

16-03

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Local Radiation Preparedness

Policy

The National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) supports effective radiation emergency preparedness and response efforts at local health departments. Although the likelihood of a radiation emergency is lower compared to other hazards, the consequences to an impacted community, and its public health, are dire, costly, and long-lasting. Therefore, NACCHO encourages all local health departments to conduct routine radiation preparedness and response planning, education, training, exercising, and community outreach in collaboration with community partners and response agencies. Additionally, these public health preparedness and response efforts should be applicable to all types of radiation emergencies, including nuclear power plant incidents, accidental releases, radiological dispersal devices (RDDs), radiological exposure devices (REDs), and the detonation of improvised nuclear devices (INDs) or nuclear weapons. NACCHO is committed to supporting local health departments with efforts to strengthen and continuously improve their radiation emergency preparedness programs and to ensuring local health departments are ready to respond and recover from the potentially disastrous public health outcomes resulting from a radiation emergency.

NACCHO urges the following radiation preparedness actions in the areas of funding, training and exercises, and awareness:

- **Funding:**
 - Federal and state agencies should provide sufficient financial support to local health departments and other relevant local stakeholders to engage in routine multidisciplinary radiation preparedness planning, education, training, and exercise activities, to maintain readiness capability.
- **Training and Exercises:**
 - Local health departments should work with state and/or other local health departments to support training appropriate personnel (a principal and a backup) as Radiological Operations Support Specialists (ROSS).¹
 - Funding agencies should ensure local health departments have the necessary resources to host the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors Public Health Decision Making in Radiation Emergency three-day course, which supports training public health officials on the health consequences of RDD and IND events.
 - Federal, state, and local agencies should work jointly to deliver and sustain foundational radiation safety training for local health department staff, strengthening



response capabilities, overcoming technical and emotional barriers, and maintaining institutional knowledge over time.^{2,3}

- Local health departments should conduct, or participate in, regular radiation drills and exercises to demonstrate the ability to execute radiation preparedness plans and continuously improve and vet existing radiation preparedness plans. While local health departments will usually not lead responses to radiological incidents, federal, state, and local agencies should integrate local health departments into radiation emergency preparedness planning efforts and exercises to assure that roles, assets, and the level of assistance coming to local health departments is well understood and practiced.⁴
 - Federal, state, and local agencies should, when able, incorporate the functionality of Community Reception Centers (CRCs) into exercises. CRCs are critical to alleviating public concern about radiological contamination and its potential health consequences in the aftermath of a radiation emergency.
 - Expanding opportunities for public health departments and Medical Reserve Corps to conduct annual Community Reception Center (CRC) training and drills can strengthen the ability to rapidly develop skills for surveying and registering CRC clients, while also supporting radiation awareness training for CRC volunteers.
 - Pre-incident training is needed to help educate the public on their role in radiological response. This will help to alleviate some of the fear and confusion surrounding radiation and deliver meaningful actions the public can initiate to protect themselves.
 - Support the coordinated development by regulatory bodies of standardized bioassay and dose estimation procedures through engagement of subject matter experts, to enable public health agencies to assist healthcare providers in assessing internal contamination following RDD events within existing CLIA and technical constraints.
- Readiness:
 - Federal, state, and local agencies with public health mandates should strengthen and support partnerships with key national organizations to maintain awareness and foster inter-agency communications about radiation emergency planning, operational guidance, general policy, and radiation detection and reporting resources (e.g., Rad-Responder (FEMA), National Alliance for Radiation Readiness, and the Radiation Injury Treatment Network).
 - Local health departments and hospitals, and Healthcare Coalitions should support and engage local Medical Reserve Corps and Radiation Response Volunteer Corps volunteers to prepare for radiation emergencies and to test deployment, communication, and coordination capabilities.
 - Local health departments, federal, and state agencies should partner regularly in order to:
 - Prepare/acquire radiological response guidance for first responders, including the review, revision, and socialization of the guidance.^{5,6,7,8,9}
 - Perform needs assessments for local responding agencies in coordination with a prioritization of response-training, radiological equipment, and tactical response requirements.
 - Establish and share viable tactical radiation emergency response plans.
 - Radiological emergency response plans should be:

- Inclusive of the needs of the whole community with emphasis on vulnerable populations frequently underserved in all emergencies.
- Developed using existing federal and state guidance to facilitate a nationwide accepted standard of response, which fosters a common operating language and the sharing of expertise in a real emergency.
- Prepare and assess public messaging using radiation subject matter experts (e.g., Disaster Response Crisis Counselors and Health Physicists) in advance of and during radiation emergencies.

Justification

According to the 2015 National Security Strategy, “No threat poses as grave a danger to our security and well-being as the potential use of nuclear weapons and materials by irresponsible states or terrorists.”¹⁰ Weapons such as INDs and RDDs have the potential to inflict physical and widespread psychological damage. After September 11, 2001, both IND and RDD terrorism became critical federal government concerns.¹¹

Radiation emergencies may be less likely than some hazards, but the consequences can be extreme. Radiation emergencies negatively impact the health and economic well-being of individuals and severely threaten national security. During a radiation emergency, local health departments may engage Emergency Support Function 8 (ESF-8) and are responsible for managing population monitoring. The Federal Emergency Management Agency *Nuclear/Radiological Incident Annex* states that, regarding public decontamination, “[s]tate and local officials retain primary responsibility for public monitoring, screening, and decontamination operations.”¹² Beyond infrastructure damage and physical health effects, local organizations must be ready to accommodate the psychological impact of a radiation emergency. Even jurisdictions with no known radiation hazards may be overwhelmed by those fleeing an incident involving radiation.

