

FY 2011 ECR Policy Report to OMB-CEQ

On November 28, 2005, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued a policy memorandum on environmental conflict resolution (ECR).

The memorandum requires annual reporting by departments and agencies to OMB and CEQ on progress made each year. This joint policy statement directs agencies to increase the effective use and their institutional capacity for ECR and collaborative problem solving.

ECR is defined in Section 2 of the memorandum as:

“third-party assisted conflict resolution and collaborative problem solving in the context of environmental, public lands, or natural resources issues or conflicts, including matters related to energy, transportation, and land use. The term “ECR” encompasses a range of assisted negotiation processes and applications. These processes directly engage affected interests and agency decision makers in conflict resolution and collaborative problem solving. Multi-issue, multi-party environmental disputes or controversies often take place in high conflict and low trust settings, where the assistance of impartial facilitators or mediators can be instrumental to reaching agreement and resolution. Such disputes range broadly from administrative adjudicatory disputes, to civil judicial disputes, policy/rule disputes, intra- and interagency disputes, as well as disputes with non-federal persons/entities. ECR processes can be applied during a policy development or planning process, or in the context of rulemaking, administrative decision making, enforcement, or litigation and can include conflicts between federal, state, local, tribal, public interest organizations, citizens groups and business and industry where a federal agency has ultimate responsibility for decision-making.

While ECR refers specifically to collaborative processes aided by third-party neutrals, there is a broad array of partnerships, cooperative arrangements, and unassisted negotiations that federal agencies enter into with non-federal entities to manage and implement agency programs and activities. The Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving presented in Attachment A (of the OMB/CEQ ECR Policy Memo) and this policy apply generally to ECR and collaborative problem solving. This policy recognizes the importance and value of the appropriate use of all types of ADR and collaborative problem solving.”

The report format below is provided for the sixth year of reporting in accordance with this memo for activities in FY 2011.

The report deadline is February 15, 2012.

We understand that collecting this information may be challenging; however, after compiling previous reports, the departments and agencies are requested to collect this data to the best of their abilities. The 2011 report, along with previous reports, will establish a useful baseline for your department or agency, and collect some information that can be aggregated across agencies. Departments should submit a single report that includes ECR information from the agencies and other entities within the department. The information in your report will become part of an analysis of all FY 2011 ECR reports. You may be contacted for the purpose of clarifying information in your report. For your reference, copies of prior year synthesis reports are available at www.ecr.gov.

Name of Department/Agency responding:	<u>U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission</u>
Name and Title/Position of person responding:	<u>Joan W. Olmstead, Attorney</u>
Division/Office of person responding:	<u>Office of General Counsel</u>
Contact information (phone/email):	<u>(301) 415-2859</u>
Date this report is being submitted:	<u>2/15/2012</u>

Section 1: Capacity and Progress

1. Describe steps taken by your department/agency to build programmatic/institutional capacity for ECR in 2011, including progress made since 2010. If no steps were taken, please indicate why not.

[Please refer to the mechanisms and strategies presented in Section 5 of the OMB-CEQ ECR Policy Memo, including but not restricted to any efforts to a) integrate ECR objectives into agency mission statements, Government Performance and Results Act goals, and strategic planning; b) assure that your agency's infrastructure supports ECR; c) invest in support or programs; and d) focus on accountable performance and achievement. You are encouraged to attach policy statements, plans and other relevant documents.]

While the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) currently does not use neutral facilitators or Alternative Dispute Resolution processes to resolve environmental conflicts, the Commission uses NRC employees to facilitate at NRC public meetings. The NRC decided to use NRC employees to act as facilitators because of the technical nature of NRC's regulatory program. The NRC facilitators staff public meetings and workshops involving NRC licensing, policy development and rulemaking activities.

The NRC currently has 24 staff members that assist staff in NRC public outreach programs, including the convening and facilitation of environmental conflict resolution processes and public meetings. The program uses outside contractors to teach general public meeting and facilitation skills. The objective of this program is to make NRC meetings more effective by developing a skilled cadre of facilitators throughout the NRC.

