	36.4%	10	22.7%	44	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	7	16.3%	22	51.2%	14	32.6%	44	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	37	84.1%	7	15.9%	0	0%	44	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	30	68.2%	6	13.6%	8	18.2%	44	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	36	81.8%	6	13.6%	2	4.5%	44	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Rocky Flats	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	24	54.5%	8	18.2%	12	27.3%	44	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	33	75.0%	8	18.2%	3	6.8%	44	100%
Like each other	20	45.5%	19	43.2%	5	11.4%	44	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	12	27.3%	21	47.7%	11	25.0%	44	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	27	61.4%	12	27.3%	5	11.4%	44	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	36	81.8%	5	11.4%	3	6.8%	44	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	28	63.6%	12	27.3%	4	9.1%	44	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	30	68.2%	10	22.7%	4	9.1%	44	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	24	54.5%	12	27.3%	8	18.2%	44	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	23	52.3%	13	29.5%	8	18.2%	44	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	28	63.6%	9	20.5%	7	15.9%	44	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	31	70.5%	8	18.2%	5	11.4%	44	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	22	50.0%	14	31.8%	8	18.2%	44	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	14	31.8%	23	52.3%	7	15.9%	44	100%
Provide one another mutual help	28	63.6%	13	29.5%	3	6.8%	44	100%

**St. Louis Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. St. Louis
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. St. Louis
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. St. Louis
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. St. Louis
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. St. Louis
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. St. Louis
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. St. Louis
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. St. Louis
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. St. Louis
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. St. Louis
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. St. Louis
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. St. Louis
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. St. Louis
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. St. Louis
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. St. Louis
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	21	72.4%	5	17.2%	3	10.3%	29	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	22	78.6%	2	7.1%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	23	82.1%	3	10.7%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	23	82.1%	1	3.6%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board has effective leadership	17	60.7%	5	17.9%	6	21.4%	28	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	11	37.9%	10	34.5%	8	27.6%	29	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	16	55.2%	9	31.0%	4	13.8%	29	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	21	75.0%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	16	55.2%	5	17.2%	8	27.6%	29	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	20	69.0%	2	6.9%	7	24.1%	29	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	21	72.4%	5	17.2%	3	10.3%	29	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	22	75.9%	3	10.3%	4	13.8%	29	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	22	75.9%	5	17.2%	2	6.9%	29	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	20	71.4%	5	17.9%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	22	75.9%	2	6.9%	5	17.2%	29	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	24	85.7%	3	10.7%	1	3.6%	28	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	25	89.3%	1	3.6%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	17	60.7%	10	35.7%	1	3.6%	28	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	18	64.3%	7	25.0%	3	10.7%	28	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	22	75.9%	1	3.4%	6	20.7%	29	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	19	65.5%	4	13.8%	6	20.7%	29	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	21	72.4%	5	17.2%	3	10.3%	29	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	20	71.4%	3	10.7%	5	17.9%	28	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	12	42.9%	6	21.4%	10	35.7%	28	100%
The Board helps define site problems	22	78.6%	0	0%	6	21.4%	28	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	15	53.6%	7	25.0%	6	21.4%	28	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	11	40.7%	6	22.2%	10	37.0%	27	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	20	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	13	44.8%	7	24.1%	9	31.0%	29	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	17	60.7%	7	25.0%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	18	62.1%	4	13.8%	7	24.1%	29	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	16	55.2%	6	20.7%	7	24.1%	29	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	14	48.3%	11	37.9%	4	13.8%	29	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	15	51.7%	9	31.0%	5	17.2%	29	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	16	55.2%	11	37.9%	2	6.9%	29	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	15	53.6%	11	39.3%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	7	25.0%	16	57.1%	5	17.9%	28	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	17	58.6%	8	27.6%	4	13.8%	29	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	12	41.4%	15	51.7%	2	6.9%	29	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	18	62.1%	4	13.8%	7	24.1%	29	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	13	44.8%	11	37.9%	5	17.2%	29	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	17	58.6%	7	24.1%	5	17.2%	29	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	16	55.2%	9	31.0%	4	13.8%	29	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	20	69.0%	6	20.7%	3	10.3%	29	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

St. Louis	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	17	70.8%	3	12.5%	4	16.7%	24	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	8	28.6%	11	39.3%	9	32.1%	28	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	14	50.0%	10	35.7%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	8	27.6%	17	58.6%	4	13.8%	29	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	26	89.7%	2	6.9%	1	3.4%	29	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	20	69.0%	4	13.8%	5	17.2%	29	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	21	72.4%	4	13.8%	4	13.8%	29	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

