Outrage factors influence risk acceptability.
Outrage factors

- Is it fair?
- Who benefits?
- Is it voluntary?
- Is there any local/personal control over the risk?
- Is it a familiar risk?
- Do I understand the risk?
Outrage factors

• The public responds more to outrage than hazard.
• Outraged people don’t pay much attention to hazard data.
Outrage factors

- Activists and the media amplify outrage, but don't create it.
- Outrage isn't just a distraction from hazard. Both are legitimate and important.
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)  Yes (lower risk)

Fair?
Do I benefit?
Voluntary?
Familiar?
Well understood?
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes (lower risk)</th>
<th>No (higher risk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I benefit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well understood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)   Yes (lower risk)

Fair?   X
Do I benefit?   X
Voluntary?
Familiar?
Well understood?
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (lower risk)</th>
<th>No (higher risk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I benefit?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well understood?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (lower risk)</th>
<th>No (higher risk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I benefit?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well understood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)  Yes (lower risk)

Fair?  X
Do I benefit?  X
Voluntary?  X
Familiar?  X
Well understood?  X
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk) Yes (lower risk)

Fair? X
Do I benefit? X
Voluntary? X
Familiar? X
Well understood? X
Detectable? X
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)  Yes (lower risk)

Fair?
Do I benefit?
Voluntary?
Familiar?
Well understood?
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)    Yes (lower risk)

Fair?               
Do I benefit?       
Voluntary?          
Familiar?           
Well understood?    
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)  Yes (lower risk)

Fair?  
Do I benefit?  
Voluntary?  
Familiar?  
Well understood?  
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)    Yes (lower risk)

Fair? 
Do I benefit? 
Voluntary? 
Familiar? 
Well understood? 
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)    Yes (lower risk)

Fair?    ✭
Do I benefit?    ✭✭
Voluntary?    ✭✭✭
Familiar?    ✭✭✭
Well understood?    ✭✭
Detectable?
How outrage factors help determine whether a risk is judged high or low

No (higher risk)  Yes (lower risk)

Fair?

Do I benefit?

Voluntary?

Familiar?

Well understood?

Detectable?
# Perception of risks from:

- **Transport of radioactive materials**
- **Driving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Transport of radioactive materials</th>
<th>Driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Fair?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I benefit?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Do I benefit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Voluntary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Familiar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well understood?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Well understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable?</td>
<td>Higher risk: X</td>
<td>Higher risk: Detectable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outrage factors

• Whatever you can do to make the risk more fair, provide benefits, make it more voluntary, provide local control, make it familiar -- the more the risk will be accepted.
Outrage factors

• Focus on what you are doing to make the risk even smaller - don’t focus on how small you believe the risk to be.
Credible sources

Good:

• Fire chiefs
• Other first responders
• Health professional
• University professors
Credible sources

Moderate:

- News media
- Environmental groups
- Local & state officials
Credible sources

Least:

• Industry (but most knowledgeable)
• Federal government
Key Public Input

• Support for cleanup is broad - even though it will result in some transport.

• DOE & Oregon taking reasonable precautions.

• Still some skepticism.

• ER capabilities lacking.
Transport Recommendations

• Developed with citizen input.
• Took to other Western states.
• Began discussions with DOE.
• Most became part of WGA transport safety program.
Responsive to Risk Concerns

- Community involved and involved early.
- We recognized a better product because of their involvement.
- Clear about public’s level of influence.
Citizen group arguments

Waste transport has dire consequences.
PROTECT WASHINGTON: STOP NUCLEAR WASTE DUMPING

- STOP the U.S. Dept. of Energy from making Hanford the nation's radioactive waste dump!
- STOP 70,000 truckloads of deadly radioactive waste from driving on Washington's roads!
- STOP dumping radioactive waste in unlined soil ditches that leak into the Columbia River!

BALLOT TITLE

"Initiative Measure No. 297 concerns 'mixed' radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous waste. This measure would add new provisions concerning 'mixed' radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous waste, requiring cleanup of contamination before additional waste is added, prioritizing cleanup, providing for public participation and enforcement through citizen lawsuits. Should this measure be enacted into law?"

This measure would establish additional requirements for regulating "mixed waste" (radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous substances) sites, such as the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. The measure would set standards for cleanup and granting permits, would prohibit waste disposal in unlined soil trenches, and require cleanup of tank leaks. Permits would not allow adding more wastes to facilities until existing contamination was cleaned up. Additional public participation would be provided and enforcement through citizen lawsuits would be authorized.

INITIATIVE PETITION FOR SUBMISSION TO THE LEGISLATURE

I, the undersigned citizens and legal voters of the State of Washington, respectfully direct that this petition and the proposed measure known as Initiative Measure No. 297 and entitled, "Initiative Measure No. 297 concerns 'mixed' radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous waste. This measure would add new provisions concerning 'mixed' radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous waste, requiring cleanup of contamination before additional waste is added, prioritizing cleanup, providing for public participation and enforcement through citizen lawsuits. Should this measure be enacted into law?", a full, true, and correct copy which is printed on the reverse side of this petition, be transmitted to the legislature of the State of Washington at its next issuing regular session, and we respectfully petition the legislature to enact said proposed measure into law; and each of us for myself or herself says: I have personally signed this petition; I am a legal voter of the State of Washington in the city (or town) and county written after my name, my residence address is correctly stated, and I have knowingly signed this petition only once.

signature (as registered) print name address city / zip county (required) phone / email
“Urgent action is needed to protect our families from the risks of more than 70,000 truckloads of radioactive waste on our roads, 70,000 potentially deadly accidents, and 70,000 rolling ‘dirty bombs’ as terrorist targets.”

I-297 News Release, January 2, 2004
“These shipments are a terrorist target – like sending dirty bombs on Interstate 5 and 90 through our communities. Even a minor accident would cripple our region’s economy and put our families at risk. …”

I-297 News Release, June 23, 2004