In FY '07 NRC established a training course on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for environmental project managers and attorneys. The training course is offered several times a year at the NRC training center and includes classes on various subject areas. This fiscal year the course included a class on tribal consultation which included discussion of outreach, consultation and coordination with tribal governments. The course offered other classes on environmental conflict resolution, public meeting facilitation and public involvement for environmental justice. Trainers are from the Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke University and the NRC. The course syllabus was developed by the Nicholas trainers and NRC staff.

Section 2: Challenges

2. Indicate the extent to which each of the items below present challenges or barriers that your department/agency has encountered in advancing the appropriate and effective use of ECR.

	Extent of challenge/barrier		
	Major	Minor	Not a challenge/barrier
	Check <u>only</u> one		
a) Lack of staff expertise to participate in ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Lack of staff availability to engage in ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Lack of party capacity to engage in ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Limited or no funds for facilitators and mediators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Lack of travel costs for your own or other federal agency staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Lack of travel costs for non-federal parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Reluctance of federal decision makers to support or participate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Reluctance of other federal agencies to participate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Reluctance of other non-federal parties to participate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Contracting barriers/inefficiencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
k) Lack of resources for staff capacity building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
l) Lack of personnel incentives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
m) Lack of budget incentives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
n) Lack of access to qualified mediators and facilitators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
o) Perception of time and resource intensive nature of ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
p) Uncertainty about whether to engage in ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
q) Uncertainty about the net benefits of ECR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
r) Other(s) (please specify): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
s) No barriers (please explain): _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 3: ECR Use

3. Describe the level of ECR use within your department/agency in FY 2011 by completing the table below. [Please refer to the definition of ECR from the OMB-CEQ memo as presented on page one of this template. An ECR “case or project” is an instance of neutral third party involvement to assist parties in reaching agreement or resolving a dispute for a particular matter. In order not to double count processes, please select one category per case for decision making forums and for ECR applications.]

	Cases or projects in progress ¹	Completed Cases or projects ²	Total FY 2011 ECR Cases ³	Decision making forum that was addressing the issues when ECR was initiated:					Of the total FY 2011 ECR cases indicate how many your agency/department	
				Federal agency decision	Administrative proceedings /appeals	Judicial proceedings	Other (specify)		Sponsored ⁴	Participated in but did not sponsor ⁵
<i>Context for ECR Applications:</i>										
Policy development	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Planning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Siting and construction	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Rulemaking	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
License and permit issuance	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Compliance and enforcement action	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Implementation/monitoring agreements	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
Other (specify): _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____		_____	_____
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	(the sum should equal Total FY 2011 ECR Cases)			(the sum of the Decision Making Forums should equal Total FY 2011 ECR Cases)					(the sum should equal Total FY 2011 ECR Cases)	

¹ A “case in progress” is an ECR case in which neutral third party involvement began prior to or during FY 2011 and did not end during FY 2011.

² A “completed case” means that neutral third party involvement in a particular matter ended during FY 2011. The end of neutral third party involvement does not necessarily mean that the parties have concluded their collaboration/negotiation/dispute resolution process, that all issues are resolved, or that agreement has been reached.

³ “Cases in progress” and “completed cases” add up to “Total FY2011 ECR Cases”.

⁴ Sponsored - to be a sponsor of an ECR case means that an agency is contributing financial or in-kind resources (e.g., a staff mediator's time) to provide the neutral third party's services for that case. More than one sponsor is possible for a given ECR case.

⁵ Participated, but did not sponsor - an agency did not provide resources for the neutral third party's services for a given ECR case, but was either a party to the case or participated in some other significant way (e.g., as a technical expert advising the parties).

4. Is your department/agency using ECR in any of the substantive priority areas you listed in your prior year ECR Reports? Indicate if use has increased in these areas since they were first identified in your ECR report. Please also list any additional priority areas identified by your department/agency during FY 2011, and indicate if ECR is being used in any of these areas. Note: An overview of substantive program areas identified by departments/agencies in FY 2010 can be found in the FY 2010 synthesis report.