There is insufficient awareness and general knowledge of radiation by both the general public and the majority of potential responders, which can impede and complicate response operations and communications. In addition, it is essential that radiation preparedness plans incorporate considerations for vulnerable populations that may have difficulty evacuating an affected area (e.g., the elderly, those dependent on medical equipment, those in assisted living or nursing facilities, and those with functional and accessibility needs). Economically disadvantaged populations must be considered, especially if they suffer from poor access to transportation, communications, and other services. These populations, as well as daycare facilities and schools, may require special accommodations to ensure access to family reunification, CRC services, public health information about radiation and the incident, and other associated resources.

To effectively mitigate the situation, radiation emergencies require unique resources, training, and communication beyond an all-hazards disaster response. Too often, the commitment to radiation emergency preparedness suffers because of competing priorities that grab the attention of legislators and the public (i.e., pandemic response, emerging infectious diseases, and the opioid crisis). Regardless of probability, the high consequence of a radiation emergency demands

that specific resources, including both staff and funding, must be committed to radiation preparedness activities. Acknowledging the enormous destructive potential of radiation emergencies, it is important that LHDs and other relevant local stakeholders, including law enforcement, emergency management, and hazardous materials response teams, are fully aware of their responsibilities and the state of their existing plans.

Local health departments need a comprehensive set of accessible and consistent guidance, tools, trainings, and resources, easy to digest and adapt, in order to build, support, and sustain radiation preparedness response strategies. Though there are a variety of radiation guidance documents and tools available, challenges persist in finding the time/resources to commit to adapting these materials to fit the needs of a local health department. Additional effort is required to develop the local health department, state, and federal coordination to assure a more robust and comprehensive response to a radiological incident. To ensure that local health departments can incorporate the available radiation guidance, the local health department perspective must be included throughout the entire spectrum of radiation guidance development. A good model of local health department inclusion was the manner in which the Radiological Dispersal Device Response Guidance was shared with first responders and local health departments. A nationwide educational campaign was implemented by the developers to explain the guidance to first-responder audiences. A similar “national-tour” method was used to encourage IND planning by other federal planners. Vetting with local stakeholders is needed to ensure developed products, or their most important components, can be folded into the existing plans of most local jurisdictions. Including local health departments as part of the process makes these products known to end users and if they are included early on, helps to build relevant, robust, and adaptable guidance.

In preparation for and following a radiation emergency, coordination between local health departments, local response agencies, and other assets that may originate with state and local partners builds a more capable public health response than a local health department can do on its own. Coordination need not stop there. It is just as critical for responding organizations at the local level to coordinate with other surrounding local jurisdictions to accommodate commuters, hospitals to advise on treatment of contaminated patients, emergency medical technicians to assure their safe transport, and other governmental and non-governmental entities, such as environmental protection agencies (to advise on water contamination), the American Red Cross, or other volunteers who may step forward in a crisis.

Effective communications with the public following a radiation emergency are of utmost importance. Naturally, there is fear and misunderstanding in the public perception of the implications of a radiation emergency. Thus, the development of messaging templates vetted by public information subject matter experts in advance of an emergency is critical. Direct, clear communications with the public about a technological incident of this nature presents significant hurdles best overcome in advance—to the extent possible. Here too, guidance at the federal level exists, but can only be effectively implemented if it is coordinated within a multi-agency framework to assure consistent messaging that builds public confidence in the response.

References

1. Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors (CRCPD). Radiological Operations Support Specialist (ROSS). Retrieved June 2026 from: <https://www.crcpd.org/ross-portal>
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Radiation Emergencies: Basics. Retrieve June 2026 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/radiation-emergencies/about/index.html>
3. Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU). Psychological First Aid in Radiation Disasters. <https://www.ornl.gov/rsb/pfaird/>
4. National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO). Radiation Emergency Exercise Resource Guide. 2019. Available via NACCHO Radiation Preparedness resources page: <https://www.naccho.org>
5. Los Angeles County Emergency Medical Services Agency Task Force. Ambulance Guidelines for Response to Radiation Events. Retrieved June 2026 from: http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/dhs/216885_AmbulanceGuidelinesforResponsetoRadiationEventsRev7-20131030.pdf
6. U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Radiological Dispersal Device (RDD) Response Guidance: Planning for the First 100 Minutes. November 2017. <https://www.dhs.gov/publication/rdd-response-guidance>
7. Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS). Prehospital Radiological Triage. Version 1, June 2026. <https://orise.ornl.gov/reacts/resources.html>
8. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). Report No. 179: Guidance for Emergency Response Dosimetry. 2017. <https://ncrponline.org/shop/reports/report-no-179-guidance-for-emergency-response-dosimetry/> (paid resource)
9. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP). Commentary No. 28: Implementation Guidance for Emergency Response Dosimetry. <https://ncrponline.org/shop/commentaries/commentary-no-28-implementation-guidance-for-emergency-response-dosimetry/> (paid resource)
10. Executive Office of the President of the United States. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. February 2015. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy_2.pdf
11. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Exploring Medical and Public Health Preparedness for a Nuclear Incident: Proceedings of a Workshop. 2019. <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/25372/exploring-medical-and-public-health-preparedness-for-a-nuclear-incident>
12. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Nuclear/Radiological Incident Annex to the Response and Recovery Federal Interagency Operational Plans. 2016. https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-07/fema_incident-annex_nuclear-radiological.pdf

Record of Action

Proposed by NACCHO Radiation Workgroup

Approved by NACCHO Board of Directors May 11, 2016

Updated February 2020

Updated July 2026