Total Responses

Date opened: June 21, 2017
Date closed: July 20, 2017
Typical time to complete survey: 4 minutes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals on IRP contact list</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals on IRP Elist</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who testified at IRP meetings</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone who responded to invitation on IRP’s Internet home page</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How survey respondents identified themselves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTSC employee</td>
<td>44.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSC executive team</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former DTSC employee</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner, operator, or employee of regulated facility</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of regulated facility</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible party of contaminated site</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of responsible party of contaminated site</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical or product manufacturer</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of chemical or product manufacturer</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of community impacted by regulated facility</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of community impacted by contaminated site</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of community impacted by regulated facility</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of community impacted by contaminated site</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of environmental or environmental justice organization</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected public official</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-elected, non-DTSC public official</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 74
Individuals who self-identified themselves were placed in three subgroups for analysis and comparisons.

- **DTSC Employees** (37)
  - DTSC employee
  - DTSC executive team
  - Former DTSC employee

- **Regulated Industry** (14)
  - Owner, operator, or employee of regulated facility
  - Representative of regulated facility
  - Responsible party of contaminated site
  - Representative of responsible party of contaminated site
  - Chemical or product manufacturer
  - Representative of chemical or product manufacturer

- **Communities** (16)
  - Member of community impacted by regulated facility
  - Member of community impacted by contaminated site
  - Representative of community impacted by contaminated site
  - Representative of community impacted by regulated facility
  - Representative of environmental or EJ organization
Q1: How many IRP meetings did you attend or view on the Internet?

Answered: 90    Skipped: 0
Q2: How satisfied were you with the geographical location of the IRP meetings?

Answered: 77    Skipped: 13
Q3: How would you rate the scope and usefulness of the information presented at IRP meetings?

Answered: 76    Skipped: 14

- Excellent
- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know / no opinion
Q4: The meeting rules and process were clear.

Answered: 71   Skipped: 19
Q5: The IRP meetings were efficiently run.

Answered: 71    Skipped: 19
Q6: The IRP followed the agenda and stayed on topic at meetings.

Answered: 69    Skipped: 21
Q7: The IRP demonstrated appropriate respect to the public and maintained a civil, non-threatening atmosphere at meetings.

Answered: 70    Skipped: 20
Q7: The IRP demonstrated appropriate respect to the public and maintained a civil, non-threatening atmosphere at meetings.
Q8: The IRP seemed to listen to what people had to say at meetings and keep an open mind.

Answered: 71    Skipped: 19
Q8: The IRP seemed to listen to what people had to say at meetings and keep an open mind.
Q9: The IRP properly received public comments and provided adequate time for them at meetings.

Answered: 70  Skipped: 20
Q9: The IRP properly received public comments and provided adequate time for them at meetings.
Q10: Overall, how would you rate the quality of IRP meetings?

Answered: 70  Skipped: 20
Q10: Overall, how would you rate the quality of IRP meetings?

Responses by Subgroup

- **Excellent**
- **Very good**
- **Good**
- **Fair**
- **Poor**
- **Don't know / no opinion**

- **DTSC Employees**
- **Regulated Industry**
- **Communities**
Q11: Have you subscribed to the IRP’s elist?

Answered: 79   Skipped: 11
Q12: Overall, how satisfied are you with the IRP’s eblast information?

Answered: 43  Skipped: 47
Q13: Have you read the minutes of any IRP meetings?

Answered: 78   Skipped: 12
Q14: How satisfied are you with the way the minutes of IRP meetings adequately and clearly summarize meeting proceedings?

Answered: 55   Skipped: 35
Q15: How often do you visit the IRP’s website?

Answered: 78    Skipped: 12

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Never
Q16: Overall, how well does the IRP website meet your needs?

Answered: 61    Skipped: 29

- Extremely well
- Very well
- Somewhat well
- Not so well
- Not at all well
- Don't know / no opinion
Q17: Have you ever asked an IRP support staff member a question face to face, over the phone, or in writing?

Answered: 78    Skipped: 12
Q18: How satisfied were you with how IRP support staff responded to your question/questions?

Answered: 32    Skipped: 58
Q19: How many IRP reports to the Governor and Legislature have you read?

Answered: 78    Skipped: 12

- All of them
- More than five
- Between two and five
- One
- None
Q20: The IRP reports are clear and understandable.

Answered: 57  Skipped: 33
Q21: The IRP reports are accurate and factual.

Answered: 58    Skipped: 32
Q22: The IRP reports are well organized, well structured, and flow well.

Answered: 58    Skipped: 32
Q23: The IRP report recommendations seem appropriate and reasonable.

Answered: 58    Skipped: 32
Q23: The IRP report recommendations seem appropriate and reasonable.

Responses by Subgroup

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral / neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know / no opinion

Bar chart showing responses for DTSC Employees, Regulated Industry, and Communities.
Q24: Please rate the IRP recommendations to date:

Answered: 55    Skipped: 35

- Much too timid / weak
- Somewhat too timid / weak
- About right
- Somewhat too drastic /...
- Much too drastic /...
- Don't know / no opinion
Q24: Please rate the IRP recommendations to date:

Responses by Subgroup

- Much too timid / weak
- Somewhat too timid / weak
- About right
- Somewhat too drastic / extreme
- Much too drastic / extreme
- Don't know / no opinion

DTSC Employees | Regulated Industry | Communities
Q25: Overall, how satisfied are you with the IRP reports and recommendations?

Answered: 54    Skipped: 36
Q25: Overall, how satisfied are you with the IRP reports and recommendations?

Responses by Subgroup

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know / no opinion

[Bar chart showing responses for DTSC Employees, Regulated Industry, and Communities]
Q26 Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns?

**Positive comments:**

- Thank you. Hope the process leads to a better DTSC.
- Extend IRP for another year.
- Survey questions are well developed.
- IRP had some effect on improving DTSC culture.
- The IRP process appeared open and fair [with one exception].
Q26 Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns?

**Criticisms of the process:**

- IRP is too chummy with DTSC.
- IRP gives too much time to the same people.
- Information isn’t presented to IRP accurately.
- DTSC gives IRP fake news.
- IRP mistreated survey respondent and was disrespectful to respondent.
- IRP didn’t address [survey respondent’s] concern/suggestion.
- No point [in the process].
- DTSC employees will not come forward without anonymous communication channel.
- IRP dealt with too narrow a group of DTSC issues and not deeply enough.
- IRP should have visited DTSC regional offices.
- DTSC staff information had sanitized appearance because it was first reviewed by Director.
- Program information presented by DTSC management had “spin.”
- Regulated community could not express concerns due to fear of retribution.
Q26 Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns?

**Process suggestions:**

- IRP should have fact sheets for communities.

- IRP should give presentation at DTSC all-staff meeting.
Q26 Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns?

**Criticisms of IRP recommendations and/or suggestions for Panel consideration:**

- DTSC is now issuing permits when it shouldn’t to please IRP.
- IRP should recommend more DTSC fact sheets for communities.
- IRP neglected political interference in the SSFL cleanup.
- More investigation of DTSC expenditures is needed.
- DTSC needs rebranding and restructuring.
- Pay inequity continues to destroy employee morale.
- Political appointees [in DTSC management] have done more harm than good.
Q26 Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns?

**Questions and/or concerns about the future:**

- IRP hasn’t fixed dysfunctional agency.

- What metrics is IRP using to evaluate IRP and DTSC performance?

- How does IRP hold DTSC accountable for recommendations made?

- IRP failed to address DTSC dysfunctionality.

- DTSC’s old guard management hopes IRP sunsets at year’s end and the department goes back to business as usual.
Conclusions?