List of priority areas identified in your department/agency prior year ECR Reports	Check if using ECR	Check if use has increased in these areas
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
List of additional priority areas identified by your department/agency in FY 2011	Check if using ECR	
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Please use an additional sheet if needed.

5. It is important to develop ways to demonstrate that ECR is effective and in order for ECR to propagate through the government, we need to be able to point to concrete benefits; consequently, we ask what other methods and measures are you developing in your department/agency to track the use and outcomes (performance and cost savings) of ECR as directed in Section 4 (b) of the ECR memo, which states: *Given possible savings in improved outcomes and reduced costs of administrative appeals and litigation, agency leadership should recognize and support needed upfront investments in collaborative processes and conflict resolution and demonstrate those savings and in performance and accountability measures to maintain a budget neutral environment* and Section 4 (g) which states: *Federal agencies should report at least every year to the Director of OMB and the Chairman of CEQ on their progress in the use of ECR and other collaborative problem solving approaches and on their progress in tracking cost savings and performance outcomes. Agencies are encouraged to work toward systematic collection of relevant information that can be useful in on-going information exchange across departments?* [You are encouraged to attach examples or additional data]

NRC does not have a formal tracking method for the use and outcomes of ECR.

6. Describe other significant efforts your agency has taken in FY 2011 to anticipate, prevent, better manage, or resolve environmental issues and conflicts that do not fit within the Policy Memo's definition of ECR as presented on the first page of this template.

As noted in the NRC 2010 report, the NRC staff continues to use an expanded public outreach program in the areas of new reactor licensing and renewal of existing reactor licenses to accomplish many of the objectives of ECR. This year NRC has also used expanded public outreach for the issue of extended storage of spent fuel and the Waste Confidence decision and rule update.

The NRC's experience is that disputes over the licensing of energy facilities, such as commercial nuclear reactors, emerge because of the lack of clear information on the NRC licensing process and the technical issues of concern, distrust of the agency motivations, the belief that the public is being excluded from the licensing process, and differing values and interests of key stakeholders. The NRC's expanded public outreach program attempts to deal with these "conflict engagement" issues through early and continuing interaction with the stakeholders concerned about a particular facility. These stakeholders include local, state, and tribal governments; advocacy groups, both national and grassroots; community organizations, such as Chambers of Commerce; the licensee or license applicant; nuclear industry organizations; and other federal agencies. We use a variety of public outreach techniques, guided by a third party facilitator or NRC staff member, including small group meetings with individual stakeholder interests.

Specific examples of this public outreach program includes the use of facilitators for public meetings to gather information for NEPA documents regarding the proposed Nuclear Fuel Services license renewal application, the combined operating license application review for Enrico Fermi Unit 3, and assorted nuclear power plant license renewals. The NRC also held one public meeting during FY 2011 as part of an expanded public outreach program to provide information to the public to discuss extended storage of spent nuclear fuel and development of the Waste Confidence rule. NRC also conducted public meetings on implementation issues associated with the proposed revision to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal and rulemaking efforts.

The NRC has also used a NRC employee facilitator to support a meeting with tribal government representatives pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation process for an in situ uranium recovery (ISR) facility license application.

While the NRC does not routinely use cooperating agency agreements, the NRC currently has approximately two environmental impact statements in process that involve cooperating agencies. These cooperating agency agreements were developed under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Army Corp. of Engineers that allows each Army Corps of Engineer District Office to determine if it wishes to enter into a cooperating agency

relationship with the NRC for a specific environmental review. Approximately three other NEPA environmental reviews involve tribes or other federal agencies as cooperating agencies. .

The NRC has completed three Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) with various agencies to address National Historic Preservation Act issues related to facility license applications in FY 2011. The development of the MOAs have included participation of the NRC, the licensee or license applicant, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and representatives of tribal governments in unassisted negotiations.

NRC hosts the Annual Regulatory Information Conference (RIC) which offers an invaluable forum for the NRC and stakeholders to share information and exchange views about important issues before the agency. The topics covered at the RIC vary every year and can include environmental issues. Last year, for example, technical sessions included presentations on groundwater protection and an international panel discussion on radionuclide source releases and migration in the subsurface at nuclear facilities.

