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Siting of LULUs in the US: Approaches

1. Intelligent muddling (incremental, small-scale, let it accumulate)
2. Path of least resistance (EJ issues)
3. Conflict resolution (mediation, arbitration, negotiation)
4. Economic incentives (compensation, incentives, insurance)
5. Congress & courts (legislative route)
6. Special siting board with power: fiat, eminent domain,
7. Interagency cooperation, dispersion of impacts
Enduringly Objectionable LULUs

1. US population as a whole
   1a. Nuclear waste sites, chemical waste sites, landfills, & nuclear power plants
   1b. Other energy facilities: coal, gas, oil, refineries
   1c. Factories, prisons, large commercial buildings

2. DOE major sites
   Much more tolerant of new missions, energy parks

3. Feelings and images
   US 1.8 to 1 negative vs. positive images
   DOE sites 1.6 positive vs. negative images
   (DOE feelings and emotions are good, jobs, necessary, happy workers, scientists in lab coats, pride, blue, green vs. mushroom cloud, bad, worried, frightened, ugly, red, yellow)
Successes in a Democracy

1. Successes are rare
2. Higher probability of success with a CLAMP selection
3. Population knows that there are benefits & wants them
4. Media are not prone to jump to a negative judgment
5. Key decision-makers are involved early and help design the participation process
6. Likely to involve interagency cooperation, dispersion of negative impacts, provision of economic incentives, intelligent muddling, conflict resolution
7. Communication programs designed around the needs of multiple populations (mass media, web, set up local office, go out for talks, and other approaches that fit needs of locals)
8. Patience and persistence