Cass Martinez

Dear To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for accepting my comments on the Holistic Settlement Agreement. After four years of closed-door negotiations, I expected a robust public involvement plan that was created with input from groups and entities working on Hanford, materials that are transparent and easy to understand, enough time to review documents, and an opportunity to comment and table at public meetings in major cities. I am incredibly disappointed. You need to do better.

For all major comment periods in the future:

- GET INPUT EARLY AND OFTEN: Consult with groups, organizations, and Tribal Nations on your public involvement plans for materials, public meeting design/timing/location, and presentations. Use that input to improve the plan.
- DESIGN FOR MEANINGFUL INVOLVEMENT: Design regional public meetings with an open house where all interested parties can table, provide information and chat with attendees, incorporate time for a local perspective to provide an alternate viewpoint, and schedule meetings in the fall and spring for maximum participation.
- USE PLAIN LANGUAGE, PLEASE: Use plain language in your presentations and materials to provide a high-level overview of the cleanup work the administrative tool (in this case, the Consent Decree & Tri-Party Agreement) covers, instead of overly focusing on the intricacies of the administrative tool itself.
- BE TRANSPARENT: If there is important information buried in your materials and presentations, bring it forward and make it transparent. For example, plainly state how much liquid tank waste you are planning to grout and plainly state that instead of delaying cleanup now, cleanup milestones will be delayed in the future. Plainly state when those delay decisions are anticipated as well as what the public process will look like that accompanies those decisions.
- STOP PUSHING YOUR CRITICS AWAY: Instead of running from critical feedback and responding with defensive/avoidant behavior, invite your critics to the table and make time to learn from their feedback.

The holistic settlement agreement isn't whole, or settled, or a full agreement. It is partial as to Hanford's problems, it leaves important details up in the air, and it lacks the agreement of all parties (civilians of several states, and Indian nations).

Sincerely, Cass Martinez