St. Louis	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	11	40.7%	9	33.3%	7	25.9%	27	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	16	57.1%	7	25.0%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Like each other	13	46.4%	12	42.9%	3	10.7%	28	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	9	32.1%	11	39.3%	8	28.6%	28	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	14	50.0%	8	28.6%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	22	78.6%	1	3.6%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	17	60.7%	8	28.6%	3	10.7%	28	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	17	63.0%	7	25.9%	3	11.1%	27	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	20	71.4%	3	10.7%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	16	57.1%	7	25.0%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	12	42.9%	12	42.9%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	10	35.7%	15	53.6%	3	10.7%	28	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	12	42.9%	9	32.1%	7	25.0%	28	100%
Provide one another mutual help	16	57.1%	11	39.3%	1	3.6%	28	100%

**Sandia Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Sandia
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Sandia
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Sandia
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Sandia
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Figure 5a. Sandia
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Sandia
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Sandia
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

Figure 8a. Sandia
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9a. Sandia
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

**Figure 10a. Sandia
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Sandia
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Sandia
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Sandia
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Sandia
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Sandia
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	10	35.7%	6	21.4%	12	42.9%	28	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	21	77.8%	2	7.4%	4	14.8%	27	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	15	55.6%	7	25.9%	5	18.5%	27	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	9	33.3%	6	22.2%	12	44.4%	27	100%
The Board has effective leadership	14	51.9%	5	18.5%	8	29.6%	27	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	8	29.6%	4	14.8%	15	55.6%	27	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	15	55.6%	9	33.3%	3	11.1%	27	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	11	39.3%	14	50.0%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	12	42.9%	10	35.7%	6	21.4%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	10	35.7%	7	25.0	11	39.3%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	16	57.1%	4	14.3%	8	28.6%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	12	42.9%	7	25.0%	9	32.1%	28	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	12	42.9%	7	25.0%	9	32.1%	28	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	23	82.1%	3	10.7%	2	7.1%	28	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	28	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	13	50.0%	6	23.1%	7	26.9%	26	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	10	37.0%	9	33.3%	8	29.6%	27	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	5	20.0%	15	60.0%	5	20.0%	25	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	3	11.1%	13	48.1%	11	40.7%	27	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	20	71.4%	4	14.3%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	13	46.4%	8	28.6%	7	25.0%	28	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	15	53.6%	4	14.3%	9	32.1%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	7	25.9%	11	40.7%	9	33.3%	27	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	3	10.7%	13	46.4%	12	42.9%	28	100%
The Board helps define site problems	8	29.6%	7	25.9%	12	44.4%	27	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	5	18.5%	4	14.8%	18	66.7%	27	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	9	34.6%	6	23.1%	11	42.3%	26	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	8	30.8%	10	38.5%	8	30.8%	26	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	9	33.3%	15	55.6%	3	11.1%	27	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
site decisions and decision making process**

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	5	17.9%	8	28.6%	15	53.6%	28	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	6	22.2%	14	51.9%	7	25.9%	27	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	22	81.5%	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	27	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	14	50.0%	10	35.7%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	7	25.0	17	60.7%	4	14.3%	28	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	15	53.6%	12	42.9%	1	3.6%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	9	32.1%	13	46.4%	6	21.4%	28	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	5	20.0%	20	80.0%	0	0%	25	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	8	30.8%	15	57.7%	3	11.5%	26	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	11	39.3%	17	60.7%	0	0%	28	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	4	14.3%	24	85.7%	0	0%	28	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	9	32.1%	9	32.1%	10	35.7%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	10	37.0%	14	51.9%	3	11.1%	27	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	11	39.3%	14	50.0%	3	10.7%	28	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	21	75.0%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	28	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	25	89.3%	3	10.7%	0	0%	28	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Sandia	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	15	57.7%	5	19.2%	6	23.1%	26	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	11	39.3%	13	46.4%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	12	42.9%	12	42.9%	4	14.3%	28	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	3	10.7%	22	78.6%	3	10.7%	28	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	15	55.6%	6	22.2%	6	22.2%	27	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	16	57.1%	5	17.9%	7	25.0%	28	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	14	50.0%	8	28.6%	6	21.4%	28	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Sandia	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	6	21.4%	9	32.1%	13	46.4%	28	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	4	14.3%	10	35.7%	14	50.0%	28	100%
Like each other	7	25.0%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	2	7.1%	14	50.0%	12	42.9%	28	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	7	25.0%	15	53.6%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	16	57.1%	6	21.4%	6	21.4%	28	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	8	28.6%	16	57.1%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	6	21.4%	17	60.7%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	11	39.3%	12	42.9%	5	17.9%	28	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	11	39.3%	4	14.3%	13	46.4%	28	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	12	42.9%	12	42.9%	4	14.3%	28	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	8	28.6%	12	42.9%	8	28.6%	28	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	11	40.7%	10	37.0%	6	22.2%	27	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	4	14.8%	16	59.3%	7	25.9%	27	100%
Provide one another mutual help	8	28.6%	12	42.9%	8	28.6%	28	100%

