

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on the Review of Emergency Preparedness Regulations and Guidance

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Bethesda, Maryland

Date: Thursday, September 1, 2005

Work Order No.: NRC-579

Pages 1-162

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE REVIEW OF EMERGENCY

PREPAREDNESS REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2005

+ + + + +

The above-entitled matter convened in the Grand Ballroom of the Marriott Bethesda North Hotel and Conference Center, 5701 Marinelli Road, North Bethesda, Maryland, at 8:00 a.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

FACILITATOR:

FRANCIS "CHIP" CAMERON Special Counsel for Public Liaison, U.S. NRC

PARTICIPANTS:

ROCHELLE BECKER	Ex. Dir., Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility
W. CRAIG CONKLIN	Chief, Nuclear & Chemical Hazards Branch, FEMA
ERIC EPSTEIN	Chairman, TMI-Alert, Inc.
JANA FAIROW	Manager, Preparedness Programs, Illinois Emergency Mgmt. Agency

1 ANDREW FEENEY Deputy Dir., New York State
2 Emergency Mgmt. Office
3 AUBREY V. GODWIN Director, Arizona Radiation
4 Regulatory Agency
5 ONALEE GRADY-ERICKSON Senior Planner, Minnesota
6 Dept. of Public Safety,
7 Div. of Homeland Security
8 & Emergency Management
9 DEBBIE GRINNELL Resource Advocate, C-10
10 Research and Education
11 Foundation
12 PAUL GUNTER Reactor Watchdog Project
13 Dir., Nuclear Information
14 & Resource Service
15 TED JACKSON Manager, Environmental
16 Emergency & Radiation
17 Program, Georgia
18 Environmental Protection
19 Division
20 MARY LAMPERT Chair, Nuclear Advisory
21 Committee, Town of Duxbury,
22 Massachusetts
23 MARK S. LEMKE Emergency Planning Manager,
24 Pacific Gas & Electric Co.
25

1 PATRICK MULLIGAN Chair, Conference of
2 Radiation Control Program
3 Directors E-6 Committee
4 ALAN P. NELSON Chief, Emergency Preparedness
5 Nuclear Energy Institute
6 SUSAN PERKINS-GREW Emergency Preparedness Mgr.,
7 FPL Energy, Seabrook Station
8 SHANNON RINDFLEISCH Emergency Planner, Prairie
9 Island Indian Community
10 MIKE ROSE Emergency & Support Serv.
11 Mgr., City of Dana Point
12 ANTHONY SUTTON Commissioner, Westchester
13 County Dept. of Emergency
14 Services, New York
15 NED WRIGHT Director, Linn County
16 Emergency Mgmt., Indiana
17 NRC STAFF PRESENT:
18 SAMUEL COLLINS Region I Administrator
19 BOB KAHLER Team Leader, Emergency
20 Preparedness Directorate
21 NADER L. MAMISH Director, Emergency
22 Preparedness Directorate
23 ROBERT MOODY NSIR/DPR/EPD/LRI
24 STACEY ROSENBERG Team Leader, Emergency
25 Preparedness Directorate

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

AGENDA ITEM

PAGE

WELCOME/OPENING REMARKS:

Chip Cameron 5

PROTECTIVE ACTION RECOMMENDATION GUIDANCE:

Bob Moody 7

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 12

AUDIENCE QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 48

NREP:

Nader Mamish/Craig Conklin 67

PUBLIC COMMENT AND DISCUSSION 72

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION 87

CLOSING REMARKS: 123

ADJOURN:

Nader Mamish 162

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:23 a.m.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Everybody, we're going to get started with the meeting this morning. I welcome all of you back. And I just wanted to go through the agenda for today, at least our tentative agenda. We're going to finish off one item from yesterday that we didn't get to and these are the protective action recommendation guidelines. Bob Moody is going to tee that up. Good morning, Eric. Thank you. Thank you, Eric. All right.

Bob Moody will tee it up and we're going to go for 45 minutes round table, protective action recommendation guidance. 8:45, we're going to start with the issues that were left over, not stale yet hopefully, from the NREP meeting and Nader and Craig Conklin, Nader Mamish, Craig Conklin, are going to talk to that. And we really want to focus on state and local Government discussion of those issues and that's where the focus will be.

We're going to take a break at 10:00. We promised our advocacy groups 15 minutes to do a presentation and I'll want to talk to you about how you want to do that. Obviously, the advocacy group representatives around the table have participated

1 extensively in the discussion, but they asked for some
2 equal time, so to speak, to do a presentation. And so
3 we're going to make sure that that happens.

4 I want to welcome Paul Gunter back on
5 Nuclear Information and Resource Service who started
6 out with us yesterday afternoon and will, obviously,
7 be a part of these presentations. We want to give
8 people an opportunity for closing remarks after that.
9 So we're going to be fluid at this point, because we
10 don't know how long we're going to take on NREP. But
11 let's start and I guess, Eric, are you going to be
12 Jeff Benjamin today?

13 MR. EPSTEIN: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And do you think you
15 can handle that role? And is it okay with Alan?

16 MR. EPSTEIN: I just asked Alan. He said
17 it was okay.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: We deputized him for
19 the industry.

20 MR. NELSON: He's the man.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. You heard it.

22 MR. EPSTEIN: All right.

23 MR. GUNTER: Chip?

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes?

25 MR. GUNTER: There was going to be a

1 presentation from Bob Moody, too, with regard to the
2 question that came up with regard to the NEI White
3 Paper?

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, that is going
5 to be -- thank you, Paul, because that was an item
6 from yesterday that we said that we would address.
7 And Nader, you told me that Bob was going to handle
8 that as part of his presentation. Will you?

9 MR. MAMISH: Paul and I.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Good. Thank
11 you. Okay. Bob, are you ready?

12 MR. MOODY: I'm ready.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

14 MR. MOODY: Good morning.

15 ALL: Good morning.

16 MR. MOODY: Chip assured me that being
17 last yesterday, he was saving the best until last.
18 I'm not sure what that makes me today, Chip. But the
19 next topic relates to protective actions and related
20 issues. Yesterday, Tom mentioned several enhancements
21 that were being made relative to on-site protective
22 actions by licensees in post-9/11 threat environment.
23 And in the last session with Craig, we discussed off-
24 site protective decisions that are made by state and
25 local officials.

1 This topic this morning explores areas of
2 protective actions and other related issues. It's
3 appropriate that we discuss these aspects of
4 protective actions, since they have such a direct and
5 significant impact on public health and safety.
6 Before the comment, we open the session for comments,
7 I would like to take a few minutes to provide a brief
8 overview of some of the existing guidance related to
9 protective actions and introduce some possible
10 enhancements related to off-site protective actions
11 that we are seeking comment on.

12 The current planning standard related to
13 protective actions is found in 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10),
14 which requires a range of protective actions be
15 developed for the protection of the public. Guidance
16 related to the development of a range of protective
17 actions is provided in Supplement 3, as well as in EPA
18 400. There are also other federal guidance related to
19 protective actions, but these are the primary
20 documents.

21 The current protective action guidance
22 contained in Supplement 3 to NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1,
23 specifies that the licensee should issue a protective
24 action recommendation based on plant conditions that
25 involve actual projected severe core damage or loss of

1 control to the facility.

2 In the event of an emergency
3 classification based on a security event, we're
4 soliciting comments regarding the receipt of the
5 recommendation from the licensee at possibly a site
6 area or an alert emergency classification.

7 While each federal guidance document
8 contains basically the same concepts of evacuation,
9 shelter, potassium iodide as a supplement to those, we
10 are interested in comments regarding the need to
11 clarify the responsibilities of a licensee to
12 recommend PARS and of the local and state officials to
13 make the final decision, which protective actions is
14 or are implemented, particularly when there may be
15 impediments to the implementation of the evacuation.

16 We're also interested in comments on the
17 need to more clearly define sheltering and we had some
18 discussion yesterday on what does go inside and
19 monitor EAS, and we appreciate those comments,
20 defining what shelter really means. And the NRC is
21 conducting studies today looking into shelter and
22 evacuation, defining what sheltering-in-place means
23 more clearly, defining maybe terms like preferential
24 sheltering or heightened awareness.

25 Another related issue to protective

1 actions is in the area of evacuation time estimates.
2 Guidance on ETEs appears in two parts of NUREG-0654.
3 Also, there is guidance on evacuation time estimates
4 in NUREG/CR-6863. That updates the guidance on ETE,
5 and sorry for all these NUREGs, but that guidance
6 supersedes or updates the guidance in NUREG/CR-4831.

7 There are some copies left of that new ETE
8 study in the back of the room. Unfortunately, the
9 summary document is sold out, but the appendices are
10 still there. We have left a sign-up sheet for those
11 of you that would like copies of the summary and we'll
12 get those out to you next week.

13 Comments are requested regarding the need
14 to enhance existing guidance. The existing guidance
15 in NUREG-0654 relating to the need to update and use
16 evacuation time estimates, they are required to be
17 developed by the licensee. For example, should the
18 frequency of updating the ETE analysis as well as the
19 criteria for updating the ETE be specified? Should
20 NUREG-0654 specify that the licensee and off-site
21 officials use the ETE analysis when making a
22 protective action recommendation or a protective
23 action decision?

24 This last slide provides some questions
25 for more discussion. These were included in the

1 Federal Register notice of July 28. We would
2 appreciate your comments on these questions. However,
3 any other questions or comments are certainly
4 appreciated. Thank you.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
6 Thank you very much, Bob.

7 (Applause)

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Just two
9 points before we go to discussion. Let me have Mike
10 Rose introduce himself. Unfortunately, Tracey Vardas
11 is ill and Mike is sitting in for her. Mike, could
12 you just tell us who you are?

13 MR. ROSE: Yes, good morning. My name is
14 Mike Rose. I am the Emergency and Support Services
15 Manager for the City of Dana Point in southern
16 California and I'm currently the chairman of the
17 Inter-Jurisdictional Planning Committee for the San
18 Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Thank you,
20 Mike. And just to repeat something from yesterday,
21 the value of the discussion, the focus of the
22 discussion is on generic issues and unless you are
23 using site-specific as an example, we want to focus on
24 the generic issues, rather than site-specific
25 comments. And with that, you heard Bob's tee-up. I

1 think we had some relevant discussion yesterday
2 already on these issues. Does anybody, Paul, you want
3 to start us off?

4 MR. GUNTER: Yes, I'm Paul Gunter with
5 Nuclear Information Resource Service. I did want to
6 follow-up with Bob and Nader with regard to a question
7 that came up yesterday on the NEI White Paper from May
8 of 2004. I think that just background, you know, I
9 think, broadly the public recognizes that there is a
10 10 mile radius emergency planning zone. And in that
11 recognition, there has been assumptions that the 10
12 mile radius constitutes the evacuation, the emergency
13 planning, the evacuation planning zone.

14 I mean, that's what EPZ has meant to us
15 for a long time. And when we saw the NEI White Paper
16 from May of 2004 recommending a two mile radius
17 evacuation and five mile downwind, we look at that as
18 a reduction in the emergency planning zone. And
19 particularly given, you know, what we have seen to be
20 even questions with regard to the adequacy of a 10
21 mile planning zone given we still have an 18 mile
22 radius around the Chernobyl site that's uninhabitable.

23 So, you know, there has always been a
24 public confidence issue. And when we raised this
25 question yesterday, particularly in light of the NRC

1 background sheet that identifies that there is a 10
2 mile evacuation planning zone, you know, we noted this
3 discrepancy and wanted some clarification. So Bob
4 said that he was going to give us some clarification
5 and I hope that we have an opportunity to have some
6 dialogue about that.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Bob, the
8 clarification, I'm not sure if we need -- did the NEI
9 White Paper identify a two mile or five mile?

10 MR. MOODY: I can turn it back over to
11 Alan or the NEI representative after I finish my --
12 just a quick comment here.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good, good.

14 MR. MOODY: Because it is their paper, but
15 which we have endorsed. The NRC has endorsed. But
16 Paul did point out that in the background sheet, that
17 was on the back table, it does talk about evacuation
18 as the initial protective action recommendation in the
19 event of a core damage event. It states that it is
20 generally a two mile radius around the plant and 10
21 mile in the downwind sectors.

22 The current guidance in NUREG-0654,
23 Supplement 3, talks about an initial PAR in the event
24 of a core damage event as being a two mile radius and
25 a five mile downwind distance. Now, this guidance, as

1 we discussed yesterday, is guidance. It's one way
2 that a licensee and the state and locals can meet the
3 requirements of the regulations.

4 Yes, Paul is correct. All the licensees,
5 state and locals are required to have an emergency
6 plan that discusses evacuation for a 10 mile radius.
7 However, under certain meteorological conditions, it
8 may not be necessary to evacuate the entire 10 mile
9 EPZ.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let me ask
11 you a question here and I'm not sure we need to go to
12 Alan based on what you said, although, obviously, Alan
13 can say whatever he wants here. But process, there
14 was a process issue from yesterday, which is what was
15 the NRC going to do with the NEI White Paper? And I
16 just heard, I think, an answer to that. You said we
17 have endorsed the NEI White Paper. Okay. Well, that
18 answers the process question. But Paul has asked for
19 clarification about the two mile, the 10 mile. We
20 heard from, I believe, Mary yesterday that it should
21 be 20 miles and, indeed, you referred to that.

22 Did Bob put in context for everybody what
23 the NRC NUREG does in terms of two mile and five mile?
24 You just heard an explanation, I think, of that. And
25 are there further questions about that?

1 MR. GUNTER: Yes, I have one and just to
2 put on the record, we're -- Nuclear Information
3 Resource Service is requesting that the transcript of
4 this meeting provide the technical analysis that
5 justifies a five mile initial action with a core melt
6 accident. You know, a five mile downwind evacuation.
7 Again, you know, I think, the whole Three Mile Island
8 incident/accident created a crisis in public
9 confidence. And here we are more than a quarter of a
10 century after that accident, and I don't believe that
11 that crisis has been addressed or has been laid to
12 rest.

13 And I think that this assembly, you know,
14 further identifies that there still is an issue of
15 public confidence in whether or not we will be told in
16 timely fashion what's going on and whether the follow-
17 up actions will be adequate. And so to see that the
18 bar has been set for an initial core melt accident for
19 a five mile downwind response, I think does not
20 assuage the public confidence issue.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
22 Paul. I think everybody can see what the issue is
23 here in terms of the five mile not being acceptable.
24 This does fall within this topic for discussion,
25 correct, Nader?