Section 4: Demonstration of ECR Use and Value

- 7 Briefly describe your *departments'/agency's most notable achievements* or advances in using ECR in this past year.

Continued use of NRC staff facilitators in public meetings.

Continued training of NRC project managers and attorneys in ECR techniques as identified in Section 1.

Continued use of the expanded public outreach program for developing NEPA environmental reviews for NRC license applications for new and existing facilities and rulemaking involving environmental issues.

Continued use of cooperating agency relationships with Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Land Management to assist in the preparation of NEPA environmental review documents for various licensing applications. Also the development of informal consulting relationships with state, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies during the development and review of NEPA documents.

8. ECR Case Example

- a. Using the template below, provide a description of an ECR case (preferably completed in FY 2011). Please limit the length to no more than 2 pages.

Name/Identification of Problem/Conflict
Overview of problem/conflict and timeline, including reference to the nature and timing of the third-party assistance, and how the ECR effort was funded
NRC did not use a third party neutral to resolve an ECR case during FY2011
Summary of how the problem or conflict was addressed using ECR, including details of any innovative approaches to ECR, and how the principles for engagement in ECR were used (See Appendix A of the Policy Memo, attached)
Identify the key beneficial outcomes of this case, including references to likely alternative decision making forums and how the outcomes differed as a result of ECR
Reflections on the lessons learned from the use of ECR

- b. Section I of the ECR Policy identifies key governance challenges faced by departments/agencies while working to accomplish national environmental protection and management goals. Consider your departments'/agency's ECR case, and indicate if it represents an example of where ECR was or is being used to avoid or minimize the occurrence of the following:

	Check <u>all</u> that apply	Check if	
		Not Applicable	Don't Know
Protracted and costly environmental litigation;	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unnecessarily lengthy project and resource planning processes;	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Costly delays in implementing needed environmental protection measures;	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Foregone public and private investments when decisions are not timely or are appealed;	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lower quality outcomes and lost opportunities when environmental plans and decisions are not informed by all available information and perspectives; and	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deep-seated antagonism and hostility repeatedly reinforced between stakeholders by unattended conflicts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Please comment on any difficulties you encountered in collecting these data and if and how you overcame them. Please provide suggestions for improving these questions in the future.

We continue to appreciate having a question that allows reporting of other types of significant efforts to “anticipate, prevent, better manage, or resolve environmental issues and conflicts” that do not fit squarely under the definition of “ECR.”

Please attach any additional information as warranted.

Report due February 15, 2012.

Submit report electronically to: ECRReports@omb.eop.gov

Attached A. Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving

**Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in
Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving**

Informed Commitment	Confirm willingness and availability of appropriate agency leadership and staff at all levels to commit to principles of engagement; ensure commitment to participate in good faith with open mindset to new perspectives
Balanced, Voluntary Representation	Ensure balanced inclusion of affected/concerned interests; all parties should be willing and able to participate and select their own representatives
Group Autonomy	Engage with all participants in developing and governing process; including choice of consensus-based decision rules; seek assistance as needed from impartial facilitator/mediator selected by and accountable to all parties
Informed Process	Seek agreement on how to share, test and apply relevant information (scientific, cultural, technical, etc.) among participants; ensure relevant information is accessible and understandable by all participants
Accountability	Participate in the process directly, fully, and in good faith; be accountable to all participants, as well as agency representatives and the public
Openness	Ensure all participants and public are fully informed in a timely manner of the purpose and objectives of process; communicate agency authorities, requirements and constraints; uphold confidentiality rules and agreements as required for particular proceedings
Timeliness	Ensure timely decisions and outcomes
Implementation	Ensure decisions are implementable consistent with federal law and policy; parties should commit to identify roles and responsibilities necessary to implement agreement; parties should agree in advance on the consequences of a party being unable to provide necessary resources or implement agreement; ensure parties will take steps to implement and obtain resources necessary to agreement