**Savannah River Site Specific Advisory Board
Evaluation Survey Results**

Figure 1a. Savannah River
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 1b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum
for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2a. Savannah River
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 2b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information
and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Figure 3a. Savannah River
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 3b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate)

Figure 4a. Savannah River
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 4b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators') site decisions and decision making process

Figure 5a. Savannah River
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 5b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Figure 6a. Savannah River
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Figure 6b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

**Figure 7a. Savannah River
Public awareness**

**Figure 7b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Public awareness**

**Figure 8a. Savannah River
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative**

**Figure 8b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative**

**Figure 9a. Savannah River
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative**

**Figure 9b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative**

**Figure 10a. Savannah River
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 10b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Group/Team work skills**

**Figure 11a. Savannah River
Working relations**

**Figure 11b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Working relations**

**Figure 12a. Savannah River
Member affect**

**Figure 12b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Member affect**

Figure 13a. Savannah River
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 13b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Responses to open-ended questions

Figure 14a. Savannah River
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 14b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses for SSAB Initiative goals (Means)

Figure 15a. Savannah River
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Figure 15b. Long Survey: Entire Sample
Summary: Combined responses on DOE-HQ involvement,
Personal experience, Group/Team work skills,
Working relations, Member affect (Means)

Table 1.
Goal 1. Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board has established processes and procedures for the effective exchange of information	21	65.6%	4	12.5%	7	21.9%	32	100%
The Board has agreed-upon procedures to operate the board	29	90.6%	3	9.4%	0	0%	32	100%
The Board has adequate support to allow it to focus on substantive issues (R) *	23	71.9%	3	9.4%	6	18.8%	32	100%
The Board provides sufficient time for discussion of issues	18	56.3%	4	12.5%	10	31.3%	32	100%
The Board has effective leadership	22	68.8%	4	12.5%	6	18.8%	32	100%
DOE requests Board advice far enough ahead of decision deadlines (R) *	9	29.0%	9	29.0%	13	41.9%	31	100%
DOE handles Board administrative issues expeditiously (R) *	19	61.3%	4	12.9%	8	25.8%	31	100%
The SSAB staff provide satisfactory support	22	71.0%	3	9.7%	6	19.4%	31	100%
The facilitator for the Board has helped the Board function effectively	13	41.9%	8	25.8%	10	32.3%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 2.
Goal 2. Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints
regarding DOE site issues

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB facilitates effective exchange of viewpoints on site issues	20	62.5%	5	15.6%	7	21.9%	32	100%
The SSAB contributes to Board members' understanding of the basis for key site decisions	25	78.1%	4	12.5%	3	9.4%	32	100%
The SSAB contributes to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints on key site decisions	24	75.0%	5	15.6%	3	9.4%	32	100%
The SSAB contributes to a constructive working relationship among the participants	24	75.0%	3	9.4%	5	15.6%	32	100%
The SSAB strives for consensus	16	50.0%	11	34.4%	5	15.6%	32	100%
The SSAB gives fair consideration to dissenting opinions	21	65.6%	8	25.0%	3	9.4%	32	100%
The Board has made the effort needed to learn about site issues	27	84.4%	3	9.4%	2	6.3%	32	100%
The Board invites expert advice into its discussion on key policy issues	29	90.6%	1	3.1%	2	6.3%	32	100%
The Board responds to public inquiries and comments about its decisions	21	65.6%	7	21.9%	4	12.5%	32	100%
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its work	15	46.9%	8	25.0%	9	28.1%	32	100%
DOE makes information on key site issues readily available to the Board	27	87.1%	4	12.9%	0	0%	31	100%
The regulators make important contributions to the Board's work	19	61.3%	8	25.8%	4	12.9%	31	100%
The SSAB creates a climate supportive of differing viewpoints (R) *	21	67.7%	4	12.9%	6	19.4%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 3.
Goal 3. Provide useful advice and/or recommendations to DOE
(and regulators, where appropriate).

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The Board provides useful advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate) (R) *	25	78.1%	5	15.6%	2	6.3%	32	100%
The SSAB reaches agreement about prioritization of key site issues for which advice is sought (R) *	20	62.5%	9	28.1%	3	9.4%	32	100%
The Board helps define site problems	23	71.9%	3	9.4%	6	18.8%	32	100%
The Board addresses issues in a timely manner (R) *	22	68.8%	6	18.8%	4	12.5%	32	100%
The Board reaches consensus on key site issues (R) *	16	50.0%	12	37.5%	4	12.5%	32	100%
The Board provides informed advice to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate)	25	78.1%	3	9.4%	4	12.5%	32	100%
The Board provides advice that reflects the viewpoints and priorities of the community	21	65.6%	5	15.6%	6	18.8%	32	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 4.
**Goal 4. Improve DOE's (and where applicable, regulators')
 site decisions and decision making process**