1 MR. MAMISH: It does.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Well, let's
3 get some other people. Aubrey, did you want to talk
4 to this issue? Okay. Let's go to Aubrey. Let's go
5 to Ned, and then let's go to the other cards that are
6 up. Yes, I see that, Mary, thank you.

7 MS. LAMPERT: I didn't know you saw it.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I did. Aubrey?

9 MR. GODWIN: Historically, the advice was
10 about 10 miles and there was an implication that you
11 might have to go beyond that and I was on the group
12 when we reviewed a lot of data and we ended up
13 agreeing with the Commission that it was a prudent
14 decision to go 10 miles. Therefore, I'm a little
15 surprised to hear anything other than 10 miles. But
16 as I understood the endorsement, you were talking
17 about going out 10 miles?

18 MR. MOODY: The NUREG-0654, Supplement 3,
19 currently is the acceptable radius would be -- I mean,
20 evacuation area would be a two mile radius and five
21 miles down in the downwind sectors.

22 MR. GODWIN: Right. But the states have
23 been preparing to go beyond that and they should.

24 MR. MOODY: The plans require that.

25 MR. GODWIN: And I would recommend --

1 MR. MOODY: This would just be the
2 initial --

3 MR. GODWIN: -- to the states that they
4 continue to do that. The other part is the keyhole is
5 probably not a bad idea for the first response, but I
6 think everyone recognizes that wind shifts and it
7 doesn't matter really where you are in the country.
8 It does shift around out west. It shifts around in
9 Alabama. It shifts around in Massachusetts. It
10 shifts around everywhere. And about every two hours,
11 you can plan on a wind shift.

12 So about the time you can reasonably
13 expect to complete evacuation, you probably ought to
14 add to it, because the wind shifted. So effectively,
15 you're going to have to add 360 before it's over with
16 and I think you need to be prepared for that and plan
17 for that as a part of it.

18 Then there's the other condition that
19 happened during Three Mile Island when the Commission
20 was advising the state to evacuate and they asked in
21 which direction and they said downwind and it was
22 pointed out the wind wasn't blowing. So you need to
23 think more than just downwind. You do need to think
24 of 360 degrees and I hope that the Commission and the
25 staff recognizes that you need to look beyond the

1 keyhole effect on a long-term basis as just a starting
2 point and not the ending point. If you try to end
3 with just the keyhole effect, I'm afraid we're not
4 going to make it.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
6 Aubrey. We're going to go to Ned and then to Craig
7 and then we're going to go to the rest of the people.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Again, I'm a little bit
9 confused, because, first of all, it's a
10 recommendation. The utility would make a
11 recommendation to the state and locals. We're the
12 ones that have to make the final decision based on the
13 conditions. And for the past 10 years in our
14 community we have been looking at things whether it's
15 weather-related. We have a big construction season
16 and this time of the year that we have the interstates
17 all cut up just because that's a midwestern type of
18 thing because of the weather.

19 So we have to look at all of these things.
20 We have been working wind shifts for years. Where
21 even though the initial downwind is in one keyhole
22 area, we do exercise the wind shifts, but we also look
23 at the two, the five, the 10 and even beyond the EPZ,
24 not just in the ingestion pathway portion, but we have
25 been doing that. So it would appear to me that these

1 recommendations, the plannings are there. Our EPZ
2 goes out 17 miles and we look at that.

3 And we also look at, you know, how are we
4 going to get the dose rate out to that far out? I
5 said basically, other than picking the core up and
6 moving it from the plant, it's not going to get there.
7 And I'm concerned that also you're worried about
8 public confidence. We also do a lot of effort to let
9 the public know that we have these plans and
10 procedures in place. We bring our citizens in to let
11 them see our planning efforts, especially dealing with
12 our specialties, populations, the day care, the
13 schools and whatever.

14 Especially, you know, we know that the
15 children are at greater risk. So we try to show our
16 public that we do have these plans in place. So to
17 come up there and say that there is a -- it looks like
18 you're moving from recommendation to ordering us to do
19 something, and you're not going to order me to do a
20 damn thing if it puts my public at greater risk. So
21 I'm looking at if you -- you know, the recommendations
22 are fine and the plans. My plan is four volumes thick
23 and it's reviewed constantly, not only by me, but by
24 others.

25 You know, we evaluate it all the time. So

1 I really think that you are beating a dead horse here
2 in trying to force something that does not need to be
3 forced. And if you don't trust us, if the citizens
4 don't trust us, they can get rid of us. I mean, they
5 can deal with our elected officials who I am
6 responsible to, but also if our public is unhappy with
7 what we're doing, they should let us know. And right
8 now, at least in our community, they don't have a
9 problem. We do not have a public confidence problem
10 because of all of our other efforts.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Ned, let me ask you
12 a question and I think I need to go to Stacey to get
13 a clarification on the record. But let me ask you a
14 question, so that I understand this. You use the term
15 forced, okay. And you also talked about this is a
16 recommendation. Is there some forcing function here
17 in this recommendation or something I'm missing along
18 these lines?

19 MR. WRIGHT: No, what I was going to is I
20 don't want it to get to the point where we have to
21 automatically evacuate out to 10 miles or whatever.
22 It's a recommendation. Obviously, we have a lot of
23 smart people doing this and I have worked with on-site
24 people and the HPs, the off-site folks, the folks at
25 the state or public health folks, and, you know,

1 there's a lot of smart people in there. You know,
2 when a recommendation comes out, obviously, from the
3 plant that has been researched and looked at by some
4 good people. And again, their families live in our
5 EPZ.

6 At the same time, that recommendation
7 comes down. Our state health department, our local
8 public health department, they also addressed the
9 issues. There are times when we have said we do not
10 agree with the recommendation from the plant and the
11 state and the locals have made a decision to do
12 something different.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Whether they recommend
15 evacuation, we recommend shelter-in-place. But again,
16 the final decision has got to be up to us and I'm just
17 concerned that we go in and put something that forces
18 us by regulation that you automatically will take a
19 step.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So keep it at a
21 recommendation. Okay.

22 MR. WRIGHT: A recommendation. That's
23 correct.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great, great.
25 Stacey, did you want to add something here?

1 MS. ROSENBERG: Yes, I just want to make
2 a clarification about the NRC guidance and what our
3 protective action recommendation is. That's the
4 initial minimum recommendation, the two mile, five
5 mile downwind and, obviously, different site-specific
6 issues, wind shifts at certain sites, because they are
7 on the ocean or something like that would necessitate
8 changing that recommendation.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Initial?

10 MS. ROSENBERG: Yes.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: How does it start in
12 the Bronx, okay. Thank you for that. Let me get
13 Craig on and then let's go to Eric and then we'll go
14 over to Mary and come back to Rochelle and Debbie.
15 Craig Conklin?

16 MR. CONKLIN: Well, I really thank Stacey
17 for bringing that to mind and Aubrey and Ned to build
18 on your comments, it's an initial recommendation, but
19 you've got to plan for 360, because of the way the
20 wind changes. And the guidance that we have in 0654
21 is what I like to refer to, and I'm going to start
22 using the term, and you'll hear it more often here
23 I've used in the Chemical Stockpile Program, and that
24 is functional equivalency.

25 What we should be doing and what I hope we

1 have done is establish what needs to be done without
2 telling you how to get it done. That gives you all
3 the flexibility to come up with your own methods on
4 mechanisms. Just like public alert and warning.
5 Sirens is one way to do it, turn on radios, reader
6 boards, all sorts of other ways to do public alert and
7 warning.

8 So our goal should be to make sure that
9 there is a functional equivalency, meaning that what
10 Iowa needs to do for their community may be more or
11 less extensive than what needs to be done by
12 Westchester County, because they got more people, it
13 may be more denser populations. They have to do
14 different things to reach that same functional
15 equivalency of being able to protect their public.
16 And that would be my goal for the program.

17 And hopefully, you know, if that's not the
18 case, let me know, because we don't want to be very
19 prescriptive in how you do your job. That's setting
20 the functional goals of what you need to accomplish is
21 what we should be doing and giving you all the
22 flexibility implemented and then we come in and assist
23 you to do it, evaluate you, because of the regulations
24 we have to follow, and things like that. But you
25 should always have that flexibility to develop the

1 program around your particular community needs.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Great. Thank
3 you, Craig. You heard it, functional equivalency,
4 flexibility. Eric?

5 MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you. First, I would
6 like to clarify, I misspoke yesterday and I'm pretty
7 anal about this. When I said the NRC approached me
8 about Amish evacuation in '79, I would just like the
9 record to record it was actually '83.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. EPSTEIN: But I'm a stickler for
12 details and I just needed to come clean with that.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

14 MR. EPSTEIN: I would just like to point
15 out what happened to us during an evacuation which
16 occurred on 36 hours after the initiating event. We
17 had a precautionary evacuation five miles out for
18 preschool children and pregnant women. It was the
19 Friday of the accident. You may recall it was
20 unseasonably warm, so people were out, and I'll tell
21 you why I'm saying that in a moment.

22 The point I'm trying to make, the
23 prescriptive evacuation was for 5,000 five miles in,
24 144,000 people left 50 miles out. So we can talk
25 miles as much as we want. I think we have to

1 acknowledge reality is once you evacuate or order an
2 evacuation, people are going to leave. And I think
3 it's better to prepare for the worst case scenario
4 than the best case scenario.

5 What we have argued for over the years is
6 to try and plan for an evacuation during a snowstorm,
7 Friday night, home Penn State football game, than
8 rather trying to look at the rosy scenarios. And like
9 the fellow from Iowa, we have cycles, too. We are one
10 of the largest tourist meccas in the country for
11 Gettysburg, for the Amish and for Hershey. So we have
12 large segments of population that will have no idea
13 what to do, who easily fall within 10 and five miles.

14 I guess what I'm trying to say to folks is
15 I think it's important to have this discussion five,
16 10, but there's a certain reality that exists that
17 when you order an evacuation, people are leaving. And
18 it's better to be prepared and prepared for the worst
19 case scenario.

20 One issue that we haven't talked on, just
21 to digress, because we've talked somewhat about
22 sheltering, one of the problems we had during TMI was
23 the sheltering of livestock. We're an agricultural
24 community. So I hope at some point we address this.
25 Because during the accident and I can tell you during

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any potential accident, farmers aren't going to
2 evacuate. They are classified as emergency workers.

3 My grandfather is a chicken farmer. He is
4 not going to leave his farm. I don't know any farmer
5 that's going to leave. So I don't want to debase the
6 argument by moving from people, but I would like us to
7 acknowledge that when we shelter, you have to think
8 about agricultural repercussions.

9 The final thought was, and I don't know if
10 anybody ever really thought about this, but people
11 didn't buy our produce after the accident and after
12 the evacuation for years. So there are consequences
13 to an evacuation that aren't necessarily short lived.
14 And I'm not sure how that falls into the five, 10, 20
15 mile zone, but I would like to at least bring the
16 mistakes that we experienced into play and hopefully
17 everybody can improve and not get too wrapped up about
18 the mileage, but at least be as prepared as possible
19 in the case of -- hopefully, we don't have to do this
20 again.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
22 you, Eric. We're going to go to Mary, Rochelle and
23 Debbie. Mary?

24 MS. LAMPERT: Yes. I will first say when
25 I came down to this meeting I had some confidence in

1 the regulators and I have none right now. And that
2 will be the message back to my community. It is very
3 clear you say in one breath your goal is to protect
4 public health and that public health and safety are a
5 priority. There is no way that this can be true if
6 you are moving back when we know the evidence has been
7 there for years in your own documents that the spread
8 from either a core melt or certainly as the National
9 Academy of Sciences has pointed out, the vulnerability
10 of spent fuels to a terrorist attack and the National
11 Academy stated.

12 Now it was Congress that mandated their
13 study. Why did they ask the National Academy?
14 Because they had no confidence in the NRC. And their
15 word is the last word and they stated unequivocally to
16 the potential for a spent fuel fire was a credible
17 event and it could result in contamination for 500
18 miles. We have -- the Sandia cracked two consequence
19 analysis of each reactor site that was done in 1982
20 and we know that those estimates are conservative.

21 They used data going back to 1970,
22 population data. They assumed the entire 10 mile EPZ
23 would be evacuated in six hours. We know that's not
24 certainly the case. They assumed aggressive medical
25 treatment would be given to all victims. We know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's not the case. And they used very obsolete
2 radiation dose calculation methods.

3 Again, the National Academy of Science
4 just issued in June the BEIR VII Report stating that
5 the effects of radiation on health are far greater
6 than previously assumed. So all of this tells us that
7 what we should be doing is preparing for the worst
8 case scenario and evacuating and/or sheltering,
9 dealing, providing protective actions for a much
10 broader range of the population as opposed to trying
11 to make scarce resources and deny population density
12 around these reactors by pretending the impact is much
13 lower.

14 My town voted at annual town meeting
15 overwhelmingly that we would not approve our plan,
16 because of a variety of elements in our emergency
17 procedures. One stated based on this two mile
18 foolishness and keyhole theory that our police, our
19 fire could be sent out of our town, our personnel
20 downwind to another community. The school buses in
21 our community can be ordered to be sent to the five
22 mile downwind whatever the state says it is.

23 The town said this is nuts. Our school
24 buses are going nowhere. Our firemen are going
25 nowhere. Our policemen are going nowhere, because

1 planning is based on a foolish assumption. So the
2 people, once they hear this, your confidence in the
3 industry, I think, is at a real low now and I think it
4 has hit rock bottom.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. You've heard
6 Mary's viewpoint on that. I would just ask people to
7 think about her opening statement. I'm sorry you
8 don't have confidence in the regulators. I don't know
9 what has been said or demonstrated around this table
10 that --

11 MS. LAMPERT: The endorsement of the NEI's
12 foolishness.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Excuse me. Excuse
14 me. Okay. You answered the question. Okay. That's
15 why Mary does not have confidence, because we have
16 endorsed. The NRC has endorsed the NEI White Paper.
17 I want to make that clear.

18 MS. LAMPERT: Yes, that's clear.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Mary also made some
20 statements about the National Academy, to the National
21 Academy of Science reports, the BEIR Report and the
22 Spent Fuel Report. And if that is Mary's take on
23 those two documents, if someone has another take on
24 it, please, tell us about that. I'm going to go to
25 Rochelle and Debbie and then we're going to come back

1 here and we're rapidly closing in on our time to end
2 this particular session. So I just want to alert
3 people to that, but we will go to the cards that are
4 up. Rochelle and then Debbie, please. Rochelle?

5 MS. BECKER: Yes, I think that this is a
6 very important point. I'm very happy that the people
7 in Iowa have public confidence, but the people in
8 California do not have public confidence. The two
9 mile limit with five miles downwind is only the
10 utility at Diablo Canyon, which means the only people
11 in an evacuation zone are the utility. Now, those
12 people at the utility will call their families. The
13 word will get out and what trust will anybody have in
14 either the utility or the NRC? No one has any trust
15 in the nuclear industry to do the right thing.

16 This is a credibility issue. Whether or
17 not it is reality doesn't make any difference. Two
18 miles is a joke, because you are only evacuating the
19 people who work at the plant and a few farmers that
20 might be out there. There is nobody there. So you're
21 saying to the public we only care about the people who
22 work at the plant. That is absolutely atrocious.

23 Now, at San Onofre, you go two miles and
24 five miles downwind and it's a military base. So the
25 military and the utility have evacuation plans and

1 none of the public do. Now, the NRC does not want
2 responsibility for sheltering. The industry doesn't
3 want responsibility for sheltering. So that means the
4 states, California with a horrible budget, has all the
5 responsibility for sheltering and evacuation plans.

6 I just read this as a slap in the face to
7 the public, a downgrading of whatever little
8 confidence we may have had and, you know, I can trust
9 the utility to want to protect their families and I
10 trust the utilities that they will call their families
11 and tell them get the hell out of here, but I don't
12 trust them to protect the public.

13 I don't trust the NRC who is not in our
14 town, the two people that are resident inspectors FEMA
15 has to fly in. Where does that leave our community?
16 This is not a good program. This gives no confidence
17 and it is unconscionable for the NRC to whip out its
18 rubber stamp and say we think this is a good idea.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let me go to Bob
20 Moody to make sure that it's clear. I think we heard
21 Stacey say that two miles is just the starting point.
22 It's the minimum. Can you respond to Rochelle on this
23 in terms of --

24 MR. MOODY: Sure.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- putting the two

1 mile in context?

2 MR. MOODY: The two mile radius and five
3 mile downwind guidance, as I mentioned earlier, is
4 just that, it's guidance, and as you heard from other
5 round table participants, the licensee does work with
6 the state and locals to develop a range of protective
7 measures that will protect public health and safety.
8 The two mile radius and five mile downwind is
9 guidance. It's one way to meet the regulations, but
10 that doesn't mean that the state and locals and
11 licensees can't work out another scheme.

12 Also, the plants, each licensee and the
13 state and locals, have the capability to evacuate a 10
14 mile radius. We're not talking about reducing the
15 emergency planning zone. Plans are still in place,
16 required to be in place, to be able to evacuate a 10
17 mile radius.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
19 Not to minimize your point, Rochelle, about public
20 perception --

21 MS. BECKER: Well, the utilities do not
22 work with the public.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

24 MS. BECKER: Maybe they do in Iowa.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

1 MS. BECKER: But they sure don't in San
2 Luis Obispo.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I want to get
4 another NRC. Go ahead, Sam.

5 MR. COLLINS: I think in the
6 clarification, was there a minimum, because I don't
7 understand this either and I would have the same
8 reaction you would in the context that it's currently
9 presented, because it does appear as if it's a
10 reduction. But for the sake of clarification, was
11 there a minimum before this? Stacey, can you help us
12 with that?

13 MS. ROSENBERG: Yes. We did endorse the
14 NEI guidance document, okay, and I wish I had a copy
15 of our regulatory information summary that did the
16 endorsement, because I can't quote from it right now.
17 But what we did say was something to the effect that
18 everything in the NEI guidance document is in NRC
19 guidance. There was nothing new in NEI's guidance
20 document, no new guidance. What it was was
21 implementation.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So in other words,
23 the NEI guidance document, the NEI document, was based
24 on NRC?

25 MS. ROSENBERG: It was based on NRC FEMA

1 guidance.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. All right.

3 MS. ROSENBERG: Okay? And there is
4 nothing in there that reduced anything, any of our
5 guidance. It was more of an implementation.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And because
7 this is an important point in terms of credibility,
8 Bob, can you clear this up a little bit for us and,
9 please, introduce yourself.

10 MR. KAHLER: Bob Kahler. I'm a team
11 leader on the Inspection Team of the Emergency
12 Preparedness Directorate, part and parcel to the
13 endorsement of the NEI White Paper. The guidance that
14 we endorsed does not change any of the existing NRC
15 documents that were in place prior to that. What it
16 did was to reverify the fact that minimum protective
17 actions that are initially given out are two mile 360,
18 five mile downwind wedge. That's the minimum a
19 licensee should be considering at the point of where
20 they are declaring a general emergency.

21 They are then to take that minimum and
22 build upon it to create what the initial protective
23 action should be. So what we're telling them is as a
24 minimum, this is the least protective action you
25 should produce to provide to the off-site agencies,

1 build upon that, expand upon that. It is not a
2 reduction. It is a starting point for them to begin
3 with. This is something that we want you to take and
4 go forward with.

5 So you could take it out to a 360 or,
6 excuse me, 10 mile 360 degree evacuation as your
7 initial protective action, but as a minimum you should
8 be giving out at least a two mile 360, five mile
9 downwind wedge.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for
11 that clarification and thank all of you for bringing
12 these points up, because I think it's useful that this
13 came up. I'm going to take the cards that are up and
14 then we're going to end. Okay? That's what we have
15 to do, and Debbie?

16 MS. GRINNELL: This is an outrageous move
17 by the NRC. You have got to protect your state
18 emergency planners, and what you have done is
19 undermined them with this recommendation. You know
20 it. I can look at your face, Mr. Moody, and tell that
21 you know what you're doing here. It's outrageous.
22 These men and women are trying to safely evacuate the
23 public and they are trying to build on confidence
24 after 9/11.

25 When 9/11 occurred, in my organization

1 there were so many hundreds of phone calls that came
2 well outside of the evacuation zone, and I'm telling
3 you we got phone calls from nearly to Boston, but the
4 Cape and places where on Cape Ann people never, ever
5 thought about the nuke, it became clear to them that
6 in any kind of a security event, they were part of the
7 population that needed to move. It's well outside of
8 the 10 mile zone.

9 You have got to factor in public response
10 and emergency planners know at this table that it's
11 going to be well outside of the 10 mile zone. Trying
12 to get people who really need, in close proximity, to
13 get out with a shadow population is going to be a
14 nightmare. And if you go to two miles, you are making
15 a mockery of the planning that these men and women
16 have been doing for years. It is an outrageous
17 guidance and you need to rescind this immediately.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, Debbie,
19 obviously you're welcome to express your opinion here,
20 but I just want to go back to what was said by several
21 people around the table, that this guidance is a
22 starting point and that it is the control of the local
23 Government to decide what actually should be done.

24 MS. GRINNELL: As federal regulators, you
25 have back pedaled and you have undermined local

1 emergency management.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, we'll hear
3 from some local emergency managers. Let's go to
4 Craig, not that he is a local emergency manager, but
5 he is the big shot, right?

6 MR. CONKLIN: Well, I'm big, but I'm not
7 a big shot.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I'm sorry.
9 I didn't want to get that on the record.

10 MR. CONKLIN: The guidance that they are
11 talking about in NUREG-0654, that document, for those
12 of you who may or may not know, was published in 1980,
13 so it has been in existence for 25 years. And I'm
14 sorry about that, Aubrey, I didn't want to indicate
15 your age or anything, but it has been around a long,
16 long time. State and local emergency management
17 officials and the federal officials that I work with
18 are very familiar with that. So it is truly not a
19 backtracking.

20 Now, it has been a long time and I can't
21 remember reading the NEI document actually, because
22 they did not submit it to us in any kind of a formal
23 fashion that I'm aware of, but it's not a
24 backtracking. And the real issue here, it sounds like
25 to me, is that the state and local folks who manage

1 the emergency activities in your states and
2 communities. They are the ones that need to set the
3 tone for how far you evacuate, how far you plan. It's
4 their responsibility, because here it is.

5 There is a little thing called the
6 Constitution out there. State and locals have the
7 constitutional responsibility for the protection of
8 public health and safety. The federal is there to
9 provide regulations and guidance and help out, but the
10 decision makers, the true decision makers, whether you
11 use KI or not, how far you evacuate, who you evacuate,
12 when, it's a state and local decision.

13 The first time the Federal Government
14 comes in and says you shall evacuate to Governor
15 Pataki, I know what Governor Pataki is going to tell
16 that federal person. All right? So what the state
17 and locals need to do, and this is what they have done
18 in Iowa from listening to Ned, it sounds like, is they
19 have worked really closely with everybody to really
20 set up effective plans, procedures and training.

21 So whether it's a recommendation of two
22 and a half or two miles 360, five miles downwind,
23 whether that's a recommendation from the utility or if
24 the utility recommends 10 miles downwind or whatever,
25 it's a state and local decision. They really need to

1 set the tone and set the plans and work with the
2 communities to do what they think is right. And the
3 advocacy groups that are here need to work with their
4 state and locals extremely closely in a collaborative
5 manner to make sure that your issues and your concerns
6 are brought forward.

7 Now, I would like to close with the fact
8 that the guidance in NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 has a 10
9 mile planning basis for the emergency planning zone,
10 the inhalation path, and it has got a 50 mile radius
11 for the ingestion pathway. That will not change
12 without significant input from everybody. All right?
13 So if there is anybody who thinks that we're
14 backtracking on that planning basis, we're not.

15 I have not seen any evidence to even
16 suggest us going and reducing 10 and 50. If anybody
17 is thinking about that, it will be a big, formal
18 process that will involve numerous public hearings,
19 input from state and local, federals and science
20 organizations and that thing. That guidance has been
21 around for a long time and I don't see it changing any
22 time soon without the appropriate input.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
24 Thank you very much, Craig, and we're going to go to
25 Tony, Mike and Andrew and then we're done with this

1 particular discussion.

2 MS. LAMPERT: I'm not done with it.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, Mary, I said
4 I was going to take the cards that were up and we
5 really need to run in a little bit more disciplined
6 manner today. We had a lot of time yesterday and
7 there will be time for you to talk later on. I just
8 want to make sure we get to the NREP discussion. So
9 Tony, Mike, Andrew. Tony?

10 MR. SUTTON: Thank you. I think from a
11 local planning perspective, again, Ned and I seem to
12 be on the same page here. These planning actions or
13 the protective action recommendations come out of
14 post-TMI planning. It's, you know, based on science,
15 it's best recommendations.

16 On the surface it appears as if it's a
17 diminishment of the EPZ, but quite honestly I can tell
18 you that during our decision making, we pay very
19 little attention to the recommendations of the
20 licensee. It's based on experience. It's based on
21 best information about projected dose, release,
22 whether it's a degrading situation, whether it's
23 something that's under control.

24 All of our discussions, and I'm sure that
25 Andrew will reiterate what I'm saying, on a command

1 line amongst the risk counties in the state, we are
2 always trying to be ahead of the curve in terms of
3 addressing school children, in terms of positioning
4 our resources for evacuation. Two around and five
5 down has always been our standard. If you look at it,
6 it only makes prudent planning, because if the wind is
7 blowing that way and there is a release, those are the
8 people that you want to deal with immediately.

9 It doesn't mean that we deal with them and
10 then we stop and it doesn't mean that we deal with
11 them and don't change that action as soon as resources
12 are in position, but certainly those are the people
13 that are at risk or would benefit most by a protective
14 action at that point in time. But again, I think it's
15 the history of it.

16 And going back to my original point from
17 yesterday, I think protective action recommendations
18 are probably far more important to some EPZs in this
19 country where there maybe is not a sophisticated
20 emergency response community off-site and they do, in
21 fact, rely on the licensees to give them the
22 directions and to give them some instruction as to
23 what is the most prudent action to take at that time.

24 Recognizing that there are different
25 levels of sophistication, again, I think that it just

1 becomes one more piece of information that we process
2 and go through, but certainly experience tells us, and
3 anybody with some time in the program has done this
4 and knows what considerations must be taken. So from
5 a local perspective, that's where we are.

6 I do acknowledge the fact that, you know,
7 on the surface it looks as if it's a diminishment of
8 protective action recommendations. So at best I
9 recognize it's a very emotional issue at the table
10 here. The only one thing I would caution, I have
11 heard some very loud and very firm statements from the
12 advocacy groups, I would please caution everybody that
13 it's okay to have that position, but it's not okay to
14 tell people not to listen to their public officials
15 and follow direction.

16 There's a fine line there to make your
17 point, but when you get to that point, you can't say
18 don't listen to those people, they are not giving you
19 the best information during an emergency. We can have
20 that dialogue. We can talk about it. We can consider
21 the advocacy groups as people who have a position at
22 the table and have a right to express their position,
23 but certainly when it gets to a point where, you know,
24 it's don't listen to them, that undermines all of our
25 planning.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Tony.
2 Mike Rose?

3 MR. ROSE: Thank you. I have a couple
4 comments for the record and I have a couple comments
5 to follow-up. First of all, for the record, I heard
6 it said earlier, the two mile and potentially five
7 mile downwind area inside the San Onofre emergency
8 planning zone encompasses only a military base and
9 that's just false. First of all, two miles, the plant
10 itself in our EPZ does sit on a military base, which
11 is relatively unique, but, please, do not discount the
12 resident civilian population of that military base.

13 Second of all, five miles downwind
14 encompasses almost half of the City of San Clemente,
15 which is obviously outside of the military base
16 itself. So there is within the two mile and five mile
17 radiuses a significant size civilian population, and
18 plans are in place for both of those populations on
19 the base and off the base.

20 That being said, I agree with Ned and what
21 Craig has said and what some other folks have said in
22 that one size does not fit all, and emergency
23 planning, off-site emergency response and decision
24 making at the local level is key.

25 You know, our decision makers need to be

1 well-trained and well-informed on a day-to-day basis
2 and I think that's incumbent upon us as emergency
3 planners at the local level to make sure that those
4 people that we are sitting next to at the table when
5 this goes down know what the impacts of those
6 decisions are, and those impacts have a significant
7 impact on the public health and safety but, you know,
8 they have to consider the political ramifications, the
9 socioeconomic ramifications of those decisions that
10 they are making. They have to encompass everything
11 that that means when they make that decision.

12 And the decision in our case is one of not
13 unification, it's a unified decision in that we have
14 multiple agencies who are independently responsible
15 for the public's health and safety and we make our
16 decisions. Our protective action decisions are made
17 in coordination with all the agencies, so all the off-
18 site responding organizations in the area.