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB has improved DOE's site decisions (R) *	20	62.5%	7	21.9%	5	15.6%	32	100%
The Board understands the decision making process at [a particular] site	16	50.0%	10	31.3%	6	18.8%	32	100%
DOE discusses important policies affecting site decisions with the Board	24	77.4%	5	16.1%	2	6.5%	31	100%
DOE has explained to the Board its site decision making process	21	67.7%	6	19.4%	4	12.9%	31	100%
The DOE shows how Board advice is reflected in site decisions	17	54.8%	11	35.5%	3	9.7%	31	100%
The decision making process used by DOE at [a particular] site is effective in furthering site clean-up (R) *	22	71.0%	6	19.4%	3	9.7%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 5.
Goal 5. Lead to more acceptable actions

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB leads to more acceptable site decisions	20	62.5%	7	21.9%	5	15.6%	32	100%
The Board supports the recommendations it gives DOE	28	87.5%	2	6.3%	2	6.3%	32	100%
The Board supports DOE's site actions	16	51.6%	15	48.4%	0	0%	31	100%
The DOE pays attention to the Board's advice on key site issues (R) *	23	74.2%	8	25.8%	0	0%	31	100%
There is support in the community for DOE's site decisions that have SSAB input	15	48.4%	15	48.4%	1	3.2%	31	100%
Progress is being made on key site issues	25	78.1%	6	18.8%	1	3.1%	32	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 6.
Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The SSAB contributes to trust and confidence in DOE	16	50.0%	13	40.6%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Relationships between DOE and the public have improved since the formation of the SSAB	20	64.5%	8	25.8%	3	9.7%	31	100%
DOE is committed to clean up [a particular] site	20	66.7%	4	13.3%	6	20.0%	30	100%

Table 7.
Public awareness

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The public knows little about the role of the Board	21	67.7%	4	12.9%	6	19.4%	31	100%

Table 8.
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds

Savannah River	Yes, Good		Neutral, Conditional, No Opinion		No, Not Good		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SSAB Initiative is a good use of funds	21	87.5%	1	4.2%	2	8.3%	24	100%

Table 9.
DOE-HQ involvement with the SSAB Initiative

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DOE-HQ provides helpful guidance to the Boards and to DOE	13	40.6%	9	28.1%	10	31.3%	32	100%
DOE-HQ provides sufficient support to facilitate the work of the SSAB	14	43.8%	10	31.3%	8	25.0%	32	100%
DOE-HQ gives careful consideration to SSAB advice in its decisions	9	28.1%	20	62.5%	3	9.4%	32	100%

Table 10.
Personal experience with the SSAB Initiative

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I consider myself to be very knowledgeable about site issues	25	80.6%	5	16.1%	1	3.2%	31	100%
Because of the SSAB, I better understand the complexities of site clean-up	21	67.7%	8	25.8%	2	6.5%	31	100%
I feel that my participation in the SSAB has been worthwhile (R) *	23	74.2%	6	19.4%	2	6.5%	31	100%

* (R) denotes a question that was asked in the negative form. For ease of review, these questions and data have been reversed in this table and are stated in positive forms.

Table 11.
Group/Team work skills

Savannah River	Agree		Neither/ Don't Know		Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All have group/team work skills	15	46.9%	7	21.9%	10	31.3%	32	100%
Have developed well-established working relationships with each other	19	59.4%	8	25.0%	5	15.6%	32	100%
Like each other	10	31.3%	19	59.4%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Have a high degree of trust and confidence in each other	6	18.8%	19	59.4%	7	21.9%	32	100%
Accept the values that are important to the group	20	62.5%	9	28.1%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Show respect for the viewpoints of others	18	56.3%	5	15.6%	9	28.1%	32	100%
Accept willingly the goals and expectations for the Board	16	50.0%	13	40.6%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Set high expectations for what they believe they can accomplish	22	68.8%	8	25.0%	2	6.3%	32	100%
Communicate fully and frankly to the Board all relevant and valuable information	24	75.0%	6	18.8%	2	6.3%	32	100%
Try not to waste the Board's time with irrelevant material or communications	22	68.8%	5	15.6%	5	15.6%	32	100%
Are willing to be influenced by other Board members about new ideas and methods	24	75.0%	7	21.9%	1	3.1%	32	100%
Clearly understand the goals and philosophy of the Board's operation	20	62.5%	9	28.1%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Do all they can to help the Board achieve its objectives	20	62.5%	9	28.1%	3	9.4%	32	100%
Get the technical knowledge and training in group skills they need	14	43.8%	11	34.4%	7	21.9%	32	100%
Provide one another mutual help	20	62.5%	8	25.0%	4	12.5%	32	100%