19 So again, that being said, our decision
20 making is based on information that we have on plant
21 conditions. It's based on our health officer
22 recommendations and our independent off-site dose
23 assessments and dose projections, again based on
24 information we're getting from the utility, which is
25 independently verified by an organization that we

1 have, it's called ODAC, similar to what Tracey
2 mentioned yesterday, their UDAC.

3 But our ODAC is made up of health
4 officials from both counties involved and our local
5 fire agencies who are actually off-site taking
6 readings and making their own independent dose
7 projections. So they actually have a third party
8 independent group, which is feeding recommendations in
9 to our decision makers.

10 And that in itself provides a lot of
11 confidence in the decisions that they are making, but
12 they also have to account for local conditions, time
13 of day, the number of transient populations in the
14 community. Is it the 4th of July, for example? It's
15 the largest day of the year for us, so that has to be
16 taken into account when the decisions are made.

17 So I think, again, one size does not fit
18 all. Leave the decisions for the protection of the
19 public health and safety in the hands of the decision
20 makers. A PAR is a PAR. It's a recommendation and,
21 obviously, it has to be considered, because we have
22 confidence that the utility knows best about the
23 conditions at the plant at the time, but decision
24 making is based on all the other factors that go into
25 protecting the public's health and safety.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
2 Mike. Andrew Feeney and then, as promised, we will
3 see if anybody in the audience has a question or
4 comment.

5 MR. FEENEY: Thank you. I just want to
6 respond a little bit to the discussion. We certainly
7 are not, I don't feel, undermined by the two around
8 and five down discussion. I must say I was surprised
9 when it was first discussed, because it came out as
10 though the industry or the NRC was considering a
11 reduction in the 10 mile zone and, you know, my
12 immediate reaction was that will never happen.

13 But we are responsible, as Ned said, with
14 the ultimate decision making and, you know, the issue,
15 and I can't stress it enough, for the NRC here and
16 even for the industry is that, you know, what the
17 industry and the NRC do is it's relevant to us, but in
18 terms of protecting the public, you know, we are going
19 to take the actions. We're responsible and there's
20 really no -- I mean, I don't feel undermined by this.

21 I think that there is an undermining of
22 public confidence to some extent through a lot of the
23 studies that are talked about and, frankly, you know,
24 Tony referred to the two guys on his shoulders
25 yesterday and I feel that way a lot of times because,

1 I mean, we have a health department in New York State
2 that is, you know, filled with very, very qualified
3 professionals who advise us on these issues and we
4 don't hear anything that says we should go beyond the
5 10 mile zone.

6 Yet, when you listen to the other studies
7 that are out there. You know, they talk about kill
8 zones and they talk about many other things. So it is
9 no doubt confusing and it must be confusing to people
10 who have far less access to the information that we as
11 professionals do.

12 The other issue, and it came up briefly
13 and I don't know that we'll get to it, was sheltering.
14 We touched on it yesterday. Sheltering for dose
15 savings is obviously different than heightened
16 awareness. We have studied it in the State of New
17 York. We have a position paper. We have a task group
18 involved and we're really getting away from using
19 sheltering as a term when it applies to anything other
20 than actually going to an inside location for dose
21 savings. That's something I just wanted to make
22 clear.

23 And the other general point I would like
24 to make is, you know, I wish, and we're not the only
25 issue that has divisiveness and has science backing up

1 varying points. I mean, it's in almost any hazardous
2 or technological issue out there. I wish there was a
3 venue where there was, you know, an independent
4 clearinghouse, because certainly, you know, the
5 proximity to an industry makes any federal regulator
6 suspect in terms of their association, and I wish
7 there was a clearinghouse where there was true
8 science, but I guess, you know, the old joke used to
9 be with economists. If you put 10 of them in a room
10 and you ask them a question, you get 10 different
11 answers, so that may be the case and we may just have
12 to, you know, ferret it out on our own.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
14 Thank you, Andrew. I just want to call attention to
15 your point and I don't know whether it was Mary or
16 Eric who raised it yesterday about more of a need for
17 good public education, communication on these issues.
18 Rochelle raised it earlier today about confusion,
19 credibility in terms of what the public knows about
20 these issues. So I think this has been a good
21 discussion to clear up, put this into context, but I
22 think that your point about public education is a good
23 one.

24 Audience? Yes, New Jersey? Please,
25 introduce yourself again, if you would.

1 MS. LETA: Again, my name is Suzanne Leta
2 and I work with the New Jersey Public Interest
3 Research Group. And I have one question, I have two
4 questions, and this goes back from yesterday, so it's
5 just because I didn't get a chance to express it
6 yesterday. I know it's not necessarily -- this really
7 isn't what we're talking about right now. It's
8 definitely related to the issues that we're talking
9 about now.

10 The first was, Craig, I wanted to clarify
11 with you. The other day you said, I'm trying to make
12 sure I get this right, you said that you don't need to
13 use potassium iodide if there are other preventative
14 measures within a 20 mile EPZ. So does that mean that
15 there is that risk 20 miles out? So that was my first
16 question.

17 And then my second question is related to
18 evacuation procedures and plant license extensions,
19 which we haven't talked about yet, and I would like to
20 bring that up, because I do think it's a very relevant
21 issue considering that there are so many plants in the
22 country that are applying for license extensions or
23 that have already received them. And there is one of
24 those plants in New Jersey, so it relates to the work
25 that I'm doing and the public that I work with.

1 And I do want to make clear that, you
2 know, we are up here as public representatives and we
3 really are representing large populations. I
4 represent 25,000 people in New Jersey, so it's not
5 just me talking here, that's speaking.

6 But if you do extend the license for a
7 plant, I do think it's very important to plan for 20
8 years, what the population is going to look like, what
9 those differences are going to be. And unfortunately,
10 that type of planning is not a requirement in the
11 license extension review process. Unfortunately, I
12 think that's a big problem. So I wanted to bring
13 those two issues up and get your responses. Thank
14 you.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Suzanne.
16 I think that we're going to have to put the license
17 renewal issue -- you raised it. We're not going to be
18 able to discuss that. I believe that there is some
19 pending adjudication before the Commission on that
20 particular issue in reference to a specific plant, but
21 obviously that will have generic implications.

22 I don't want to open up the whole KI thing
23 again, but you had a question on it and, hopefully,
24 it's just a straightforward question. Is there
25 anybody who can just give us a quick answer to the

1 question that Suzanne had about KI?

2 MR. CONKLIN: There is no quick answer,
3 because it's a complex issue.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

5 MR. CONKLIN: With regard to protective
6 measures for exposure to KI and uptake and intake of
7 KI, even within the 10 miles, when you look at the
8 release probabilities and the accident scenarios, you
9 cannot just say there is or is not a risk out to five
10 miles or 10 miles or 20 miles. You have to look at
11 the local terrain, the meteorology, the release
12 conditions. A whole number of factors really
13 determine what the risk is at any one point, whether
14 it's one mile or 10 miles or 20 miles.

15 What I am saying is that there are
16 alternatives to protecting the public from KI,
17 embargoing of crops, holding of the milk if it gets
18 contaminated, evacuation of the people, because if you
19 have enough KI out there to be a concern, most of the
20 time, from what I can remember, you have got a lot of
21 other radionuclides out there that may be causing more
22 damage and more risk.

23 So as part of this process, it's a state
24 decision about whether or not they implement KI within
25 their 10 miles, and our recommendation is for the

1 communities and the state and locals to look at their
2 situation, make a determination for themselves on what
3 they want to do and take a look at all the
4 alternatives for using KI or protecting the public in
5 another method, and Section 127 of the Bioterrorism
6 Act, paragraph F, if I remember right, provides that
7 option.

8 And even if you look at the National
9 Academy of Sciences report, it says that there is no
10 question that KI is effective. Nobody debates that if
11 you take it early enough and then you're exposed to
12 iodine-131 it will help protect the thyroid. There is
13 no debate about that. The debate is the best way to
14 protect the people, a risk management decision. And
15 as you make the decision, you should take into
16 consideration all the various factors and the
17 considerations for your particular locality.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And I'm
19 sorry, but I don't want to open up a whole discussion
20 on KI at this point. We visited it yesterday. I want
21 to see who else is here who has comments in the
22 audience and since we're on New Jersey, I guess we'll
23 go to Jill.

24 MS. LIPOTI: Thanks, Chip. I thought that
25 Bob Moody's presentation was very good and I feel that

1 we have shortchanged any discussion on the questions
2 that he ended with. And in particular, there were
3 three discussion questions that he posed to the
4 audience. The first one is how can responsibilities
5 of licensees and state, local and tribal officials be
6 clarified relative to protective actions?

7 I'm not sure they need clarification and
8 I guess the first question that I think we need to
9 answer is do the responsibilities need clarification
10 and if so, how? I would like to propose that since we
11 really don't have the time to answer all of these
12 questions, because we need to move on to other issues,
13 that we have some sort of subcommittee or subgroup
14 that looks at that question that includes state, local
15 and tribal officials, that includes the licensees, so
16 that we can try to move forward on it.

17 Similarly, how can sheltering be more
18 clearly defined? I think there are a lot of us who
19 are wrestling with exactly that question and what we
20 need are some sample EAS messages and some sample
21 press releases and a small group can perhaps delve
22 into the issue in depth and make some progress on it.
23 And the last one about guidance related to updating
24 the use of the evacuation time estimates, I guess,
25 again, the first question is do we need to enhance

1 that guidance, and then the second question is how
2 should it be enhanced?

3 So I'm really suggesting a continuation of
4 the discussion, but one that gets into more depth and
5 I will leave that for your consideration. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Jill, and
7 could you just tell us your position and who you are
8 there. I don't know if you want people to know.

9 MS. LIPOTI: I am the Assistant Director
10 in the New Jersey Department of Environmental
11 Protection. I'm in charge of radiation protection and
12 release prevention for chemicals. Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
14 And I will add that suggestion to the NRC take-away.
15 Yes, sir?

16 MR. UFREY: I am Elgan Ufrey with the
17 Tennessee Emergency Management Agency. I have worked
18 with the REP Program for 25 years. These discussions
19 are ludicrous, if you want to call them discussions,
20 are ludicrous. The state is responsible or the local
21 Government is responsible for the health of the
22 people, and if you have not considered all of these
23 ramifications in your decision making, then you're not
24 doing your job.

25 To sit up here and denigrate the work that

1 has been done over the past 25 years is a disservice
2 to your community and to the people that serve your
3 communities. We who work in the state Governments and
4 local Governments are trying our dead level best to
5 provide guidance and protection to the public, and if
6 you don't believe that then we can't convince you of
7 it, I'm sure, but we do take all these things into
8 consideration.

9 When I received, and I have worked as a
10 director and control officer in the State Emergency
11 Operations Center, when we receive the recommendation
12 from the utility, we look at that recommendation, but
13 it's not gospel. We consider all of the other factors
14 that have to go into that. We consider whether the
15 roads are closed or not. We consider whether it's a
16 school day or not, and we have done this prior to
17 coming into an emergency situation.

18 So we have all of these factors in our
19 plans, in our head and it's not the utility says this
20 is what you have to do. The utility, looking at their
21 capability to determine what the status of the plant
22 is, gives us some insight as to what's going on, but
23 it's our decision and our recommendations that the
24 public is going to hear.

25 A lady asked about public information

1 releases. If you don't have those public information
2 releases already preplanned and ready to go, you
3 haven't done your job. We have a book that thick full
4 of them covering most any situation, and local
5 Government have plans not only for nuclear power
6 plants, but they have emergency plans for a lot of
7 contingencies. You don't just jump up and say okay,
8 we have got an emergency, what are we going to do?
9 They know what they are going to do prior to that.

10 You talk about going beyond the 10 miles.
11 We have looked at that. That's why communities have
12 emergency plans, so if something unexpected happens,
13 they are prepared to respond to it. We have looked at
14 going out 25, 30 miles and we can do that.

15 You talked about KI. The State of
16 Tennessee was one of the first ones in the country to
17 distribute KI. We distributed it. The health
18 department went door-to-door delivering KI. They did
19 that for several years. Then they pulled back and
20 said okay, if you want it, we'll put it in our health
21 departments in the communities. Less than 10 percent
22 of the people wanted it. Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, thank you,
24 sir, for those insights from the state Government
25 standpoint, and I think -- are we're going to Ohio?

1 Please, introduce yourself.

2 MR. GREER: Thank you. My name is Jim
3 Greer and I'm the Emergency Management Director from
4 Ottawa County, which is in Ohio, or the home of the
5 Davis-Besse nuclear power station. I have a laundry
6 list of items that have been bothering me for the last
7 two days and I will try to keep it brief.

8 First of all, I'm disappointed that there
9 isn't a more visible FEMA presence in the room. I
10 know that Bill King got called to other duty. I can
11 understand that, but for 26 years I have been working
12 through the State Emergency Management Agency who in
13 turn works with FEMA to oversee our exercises and our
14 plans, and I think they should have a more visible
15 presence here.

16 Second, I would like to reiterate. We do
17 need a clear definition for sheltering, because it's
18 used in so many different ways in different
19 situations. Third, I really got fired up yesterday
20 when the Witt report was referenced. I worked for
21 years when James Lee Witt was in charge of FEMA,
22 conducted exercises that his agency said met the
23 criteria.

24 My emergency plan met the criteria that I
25 was protecting the health and safety of the public and

1 everything was fine, and then James Lee Witt became a
2 consultant and told the people who were paying him
3 several hundred thousand dollars exactly what they
4 wanted to hear, and that is that the emergency plans
5 were worthless and that the exercises didn't prove
6 anything. If nothing else, he probably ought to give
7 his salary back to FEMA for all the years that he was
8 telling everybody everything was okay.

9 This morning, I think it was, the term
10 crisis in public confidence was used. I just urge
11 you. You have heard the terminology several times
12 over the last two days that one size does not fit all,
13 and maybe it's a regionalized thing. I agree with the
14 gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from Iowa.

15 We had a recent event at Davis-Besse,
16 which was pretty significant to say the least, but we
17 dealt with it as emergency planners. The NRC dealt
18 with it. The state dealt with it and we held public
19 meetings monthly for about a year and a half, and I'm
20 here to tell you the majority of the people, 99
21 percent of the people who stood up and complained and
22 said that the plans won't work and so forth, were
23 people from Washington who flew in. They were people
24 from Indiana who flew in.

25 The local people trust the people at the

1 plant. They have friends that work there. They have
2 family who works there. They trust them. They trust
3 in the emergency plan. They believe it will work and,
4 you know, if it wouldn't work, we haven't been doing
5 our jobs for 26 years.

6 Again, I urge you, don't make these
7 generalizations. I'm sorry for the people who live in
8 Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey who may or may not
9 believe in their emergency plan. It may or may not
10 work. I'm sorry about the situation there, but that's
11 your situation. It's not the situation in Ohio. We
12 don't need regulations changed to force us to do
13 things to protect health and safety. We're already
14 doing that. We have the people's confidence that we
15 are doing it.

16 And finally, I know you don't want to open
17 this up again, but regarding sirens, it's one small
18 piece of the puzzle for notifying the public. We and
19 our community use the Emergency Alert System. We use
20 NOAA Weather Alert radios. We have a reverse call out
21 system. It's the Community Alert Network. I caution
22 you from using the term reverse 911, because there is
23 a company out there called Reverse 911, and we heard
24 from their attorneys when the newspapers were calling
25 our system reverse 911.

1 But at any rate, we have those systems in
2 place and what I preach when I go out to do talks, to
3 service organizations and the schools and so forth, is
4 if you want to make sure you're notified, you buy a
5 tone activated Weather Alert radio, because if the
6 power is knocked out to the sirens, you're going to
7 get notified. If it's a hazardous material incident,
8 you're going to get notified. If it's a tornado
9 warning, you're going to get notified. If it's a
10 power plant accident, you're going to get notified.

11 And I really view it as no different than
12 smoke detectors in the home. In general, people don't
13 come to the Government and ask them to provide smoke
14 detectors. They do it because it's a way to protect
15 their family. And if we did hand out Weather Alert
16 radios, what are we going to do then? We're going to
17 force us to go in, make sure that they are plugged in,
18 make sure that the battery backup is there.

19 I'm not a believer in battery backups for
20 sirens. We put 32 sirens in at our county's expense.
21 We didn't do it and we had a reason why we didn't do
22 it. Don't force us to do that. Don't force us to go
23 to electronic sirens. Don't force us to use sirens
24 that have voice capabilities. We investigated all
25 those things. We don't want to do them. We can

1 notify our public. There is really no need to change
2 the regulations. Thank you.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, sir. I'm
4 going to take two more and then we'll come back to
5 you. Yes, sir?

6 MR. LIMA: I'm Gary Lima. I'm with the
7 State of Tennessee. I'm over the REP Program and I
8 just want to add a couple of comments to what Al
9 Genershy from Tennessee Emergency Management said. He
10 has been there. He has been there over 25 years, so
11 he saw our nuclear industry from its inception. I'm
12 looking at it with eight years in the program and, as
13 of a year ago, in charge of the program, and I want to
14 say this.

15 I'm glad to go back to Tennessee, to the
16 Land of Milk and Honey. I sat there. My purpose was
17 to find out what I don't know yet and see if I can
18 check off what we're doing, and I could mentally just
19 check off, check off. What I believe is very
20 necessary is a relationship. We have a strong
21 relationship with NRC. We have a strong relationship
22 with our oversight, FEMA, whatever they become
23 effective 1 October, it will be the same people, and
24 we have an excellent relationship with Tennessee
25 Valley Authority.

1 In Tennessee our utility is our family and
2 we trust them implicitly, and we have the same issues
3 in our planning we always consider and we exercise.
4 We always consider the what ifs and we take the
5 recommendations with a real level teaspoon of respect
6 and we'll do what we believe is best for our people.
7 We're a strongly 10th Amendment oriented state. We
8 appreciate the help from the Federal Government, but
9 ultimately those people are our responsibility. So
10 the relationship of local Government and state is very
11 intense and we're, quite frankly, very hard on
12 ourselves.

13 If I make a mistake in my thinking, they
14 are going to make sure I know about it and that's how
15 we work. Referencing KI, and this is a positive note.
16 If it wasn't for Patricia Milligan with NRC, we
17 wouldn't have right now KI for 100 percent of our
18 population. We have planned evacuation for 20
19 percent, the standard for 10 miles. We had an
20 opportunity, because of our relationship, to access KI
21 for 100 percent of two 10 mile EPZs.

22 You know, even though our plan doesn't
23 call for some fantastic plume beyond 50 miles, but
24 I'll bet you with that 100 percent of KI available,
25 whatever that plume projection is or actual path,

1 we're going to be able to provide KI. As Al said, we
2 were probably the first state, as I understand, in
3 that business.

4 So what I want to say is it's a
5 relationship issue. We want our people to trust us
6 and we believe they do. We also want to trust those
7 who are providing guidance from the Federal
8 Government, but we ultimately accept one
9 responsibility. Those people are our people and we're
10 the ones that are going to take care of them.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. This
12 won't be the last time we're out here, but let me go
13 to this woman and then on my way back we're going to
14 hear from that gentleman and then Nader, I think, you
15 and Craig want to start off on NREP. Okay. Yes,
16 ma'am, please, introduce yourself.

17 MS. STOTALA: Thank you. I'm Cathy
18 Stotala. I'm with the State of Iowa Homeland Security
19 Emergency Management Division. I don't get very often
20 to say I'm really happy to be from Iowa and a
21 representative up at the table has proven that today.
22 Thank you, Ned. Just one comment for the lady from
23 New Jersey. I'm not quite sure what company you are
24 with, but each state is required to submit an annual
25 letter of certification every year and part of that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 certification is to look at the population densities
2 and the changes and to make sure their plans are in
3 accordance with what populations and what special
4 facilities and such that we have. So it's not
5 overlooked by the licensee. It's looked at at the
6 local and state level. It's done on an annual basis.
7 Every year we look at the population and how it has
8 changed over the last year.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. If you,
10 Suzanne, need to get more information, please, to talk
11 with her and Suzanne is New Jersey PIRG, Public
12 Interest Research Group. On my way back here, I'm
13 going to touch base with this gentleman and then
14 Nader, would you -- do you want to start your thing?
15 Yes, sir.

16 DR. MOUSSA: I'm Dr. Frank Moussa. I
17 represent the State of Kansas Emergency Management and
18 we have a nuclear power plant. Wolf Creek is our
19 nuclear power plant in the state. We do a number of
20 things that helps to alleviate that public distrust.
21 One, we do have joint radiological monitoring teams
22 that are comprised of the county, state, as well as
23 plant officials in our EOF, Emergency Operation
24 Facility.

25 We have county, state and utility people

1 that work side-by-side. The data is available to
2 everyone. We don't pre-distribute KI to the public,
3 because we have a very strong advocate position that
4 we will evacuate well before there is an eminent
5 release. And KI is only to protect you against
6 specific radionuclide.

7 I'm hearing a lot of good discussion and
8 I've been involved with the programs since the plant
9 basically came into licensing. And I want to continue
10 that relationship and I recognize the work by my
11 fellow emergency management people here around and I
12 sure would not want to give the impression that we
13 don't take our jobs seriously. Not only do we do the
14 drills, but we also do drills that are not announced
15 or not regulated. We're in the plant every quarter,
16 we're doing a drill.

17 The plans are reviewed by the public. At
18 any time they can review the plans. I don't want to
19 belittle the work that the states have done with the--
20 to protect the public and if there is a perception
21 that there is not any work being done or what the work
22 of NRC has been done as not to be recognized, I think
23 that's a sad day when we are giving the public that
24 perception.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Doctor,

1 and thank all of you for those comments. Nader, what
2 do you want?

3 MR. MAMISH: I think Craig and I would
4 like to take five minutes and give people, you know,
5 time to take a short break.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do you want to give
7 people a short break to get coffee?

8 MR. MAMISH: Yes, and Craig and I would
9 like to shorten our discussion, so that we can give as
10 much time as possible.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'll tell you what,
12 it's about 9:50. Everybody be back by 10:00, please,
13 and we'll start with NREP. Thank you.

14 (Whereupon, at 9:47 a.m. a recess until
15 10:08 a.m.)

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Everybody,
17 we're going to get started and this part of the
18 proceeding is to give state and local Governments an
19 opportunity to talk with NRC and FEMA, because this is
20 an extension of a meeting that took place somewhat
21 some months ago, the NREP meeting, and you're going to
22 hear more about that.

23 I would just also note that for those of
24 you that we don't get to, there are cards back there
25 for questions and comments. I know that that's not as

1 satisfactory perhaps as making your comment to all of
2 us in person, but at least one way to do it. But I
3 think we're going to get to a lot of people now.
4 There is still time to sign up for the remaining
5 tours, I believe, of the operation center, if you want
6 to do that. And with that, I'm going to turn it over
7 to Nader and Craig. Nader?

8 MR. MAMISH: Thank you, Chip. As you
9 mentioned, Craig and I hosted a workshop at the NREP,
10 the National Emergency Preparedness Conference in
11 Harrisburg last April. Craig and I fielded a number
12 of questions, concerns, good ideas on how we can
13 improve things and we talked about the fact that
14 overseeing the public is everyone's job. It's NRC,
15 FEMA, state and local and the public in ensuring
16 everyone's safety. And we do recognize that state and
17 local folks have a pretty challenging job and we
18 respect all the things that you do and we thank you
19 for taking your job so seriously.

20 Craig, any opening remarks?

21 MR. CONKLIN: None. No, I'm just looking
22 forward to continuing the dialogue on these issues
23 that we are about to bring up.

24 MR. MAMISH: Thank you. The NRC and FEMA
25 took the five issues, all the issues that we feel that

1 during the NREP conference and basically bend them
2 into these five areas: Sharing of sensitive
3 information, resources for implementation, alternative
4 for public alerting, outreach activities and training
5 and informing the public and decision makers.

6 And Craig and I are going to sort of tag
7 team these issues. We're going rather quickly through
8 our presentation to save as much time as possible for
9 comments. Regarding sensitive information, we, the
10 NRC, has worked diligently to share sensitive
11 information with licensees, federal agencies, state
12 and local and tribal governments to enhance the
13 protection of the public. Let me say that we are
14 sincerely interested in providing sensitive
15 information to folks that have a need to know.

16 We have done that well in some cases and
17 not so well in other cases. What I'm here to tell you
18 is we are trying to get better every day. We are
19 working on an internal process to improve the way we
20 disseminate sensitive information and do hope to get
21 all the information to those folks that have a need to
22 know.

23 Next slide. With respect to resources for
24 implementation, I think we can all acknowledge that
25 9/11 presented challenges that many of us had not

1 previously thought of. And those challenges have
2 certainly provided and strained our resources
3 tremendously. I think we talked a little bit
4 yesterday, certainly not enough and we can open it up
5 some more for dialogue today, about the fact that we
6 need to find better ways to get the job done more
7 efficiently and more effectively with the resources
8 that we have. Craig?

9 MR. CONKLIN: Yes, the resource
10 implications are significant for all of us, whether
11 you are a state, local or federal folk, and we need to
12 find a way to maximize the effective use of those
13 resources. I just want to bring to attention that
14 within the Department of Homeland Security we've got
15 an effort undergoing called "Comprehensive Reviews" in
16 which we are doing a review of all 17 critical
17 infrastructure in key resource sectors to identify
18 areas where we can enhance protective measures around
19 those facilities as well as emergency preparedness
20 operations.

21 Through that effort, we hope to identify
22 the areas which can be enhanced the greatest and have
23 the greatest need and then apply the limited resources
24 that DHS has to those areas. The nuclear is the
25 leading sector in that. I'm not going to go into any

1 more detail than that, other than saying that we're
2 going to be doing it for all 63 sites and within the
3 next year and a half to two years, we will visit
4 everyone with a comprehensive team of federal, state
5 folks, FBI, FEMA, NRC to look at these sites from both
6 a security end and an emergency preparedness end.

7 Alternatives, the next one. That is
8 alternatives to public alerting. We have talked a lot
9 about that. There are a lot of technologies out there
10 that we will need to take advantage of and will need
11 to figure out how we can integrate all those
12 technologies so they work together in an effective
13 systematic manner.

14 MR. MAMISH: With respect to outreach
15 activities, I think in previous presentations, some of
16 you heard me say that we have formed an outreach team
17 to go out and help state and local folks, Union of
18 Concerned Scientists, I believe, are going to provide
19 us some good comments and good ideas on how we can do
20 that. We look forward to their ideas. We also want
21 ideas from state and locals on how we can help you
22 with the additional resources that we have.

23 Many of you are aware of our website which
24 we have significantly enhanced, the emergency
25 preparedness website. This public meeting is an

1 example of the openness that we are trying to deal
2 with these issues and certainly Craig and I talk on a
3 routine basis. Our communication has significantly
4 increased over the past year or so. And that's why
5 we're also here today. You see both agencies at this
6 meeting and we continue to work closely with Craig and
7 his staff.

8 MR. CONKLIN: The next slide. Training
9 and informing public and the decision makers.
10 Obviously, public education is key to any effective
11 program. The public needs to know what we mean when
12 we say sheltering, what we mean in evacuation. They
13 need to understand where to go when we do tell them to
14 evacuate. And there are lots of roles and
15 responsibilities here. And as the slide says,
16 licensees should work with their state and local to
17 make sure that the messages are understood, help
18 develop public messages.

19 The state and local folks then need to
20 turn around and work to educate and inform their
21 public and also at the federal, state and local level,
22 we have an obligation to help out at any step along
23 the way, wherever we can, as far as crafting messages
24 and evaluating them and ensuring there is effective
25 systems to get them out. This is a key area and it's

1 a role that we all have to play and we all have an
2 important part to do in making sure that the public is
3 informed, so that when orders come out from the state
4 and locals, the people understand them.

5 If you look at Louisiana right now, for
6 whatever reason, a lot of folks unfortunately did not
7 evacuate. Some of them didn't have cars. Some of
8 them had cars, but decided to stay there, because they
9 have weathered Camille, they have weathered other
10 storms and now, of course, they are in 3 feet of water
11 or 8 feet of water depending on where you are located.
12 So it's key that the messages that we develop and give
13 out are received by an informed and educated public,
14 so that the proper actions can be taken.

15 MR. MAMISH: And I believe we're at the
16 point of taking some questions. Chip?

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Okay.
18 Five issues, right, and we're going to go to --

19 MR. MAMISH: If I could just add real
20 quick?

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

22 MR. MAMISH: We did, as I said, take some
23 concerns at the NREP conference and Craig and I worked
24 closely to address the questions and concerns. We
25 posted those on our website and we welcome any

1 comments or questions, further questions you may have
2 on the responses that we posted.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I see some
4 cards around the table and this is not meant to be an
5 exclusive discussion with states and locals and we
6 will get to those cards. But I think that what I want
7 to do is work the audience to see if there are state
8 and local Government people since these issues are not
9 exclusively state and local Government issues. That's
10 for sure. But since you did just come out of that
11 meeting, let me see if I can get the state and local
12 Government people and then we're going to come to
13 others for discussion on these five issues.

14 State and local Government on any of these
15 issues?

16 MR. EPSTEIN: Rich, can I volunteer you
17 again? You hosted the meeting in Harrisburg, didn't
18 you?

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, you know,
20 you're so lucky to have Eric in your state, you know.

21 MR. EPSTEIN: Neighborhood.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: In your
23 neighborhood.

24 MR. EPSTEIN: Well, former neighborhood.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: But seriously, Rich,

1 do you want to speak to any of the issues? And if you
2 do, you'll have to speak into the mike.

3 MR. JANATI: Well, as far as safeguard
4 information, we have had access to safeguard
5 information on a need to know basis. So we really
6 haven't had any issues with the safeguard information,
7 except the timing of the issuance of safeguard
8 information. Usually happens Friday evening at 5:00
9 p.m. and most of us are not in the office and it has
10 created some issues and problems for us.

11 However, at the same time, having access
12 to safeguard information is fine, but obviously we are
13 responsible for making sure that this is happening in
14 a controlled manner. The states need to be
15 responsible for maintaining the safeguard information.
16 There are some responsibilities associated with it and
17 if you are interested in this information, you need to
18 make sure that you are capable of maintaining this
19 type of information.

20 But again, it's really necessary for
21 states and certain members of the local communities to
22 have access to this type of information, because we
23 are first responders. If something happens, we are
24 the ones who are going to have to respond before
25 anybody else. And also, the timing of it, the times,

1 we need to have the information in a timely manner, so
2 that we are prepared to respond accordingly and
3 responsibly.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Rich, and
5 we're going to go to this gentleman right here. But
6 Rich used the term safeguards information and that's
7 fine. I believe that the term sensitive information
8 is a broader category than just safeguards
9 information. Is that correct, Nader?

10 MR. MAMISH: That is correct.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
12 Yes, sir?

13 MR. VYENIELO: Hi, I'm Marty Vyeniello,
14 Chief Emergency Response for Pennsylvania, ERP. I
15 want to talk a little bit about outreach activity. We
16 had a post-blue exercise last year. We had a TMI
17 exercise this year and we had an outreach with the NRC
18 and with FEMA on both occurrences. The counties
19 thought it was very beneficial. The state thought it
20 was very beneficial. But those outreaches were on
21 what the feds could do for you, okay.

22 We didn't get into the details of how they
23 do it. And that's when you exercise with each other.
24 So outreach is good, exercise is better. And we would
25 like to see more exercise with our partners at the

1 NRC, with FEMA, with as many federal players as
2 possible, because that's reality. That's real life.
3 And the little intricacies of multiple med towers, NRC
4 doing those projections, comparing those projects
5 between the NRC, the utility and the state would
6 actually happen. So more exercise is what
7 Pennsylvania needs.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead.

9 MR. JANATI: Pennsylvania, we have nine
10 regional task forces and it's my understanding that
11 those regional task forces they conduct periodic
12 drills and exercises. And I think it would be a good
13 idea for the appropriate agencies to participate in
14 select exercises and drills with the local officials.
15 I think it would be very beneficial. I'm not sure if
16 that's happening. But if it's not, I strongly
17 recommend that, you know, we do that.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Is it a question of
19 perhaps the federal agencies don't know when those
20 nine task forces are going to be doing things?

21 MR. JANATI: That's part of it and
22 probably maybe lack of communication as far as what
23 the task forces are doing and how many of them are out
24 there and all that sort of thing. I think it requires
25 some additional communications. Yes, I believe so.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Thank
2 you, Rich. Other states or local Governments out here
3 who want to address these five broad issues? Let's go
4 right up here to this gentleman.

5 MR. BEVIL: Chip, I have a question.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Just tell us, I know
7 you, but tell them.

8 MR. BEVIL: Okay. Well, this is
9 specifically for Craig. Regarding alternatives to
10 public.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: They want to know
12 who you are.

13 MR. BEVIL: Oh.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Just introduce
15 yourself.

16 MR. BEVIL: I'm Bernie Bevil from the
17 State of Arkansas.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

19 MR. BEVIL: Craig, I have a question
20 regarding the alternates to public alerting regarding
21 changes to the system where we're to discuss with FEMA
22 prior to the implementation. Is there more of a
23 formal review process besides just a discussion?
24 Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Bernie.

1 MR. CONKLIN: If you're going to be using
2 or if you're going to be changing the system that
3 you've got in place around your facility, for example,
4 if your initial system was designed to be all sirens,
5 for example, any significant changes to that system
6 need to be reviewed and approved by FEMA through a
7 formal alert notification system review process.

8 If your system included sirens and tone
9 alert radios and you make a change, again, any
10 significant changes need to be reviewed and approved
11 by us. And that's an excellent question, because
12 that's an area in which we actually have some concerns
13 that changes are actually being made to some systems
14 without proper notification of us at the headquarters
15 and regional level. And we have worked hard lately to
16 improve what we define to be a significant change.

17 So yes, there is a formal process for
18 that. It has worked through the regional components
19 of the REP Program and then once they have done their
20 review, they provide the recommendations to
21 headquarters for us to concur on.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, Nader, did you
23 want to add to that?

24 MR. MAMISH: No, not to add to it. I want
25 to go back real quick to the issue of sharing

1 sensitive information with state and locals. After
2 the NREP meeting we came back and talked with some of
3 our security folks in an attempt to try to do better
4 in terms of dissemination of such information. Can
5 people here tell me whether there are any other, any
6 specific examples since April time frame of cases
7 where we didn't do as well as you would have liked us
8 to have done?

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And we're
10 going to pick. We'll pick that up. We're going to go
11 to Massachusetts right now. And if you have, besides
12 what else you are going to say, any examples in
13 response to Nader's point, please, tell us that, too.
14 Yes, sir?

15 MR. GIARRUSSO: John Giarrusso, Mass.
16 Emergency Management. I'm new with the Agency for
17 about a month. Sharing sensitive information, in my
18 past life working with the utility, one of the things
19 I would like to see is specifically when it comes down
20 to security type items, it needs to be that sharing of
21 safeguards information back and forth, I think, with
22 the state agency.

23 I know what we had to go through when
24 safeguards information came out at the plant, but that
25 needs to be -- we have to make sure that is

1 ultimately, in my case, Mass. Emergency Management,
2 that's the type of criteria there. So I know it's
3 sensitive information safeguards, especially in a
4 security event.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much.
6 Let's go to this gentleman right here. Yes, sir,
7 please, introduce yourself.

8 MR. NAWOJ: Yes, I'm Mike Nawoj. I'm with
9 the New Hampshire Department of Safety, Bureau of
10 Emergency Management. And I would say right off the
11 top that since April we have been getting more than
12 our share of sensitive information. We really
13 appreciate that. That has been helpful.

14 I think I agree with John that we -- no,
15 that comes from NRC. Sensitive information from the
16 utilities and from Homeland Security seems to get
17 caught up in another web, and I think we have to work
18 harder to connect those lines.

19 On the sharing of sensitive information,
20 I think we see that in conjunction with the terrorist
21 attack information. We believe there may be precursor
22 information and that that should be coming to the
23 states and perhaps to the utilities as well. And
24 there may be even a function where the states would be
25 putting critical infrastructure facilities, include

1 nuclear utilities, on notice for more scrutiny of
2 those kind of situations, rather than the other way
3 around, they notifying us and we say oh, shucks. So
4 we would like you to perhaps consider that aspect.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
6 sir. Nader and Craig, did you pick up on that and do
7 you have a comment, Craig?

8 MR. CONKLIN: With regard to Homeland
9 Security, Homeland Security has funded top secret
10 clearances in at least five positions within each
11 state and Government. They have provided the funding
12 to get those clearances. They have established
13 classified communications networks with the Homeland
14 Security Offices in the states and there are routine
15 communications between the Homeland Security
16 Operations Center and their integration folks with the
17 state folks as the need arises, based on the threat
18 information, the threats that we get from the National
19 Security Agency, CIA, FBI, and those kind of things.

20 Once they have been vetted and reviewed
21 and approved for those areas, closed communications
22 with the state and with the selected folks, folks
23 being selected primarily by the Governor of the State
24 as to who should have those clearances, and then they
25 are supposed to communicate downward within their

1 chain of command the appropriate information as they
2 deem appropriate.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
4 Craig. State and local Government in the audience on
5 the five issues? And this is Ohio.

6 MS. O'CLAIRE: Hi, I'm Carol O'Claire. I
7 spoke yesterday a little bit. I am from Ohio
8 Emergency Management Agency. I have, I guess, a
9 couple concerns/questions. In sharing of information,
10 I get a lot of safeguarded information and some of
11 that information pertains to power plants. My concern
12 is that during an emergency, the sharing of the
13 information we need from the nuclear power plants to
14 the states and if that safeguarded information, can
15 that information be discussed between the utility and
16 the state, and how that would take place? Whether it
17 would be over a secure line. I'm not sure all the
18 plants have a secure line to discuss classified, well,
19 safeguarded information or not.

20 And the other thing I wanted to talk about
21 is I've been aware of a facilitated two day Tabletop
22 Outreach Program, and I was hoping that that's still
23 being offered to the states. We're looking at an
24 ingestion exercise in 2006 and are attempting to
25 receive that facilitated tabletop exercise that goes

1 over two days where we actually find out how our
2 federal partners are going to interface with the state
3 and local people. Thank you.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Thank you.
5 Nader and/or Alan, do you want to address either of
6 those? I think people might want to know about the
7 two day, also. And introduce yourself.

8 MR. MADISON: I'm Alan Madison. I'm Chief
9 of Mitigating Measures and Integrative Response in the
10 Division of Nuclear Security. I'm not aware of the
11 two day workshop. Maybe somebody else can answer that
12 question. But with regard to the sharing of
13 information during an event, we have shared during
14 events information of classified nature. If the
15 secure phone is available, that would be the
16 appropriate route to go. But in circumstances, if
17 there's an emergency need, we can share classified
18 information over an open line with those who have a
19 need to know and we have and will do that in the
20 future.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I think that
22 addresses the one point very well. Thank you, Alan.
23 Anybody have information, do you know what she is
24 talking about when she talked about the two day
25 tabletop?

1 MR. MAMISH: I'm not aware of the two day
2 tabletop. We'll look into it and get back to you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Craig, is that the
4 conference?

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Craig, may have
6 something.

7 MR. CONKLIN: Yeah, but the microphone
8 here --

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Don't eat that.

10 MR. CONKLIN: I don't know. I'm not sure.
11 I don't know if you're talking about a FRMAC type
12 tabletop exercise or if you're talking about the
13 integrated exercises that we're doing with EP and
14 security?

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Let's get some more
16 clarification then.

17 MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

18 MS. O'CLAIRE: I'm sorry I wasn't very
19 clear. It's an NRC Outreach Program. Before the
20 ingestion exercises, the NRC will come out and do an
21 outreach with the states. And it used to be just a
22 one day Outreach Program. And I've heard that now it
23 is a two day facilitated Tabletop Outreach Program.
24 And I was hoping that is still being offered.

25 MR. CONKLIN: Yes, I'm very familiar with

1 what I would consider the routine outreaches we do
2 before the biennial exercises and such. But I'm not
3 that familiar with the concept that you're talking
4 about about a two day facilitated tabletop. That's a
5 lot more involved than I would have thought. So let
6 me check on it from my end and if you have a point of
7 contact that we can get in touch with, if you know
8 somebody who is organizing this, let me know.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sure that she
10 will provide cards and information.

11 MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I guess I would
13 also, if there is such a thing, it sounds like you
14 would want to recommend that as a useful thing. So
15 you can put that on your -- Pat, do you have
16 information on this?

17 MR. MULLIGAN: I do, Chip. If I could for
18 a little bit?

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead.

20 MR. MULLIGAN: There was a working group
21 that the CRCPD was involved with and it was a joint
22 effort between NRC and FEMA. I believe Dan Wilcox was
23 on that committee, so he would probably know something
24 about it. We had a working group. FRMAC has been the
25 lead on presenting those outreaches. They did

1 incorporate into that one day outreach as a pilot, a
2 tabletop exercise that would be incorporated into it.

3 We have looked at that and we're --
4 currently that working group is undertaking the
5 responsibility of modifying the Outreach Program to
6 include a lot of the other agencies that have been
7 folded in with the most significant being the advisory
8 team and the new initiatives with the advisory team.
9 So it's going to be a two day program and I'm not sure
10 when that is going to be rolled out. The working
11 group is still meeting on that. But it's going to be
12 an outreach combined with probably a one day tabletop
13 is what it's looking like.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So it sounds like
15 CRCPD may be a focal point for that then?

16 MR. MULLIGAN: That and FRMAC.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And FRMAC.

18 MR. MULLIGAN: But it is a multi-agency
19 task force.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Great.
21 Other state and local Government comments on these
22 issues? We want to make sure that we hear from any
23 state or local Government. And we will come up to the
24 state and local Government and others at the table.
25 I just want to make sure that everybody in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 audience gets an opportunity to talk to any of these
2 issues that you wish to talk to, at least from state
3 and local Government, at this point.

4 Anybody else here on these issues? Okay.
5 Let's start at the table with, Ned. Did you have
6 something you wanted to say on these issues?

7 MR. WRIGHT: I was just checking on one
8 thing. At the NREP, we did talk about and I'm not
9 sure, I just want for clarification, it was brought up
10 about commenting to the Director of Homeland Security
11 to the public, through the media, within 30 minutes.
12 Is that -- I'm looking at the Executive Summary and
13 maybe that would be something for Craig, you and I
14 later, but I was concerned about the comment about
15 getting to the national media very quickly while this
16 thing is still ongoing.

17 MR. CONKLIN: Yeah, the Secretary of
18 Homeland Security, when it was Secretary Ridge and I'm
19 sure it's continuing, any time that there is an
20 Incident of National Significance and we just had our
21 first one with the hurricane, the Secretary of DHS has
22 a goal of getting on with the media within an hour of
23 that event and laying out what DHS will be doing and
24 the role it will be taking to respond to the
25 situation. Because they have a strong feeling that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there would be for an Incident of National
2 Significance, there will be a quick need to respond in
3 a public manner to let people know what the Federal
4 Government is going to be doing to that activity.

5 MR. MAMISH: I look at that and in some
6 cases I understand where that's going. Our concern
7 and this is based on something that just happened to
8 us recently. We had an Amber Alert. In the late
9 evening, I think it was around 11:00 at night, and it
10 was put out and the local law enforcement was
11 overwhelmed by the national media trying to get more
12 information that they couldn't -- you know, all the
13 phone lines were jammed up.

14 And my concern as I'm looking through
15 this, just as it was written without any other thing,
16 is saying that if there was an incident and based on
17 some of the situations we talked about, the
18 information flow going up to the federal level, that
19 if it's announced to the national media before we are
20 ready to -- you know, there's no PIO there and stuff
21 like that, I'm just looking at having an overwhelming
22 input -- influx of calls from the national media, from
23 the Washington area that would limit us in doing our
24 job, just because we're so overwhelmed.

25 And I'm looking at this event that just

1 happened with us that steps were missed in what they
2 were supposed to do with the Amber Alert, because the
3 one watch commander, because the general command group
4 was not there, one guy was trying to juggle all these
5 things and he missed a step. And then later, he got
6 tacked to the wall because, gee, you know, in the 20
7 things he was supposed to have done, he skipped number
8 17.

9 And I'm just concerned that with -- and I
10 understand about getting the information to the
11 public, to the national media, but I'm also concerned
12 that as soon as that word goes out that something
13 happened in X county or X city, unless the major
14 cities that are operating on a 24 hour basis,
15 Washington, New York, etcetera, that we would get so
16 inundated with calls that we couldn't even -- you
17 know, our phone lines would be so jammed with incoming
18 calls and you can't just, you know, turn them all off.
19 I mean, because you don't know which one is important
20 and which one is not. So I would ask that that also
21 be looked at as just a concern from area.

22 MR. CONKLIN: That's a point taken. I'll
23 take that back. I think one of the key things to
24 remember is that an Incident of National Significance
25 is going to be a rare thing. We had train derailments

1 in which six, seven, eight people got killed. DHS was
2 not on the news saying what they were going to do. We
3 had tornados and other types of national events that
4 killed people and ruined communities. We're not INS.
5 Katrina here was formally declared an INS yesterday,
6 I guess it was. So these are going to be rare events.

7 In talking and working through this issue
8 with the NRC and same tabletops with Assistant
9 Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, Bob Stephan,
10 we have come to a determination mostly that until you
11 have pretty much an actual release from a site, you're
12 not an INS yet. So it's going to get very high before
13 we look at thinking about declaring an INS for a
14 nuclear power plant accident.

15 We have actually had tabletops, Roy
16 Zimmerman was there, I was there, some of what we call
17 the integration staff from DHS were there along with
18 Mr. Stephan, and it's going to be a pretty significant
19 event and you all will be well into the response
20 before it gets declared an INS, the way we project
21 things are going.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: That clarifies just
23 looking at the Executive Summary. Thank you. That
24 clarifies that.

25 MR. MAMISH: Yeah, I think you have to

1 enter into general emergency before we're actually
2 into an Incident of National Significance.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
4 Let's go to Eric and then we'll go to Rochelle and
5 Mary. Eric?

6 MR. EPSTEIN: Thanks. And I appreciate
7 the opportunity to speak. I have to leave early to
8 attend to a medical emergency at home, so I would like
9 to address this and then just make a couple of
10 comments, if that's okay.

11 About the outreach, one of the things that
12 we have done, and hopefully you won't find this too
13 confrontational, is we have challenged the public to
14 take an active role in their own security. Too often
15 I get asked what are you doing for me and I'm
16 challenging people to say well, what are you doing for
17 yourself? And I think that includes emergency
18 planning as well. So we have done some public service
19 announcements where we have asked people to go through
20 a specific checklist to prepare for an emergency, but
21 not just to be passive.

22 And whether you believe it or not, the
23 public likes it when we agree. The media may not, but
24 the public finds it soothing. When we partnered with
25 Exelon to secure \$2 million worth of sirens, there was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 no media coverage. When I did a press release saying
2 that somebody's elbow fell on a computer and put all
3 the sirens down, it was front page news.

4 So when we are talking about how to handle
5 the media and this is not to disparage the medias out
6 there, they prefer conflict to cohesion. Just
7 something to keep in mind when we're doing the
8 planning.

9 I have a couple of suggestions that have
10 worked for us when it comes to emergency planning.
11 And one of the ways I think to disburse sparse
12 resources is to attend dedicated meetings or
13 associations. In Pennsylvania, we have the -- for
14 instance, most of the people involved in planning get
15 together every year for a borough's association
16 meeting, a county association meeting, the fire
17 police. You can get to a very important public once
18 by just addressing these folks.

19 Furthermore, what we have done is we have
20 had these programs broadcast on cable access and PCN.
21 So you are not only hitting your target audience, but
22 it's going out repeatedly without you having to
23 continually go out and engage folks. I would also
24 encourage you to update hospitals. One of the
25 complaints I have gotten is that these are the people

1 that are going to have to deal with medically ill
2 folks and some of them are within 10 miles, so you may
3 want to have dedicated meetings or strategy for the
4 hospitals as well.

5 I don't know if any other community does
6 it. I presume they do. The phonebook has been really
7 useful for us. Everybody in our community knows the
8 emergency plan is in the phonebook and that's the way
9 it has been for the last 26 years and there's also
10 emergency directions there. Maybe it sounds silly,
11 but there is frequently asked questions, what to do,
12 where to go.

13 And it would be just something, frankly,
14 I think I would suggest -- the final thing we have
15 done and maybe this is just Pennsylvania-specific is
16 that there are booths at the Farm Show, at the Boating
17 Show, next to the people that do CPR demonstrations,
18 people welcoming. They welcome the information.

19 In closing, I would just remind everybody
20 that we are all supposed to be partners here and I
21 don't feel like we are very partnerisk after two days.
22 And I think the only way this thing works is if we do
23 it together. And to that end, I would suggest if
24 anything comes out of this two day conference, is we
25 do what we did after the TMI accident and that was a

1 TMI Advisory Panel. It was sponsored by the NRC. We
2 met quarterly. There was an agenda.

3 Chip, this is not meant to disparage you,
4 but people got two minutes and that was it. I
5 subscribe to the two minutes and shut up. See, I have
6 already exceeded that. Yes, right, right, right. Do
7 what I say. But it was a really good way and I think
8 it would be good here for us to get to know one
9 another. We all have different concerns and it seemed
10 to me that the last two days were rather combative and
11 acrimonious. That's just my perspective.

12 I was hoping we could be more constructive
13 and engaged and I'm not coming away with that. I
14 think the only way to do that is if we meet on a
15 regular basis, get to know one another and move
16 forward. I think we all want to get to the same
17 place. I'm not leaving today with a great deal of
18 confidence that we're a coherent team. It seems to me
19 that there is warring factions and I don't have the
20 answer for it. Chip, I would suggest a TMI Advisory
21 Panel.

22 If Dr. Mike Masnik is around, he
23 coordinated it for 13 years. He had an awful hair
24 cut, but other than that did a nice job. And Rich
25 Janati's predecessors were there, Tom Gerewsky and

1 Bill Dornsife. But I mean, that's my plea for
2 cohesion and to be constructively engaged. I would
3 also agree with you, Mary. I think one and a half
4 days to deal with these topics was clearly not enough.

5 Again, I apologize for leaving. You have
6 my card if you need to get a hold of me. And thanks
7 for the opportunity.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
9 you, Eric, for your participation and unfortunately I
10 think Mike still has the same hair cut.

11 MR. EPSTEIN: Yes, but does Jeff Benjamin?

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You can take that
13 card with you.

14 MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: But remember also
16 this is a beginning and I think your suggestion and
17 some other suggestions we heard about further
18 meetings, subcommittees, that that's going to be
19 something that may be helpful if we can do it to try
20 to promote the collaboration that you are talking
21 about. And sometimes it's a larger issue than just
22 getting together at a meeting, too, but I think we
23 have talked and people need to perhaps start
24 listening, too, to each other. And we need to get
25 together to do that.

1 Okay. Rochelle and Mary?

2 MS. BECKER: Yes, I have, first, a
3 question on your -- oh, the slide is down, but it was
4 alternatives for public alerting. And I was wondering
5 what the alternatives for public alerting with no
6 power are. Assuming we have no electricity, then I'm
7 wondering what they are. And I know -- and then a
8 suggestion would be during our energy fiasco in
9 California a few years ago, the utilities were charged
10 with helping people save energy. And to that end,
11 there were many drop off points or collection points
12 where you could go and trade in a regular lightbulb
13 for a compact florescent lightbulb.

14 And I think that we do need to admit that
15 sheltering is going to be one of those alternatives
16 that we need to work with. And to have something like
17 Eric suggested and have some sort of a discount, it
18 was not only cars that kept people from evacuating, it
19 was the ability to afford gas, and that was before it
20 was \$3.50 a gallon evidently today.

21 So I think that those things need to be
22 taken into consideration, but you have to train the
23 public that they need something in their home that is
24 not something that they plug in, because we all have
25 octopuses that you plug everything into. And so I

1 think it's important if you're going to train people
2 that sheltering is an option to also give them the
3 tools to shelter and get that information.

4 And I don't think that alternatives for
5 alerting if you have no power are going to be great,
6 so I think that in order for them to help themselves,
7 they need to have the tools to help themselves or at
8 least know that they need to have those tools. And
9 that could be difficult in some areas.

10 MR. CONKLIN: I couldn't agree with you
11 more. We need to educate the public and DHS when you
12 listen to Secretary Chertoff and practically everybody
13 in DHS, we stress community involvement and build on
14 Eric's thing. You've got to have a plan for your
15 family. You have to have your own supplies and kits
16 available and know where they are. Keep them stocked
17 up. Keep the batteries refreshed. No system works
18 without power, obviously.

19 MS. BECKER: Right.

20 MR. CONKLIN: But there are transistor
21 radios. There are weather alert radios. There are
22 things out there that should be part of every family's
23 tool kit. And DHS is working hard. If you go to "are
24 you ready" and ready.gov, they have lists of supplies
25 that you should have in your tool kit. And what we

1 need is the state and locals to help us get that
2 message out.

3 MS. BECKER: Yes.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Thank you.
5 Thank you both. Mary?

6 MS. LAMPERT: Yes, I want to speak to
7 resources. Yes, I think it's very important that we
8 look at DHS and look at -- and find our critical needs
9 that are multi-functional. But there are needs that
10 are unique to a nuclear accident. And I think back
11 at Dr. Shirley Jackson, the former NRC Chair, when she
12 expressed her fears about electric deregulation that
13 with competition that the nuclear industry may go to
14 the bottom line, literally that's the focus, and the
15 monies would not come forward enough for safety,
16 etcetera.

17 And so that's why I think that's a fact
18 and I think that's why it's important that the NRC
19 have regulations, not simply go to guidance, and that
20 regulations go not to the bottom such as endorsing the
21 NEI White Paper, but that they deal with reality. And
22 why I say this is we wind up with unfunded mandates.
23 Local communities and state planners can have the best
24 of intentions and the best of hearts, but if they
25 cannot provide the tools that have radiation monitors,

1 the this, the that and everything else, they can't do
2 it. That's all there is.

3 So without a regulation, a requirement,
4 but let's say backup batteries for sirens, they aren't
5 going to happen. And that's why I think it's a
6 necessity to move in this direction. And I also will
7 say that I think it's a right of an American citizen
8 to health and to safety, irrespective of where you
9 live. And so whether -- I mean, it sounds like I'm
10 really thinking about IOM when I get right down to it,
11 but, you know, we should have the same protection
12 throughout our nation. And it is, I think, a
13 reasonable responsibility of the Federal Government.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
15 you very much, Mary. Aubrey, you raised your card.
16 Something struck you, struck accord with you?

17 MR. GODWIN: No.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Based on what Mary
19 was saying?

20 MR. GODWIN: Oh, just in general, not
21 necessarily I will address one of the areas. Unfunded
22 mandate. As I recall, the document from the National
23 Response Group, there was a comment in there something
24 about the what and the unfunded mandates about this,
25 if I remember that correctly. And for us old timers

1 who went through getting things started up, it was --
2 the whole thing was unfunded and we had to scrounge
3 around and get all sorts of support.

4 Certainly, the federal agencies did not
5 provide additional money to the states that had
6 reactor sites and things. So I would view it as an
7 unfunded mandate that through various ways the states
8 and locals have been able to recoup their costs or get
9 the bills paid.

10 I would turn now to instrumentation that
11 goes around the plant in terms of survey monitors and
12 things. What with the major emphasis now on weapons
13 of mass destruction, everybody and their brother is
14 getting an instrument and that's really very helpful
15 with a few caveats with it. Number one, from a
16 Government planning point of view, if every agency
17 ends up with different instruments, you really create
18 a terrible training nightmare.

19 They are just different enough that you
20 can't really train, do the same training course.
21 Quite often, you have to develop a whole slew of
22 training courses. And since we are the ones in
23 Arizona that have to do the training, we have tried to
24 encourage folks to stick with one or two very similar
25 instruments, so we could avoid that training

1 nightmare. And I would suggest you need to be aware
2 of that potential problem around nuclear power plants.

3 It is an inner-operability problem that
4 everybody seems to stick that with communications, but
5 it works with other things too. And we really need to
6 look at it. A part of the problem also is that some
7 of the instruments that are being selected are based
8 upon who was the salesman there last, rather than what
9 the potential capabilities are. And in some cases,
10 the selections will not be correct for the problem at
11 hand. So you need to be very careful in the selection
12 of instrumentation there.

13 In addition, we have noticed some agencies
14 buy instruments and forget about the other key part of
15 buying an instrument is calibrating the instrument.
16 They come from the manufacturer usually pretty well
17 calibrated. 10 years from now if you haven't done
18 anything to it, I wouldn't want to have the
19 instrument. I think it would make a nice contribution
20 to the junk pile. But that gets, I guess, back to the
21 "snoot full" that you will get trying to use it.

22 The HIDA Program that was developed by
23 Homeland Security is very helpful except it does sort
24 of cut across the problem and generally it's the
25 problem of training. The instruments are a variety of

1 instruments in some cases, and they have done a pretty
2 good job of selecting them toward weapons of mass
3 destruction usage, so that they are in pretty good
4 shape there.

5 But be aware that the HIDA Program will
6 put a lot of instruments into the area that may not be
7 well calibrated or quite the imagery selection that
8 you need. And I must close by saying that we really
9 need to make the public aware that while we in
10 Government are close to God, we are not quite there
11 yet. They still have responsibility personally to
12 take care of themselves to some degree. And I think
13 it's -- in all seriousness, we cannot, we in
14 Government, take care of everything.

15 We have a responsibility to provide as
16 best we can with our resources and go out and make
17 sure that they are aware, the decision makers on our
18 resources are aware of the consequences of their
19 decisions to either give or not give us resources.
20 But at some point, there is a responsibility on the
21 part of the public to be aware that they are living in
22 an area of chemicals or nuclear power plants or
23 whether it is tornados or whether it is hurricanes.
24 And they have to take the responsibility of taking
25 some actions to protect themselves. There's just no

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 way out of it.

2 The tool kit idea from Homeland Security
3 is very good. If you do that and act responsibly, you
4 will really help your survival tremendously in these
5 circumstances, both nuclear power plant problems as
6 well as weapons of mass destruction. And I really
7 think we ought to emphasize that point to the public
8 and let them also be helping us. We can only do what
9 the public wants us to do, and they do that by
10 providing us resources.

11 And as they see what our resource needs
12 are for some of these things, they can help by helping
13 themselves. And we really need to look at that.
14 Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
16 Aubrey. There was one question from the audience that
17 we needed to get a clarification on and the
18 radiological annex of the national response plan says
19 any general emergency or terrorism event at a nuclear
20 power plant would be an Incident of National
21 Significance. And we asked for clarification. I
22 guess the clarification could be that's correct. I
23 don't know.

24 MR. CONKLIN: That is correct. And I was
25 thinking about the statement I made earlier. If there

1 is any terrorist attack, from what I understand,
2 whether it is nuclear, chemical, a truck bomb, a
3 suicide attacker, it's likely to be raised up to the
4 level of an Incident of National Significance pretty
5 quick, because of the potential for follow on attacks
6 similar to the London situation.

7 So yes, if they deem that there is a
8 terrorist attack at a power plant, it's likely to be
9 in INS right away.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

11 MR. CONKLIN: And you will see some pretty
12 -- well, you may not see them, but there will be some
13 quick responses at the federal level.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
15 Craig. We do have a clarification that Bob Kahler
16 from our staff wants to make. Bob?

17 MR. KAHLER: Yes, it was just pointed out
18 when I was talking about the minimum protective action
19 recommendation for the two mile 360, five mile
20 downwind wedge to be for evacuation. I would like to
21 temper that by saying that that could also include
22 sheltering, rather than just evacuation. Could
23 consideration be provided there also, that it should
24 be sheltering rather than for evacuation?

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Bob.

1 Yesterday morning we -- are you -- are we done with
2 the NREP issues?

3 MR. MAMISH: Unless there are other
4 questions.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Let's go on
6 here.

7 MR. VYENIELO: Again, Marty Vyeniello,
8 Chief for Emergency Response for PRP. I'm a little
9 confused on the Incident of National Significance. ON
10 July 13 a RIS was issued by the NRC that clarified
11 when an Incident of National Significance occurred, it
12 included transportation, but it said at the alert or
13 higher would be an INS. So do we have a
14 clarification?

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And could someone
16 just tell us what the acronym stands for also?

17 MR. MAMISH: RIS is Regulatory Information
18 Summary.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

20 MR. MAMISH: I believe that the RIS that
21 was referred to was issued by our sister directorate,
22 unless my staff -- I will need to --

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And Alan, I think,
24 also. Alan, go ahead.

25 MR. NELSON: Yeah, I mean, I believe that

1 RIS supported the national response plan and the
2 coordination with the incident response at the NRC.
3 They held several outreach programs beginning with
4 last October through, I think, January, February or
5 March and they had an opportunity for folks around the
6 country to learn more about the incident response plan
7 and the Presidential Directive.

8 And they put out a RIS that culminated
9 those meetings and those exchanges and how they would
10 operate in support of the national response plan.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Alan.
12 And let's go to Roy Zimmerman.

13 MR. MAMISH: Yes, I guess, if I could, I'm
14 looking at the language here. It seems to me that it
15 is consistent with the national response plan. I'm
16 not sure what is inconsistent in here. It says that
17 in general the following will likely be considered
18 Incidents of National Significance: A general
19 emergency declaration at a nuclear power plant
20 resulting from an accident, an emergency declaration
21 alert or higher at a nuclear power plant or nuclear/
22 radiological facility resulting from a terrorist
23 incident and three, terrorist incidents outside
24 nuclear/radiological facility boundaries involving an
25 improvised device, radiological dispersal device or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any and/or radiological exposure device.

2 That seems to me that --

3 MR. JANATI: I think the reason Marty made
4 that comment is that, I guess, Craig mentioned
5 something about any threat at a nuclear power plant.

6 MR. MAMISH: Not threats.

7 MR. JANATI: This is what --

8 MR. MAMISH: Not threats. It's based on
9 declarations.

10 MR. JANATI: Declaration of -- but it
11 can't happen in an unusual event. It has to be alert
12 and higher. I think that's the point that was
13 mentioned actually, I think.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And that's what you
15 said.

16 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I agree with the direction
17 the dialogue is going. The only thing I would
18 indicate associated with the Regulatory Issue Summary
19 is that the decisions that are going to be made by
20 DHS, to say a security-related event, will, as it
21 says, be in the alert or higher range. But I don't
22 want to leave the group with the sense that it's just
23 going to be automatic at the alert. There will be
24 dialogue going on. We work very closely with DHS and
25 it may very well occur at the alert or based on that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information. They may stay in touch and just wait to
2 see how things continue to develop.

3 But rule of thumb from tabletops that we
4 have done with Department of Homeland Security, both
5 on operational events that led to a radiological
6 release, led to the general emergency as we tabletop
7 different types of security events, alert was about
8 where it came out. So that's what we wanted to
9 provide. But I just don't want to leave the
10 impression that it's just black and white at the
11 alert.

12 MR. MAMISH: Thank you, Roy. And that is
13 consistent with the language that we issued. It will
14 likely be considered Incidents of National
15 Significance.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
17 I just want to thank everybody around the table for
18 following the ground rules that we set out and thank
19 everybody in the audience for comments and, obviously,
20 the comments around the table. And this is a
21 beginning and, hopefully, we can continue this. I'm
22 not going to say we're adjourning the meeting right
23 now, but I did want to at least express that before we
24 do adjourn, because we do have a 1:00 session on
25 security issues over in the White Flint Building, so

1 I think we need to begin to wind down.

2 Yesterday we promised the advocacy groups
3 at the table an opportunity, 15 minutes, for a
4 presentation. I'm not sure how the presentation will
5 differ from anything else that we have heard around
6 the table, but we are going to do that and I'm going
7 to start in a minute with Paul, because Paul I think
8 has probably had less air time with us than any of the
9 others, but we'll start with Paul and we'll go that
10 way.

11 But I also want to package this with going
12 to everybody else around the table after we're done
13 with that for any closing remarks they might want to
14 give us on this session, because I think we're about
15 at the end of this particular thing. And, Paul, do
16 you want to start us off in the presentation mode, and
17 I can't give you any more information than that.

18 MR. GUNTER: Right. And thank you, Chip.
19 And I think what I would like to do is just to make my
20 brief comments pretty much in context of the
21 discussion that we have had here yesterday and today.
22 You know, I'm going to start out by, you know, again,
23 it's hard to ignore the issue of the lack of public
24 confidence in emergency planning and it doesn't occur
25 in a vacuum.

1 And particularly in the context of
2 referencing my remarks to the issue of sheltering
3 versus evacuation or sheltering in combination with
4 evacuation, you know, I would like to note that, in
5 fact, the issue of evacuation and sheltering were
6 original design and licensing issues with two specific
7 examples being the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station and
8 the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station.

9 And you know, in the context of those
10 licensing proceedings before an Atomic Safety and
11 Licensing Board, the public's intervenors continually
12 brought up the issue of impediments to evacuation and
13 in those instances, the utility and the NRC staff,
14 lawyers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency
15 addressed the issue, you know, that, in fact,
16 sheltering could be used as an option.

17 And so in the context of those original
18 licensing proceedings, you know, one particular
19 example was what do you do with 135,000 people on the
20 beach if an accident occurs at the Seabrook Nuclear
21 Power Station? And the utility's answer was, you
22 know, to put people in clam shacks, beer coolers and
23 a whole assortment of very dubious shelters and
24 sheltering circumstances.

25 And you know, in the end, with the veto of

1 the Governor of the State of Massachusetts and the
2 Governor of the State of New York, those concerns were
3 overruled by what we now know to be the realism
4 doctrine, and that is whether or not you have
5 confidence in a plan, there is a paper plan and when
6 it comes down to an accident, you will use such things
7 even without confidence, that they will succeed in
8 protecting public health and safety.

9 And so now, we are here today, you know,
10 again with the realism doctrine and, you know, in
11 fact, I think that we need to look at what has
12 happened in Louisiana and the Gulf Coast and what if
13 Katrina had come ashore and made a direct hit on the
14 Superdome with 25,000 people. That clearly was
15 established as a shelter of last resort, but I think
16 that in reflection there wasn't going to be much
17 confidence that that was going to protect those 25,000
18 people with any high degree of confidence,
19 particularly if the hurricane had made landfall at a
20 Category 5, but that's all there was.

21 But you know, again, we went through these
22 licensing proceedings, which were there to provide
23 public health and safety and, in fact, what happened
24 was the licensing and a very dubious evacuation plan
25 was shoehorned into the public arena. And I feel that

1 we're at that same juncture today that, in fact, now
2 sheltering is being offered where there are clearly
3 impediments to evacuation and, in fact, what's
4 happening is that sheltering again is about to be
5 shoehorned into an emergency plan that constitutes a
6 very dubious action if, in fact, we have a
7 catastrophic release.

8 So you know, again, you know, it's my
9 appeal to state officials, to the utilities, to the
10 NRC that this lack of public confidence does not come
11 without reason and that we appreciate this opportunity
12 for this dialogue, but we need to have something more
13 than just a pressure relief valve and we need to have
14 something more than just what provides this Agency
15 with the cover that it has gone through the motions of
16 being transparent and providing the public with an
17 opportunity to address these issues.

18 And we would hope that out of this,
19 actually, there are some constructive dialogue that
20 will provide, you know, the fact that we do have some
21 very real threats, particularly in light of the added
22 threat now of the security issue, and we hope to
23 continue to participate in these dialogues.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
25 you, Paul. Debbie Grinnell?

1 MS. GRINNELL: I'm going to hand this
2 over, because Paul just spoke to the history of the
3 Seabrook evacuation plans and I think I will just
4 defer.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Debbie.
6 Rochelle?

7 MS. BECKER: Yes. I just have one
8 question, because it's the two and five mile question,
9 and this was a rule that has been around for a very
10 long time. And yet, again, it is being brought up by
11 the NEI and blessed by the NRC and I'm wondering why
12 the timing of this. If it's already a rule and it's
13 already there, why is it coming back up again?

14 It does signal to the public that there is
15 something else going on and we don't know what it is,
16 and when we don't know what it is, distrust builds and
17 it's not good for us and it's not good for you. So
18 when you take an old regulation that everybody is
19 telling me has been sitting around forever and the NEI
20 brings it up in newer papers and the NRC blesses it in
21 newer papers, then we think why is it being done
22 again?

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I don't want to
24 open up this whole discussion again, but I think
25 Rochelle is bringing up a very important point and if

1 we can clarify this, I think we should, because I
2 understand the perception and I'm not sure who I'm
3 going to go to on this, I think Nader, but just
4 remember the -- and I think Alan can explain this, but
5 just remember Stacey and Bob Moody.

6 The beginning piece was this was already
7 in NRC guidance space. Then, in chronological terms,
8 I think that the industry in trying to prepare for
9 their plans developed a White Paper and followed the
10 guidance, and this later endorsement I'm going to ask
11 you about. But, Nader, would you start us off and
12 then let me ask Alan to put that in.

13 MR. MAMISH: Sure. I don't want to speak
14 for the industry --

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: No, he will.

16 MR. MAMISH: -- as to why they put the
17 language in there, but what I can say is our
18 regulations talk about requirements. They don't talk
19 about the how to for the specific reason that we have
20 been discussing for the past day and a half about, you
21 know, it's not a one size fits all approach. We would
22 not want to impose that type of approach.

23 So I believe that my staff worked very
24 hard on the issue and the industry can speak a little
25 more to it, but the industry's paper was designed to

1 implement and provide the industry with guidelines as
2 to how our regulations can be met. Alan?

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead, Alan.

4 MR. NELSON: Yes, thank you. I'm not
5 going to talk specifically about the White Paper in
6 itself, but only in that it was an application of the
7 -- what happened was there were regulations. There
8 was the NUREG Supplement 3, EPA and also the Response
9 Technical Manual that the NRC uses in the incident
10 response, all provided valuable information in the
11 implementation of protective actions.

12 So what we did was bring all those pieces
13 together, so that there was a clear understanding on
14 the implementation of the action. We did not deviate
15 in any way from what the requirements were or the
16 process in which to notify the off-site of the
17 recommendations that we would make, whether it be
18 shelter, evacuate or consider KI. So I don't think
19 you'll find anything new, but it did provide a step-
20 by-step process in which the licensee could evaluate
21 those areas of --

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

23 MR. NELSON: -- protective action
24 recommendations.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. And I'm

1 listening to what was presented here the same as
2 Rochelle and everybody else, and I think that the
3 problem arises from the term "endorsement." When we
4 said, when the NRC said that it endorsed the industry
5 White Paper, it leads people to believe that the
6 industry was the one who was really taking an
7 initiative on how things should be implemented, gave
8 it to the NRC and we endorsed it. Where really what
9 we're saying is, Alan, the industry took all of these
10 different things, including the existing NRC guidance
11 and rules, and basically we said yes, that's
12 consistent with our guidance. So I think the term
13 "endorsement" is a misleading word.

14 Now, Nader, what do you think about that?

15 MR. NELSON: Yes, let me just ask you.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead.

17 MR. NELSON: Let me just mention why we
18 seek endorsement. We're a regulated industry and in
19 order to have consistent implementation, we would
20 provide a White Paper and seek it as an alternative
21 approach or an approach that is acceptable under the
22 window of regulatory implementation.

23 So in order to have consistent use of a
24 process or a mechanism, we as an industry seek that
25 endorsement. We ask them to technically review it and

1 assure that if we implement it in that manner, that it
2 will be acceptable not only to them, by the inspector
3 that would evaluate that implementation.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

5 MR. MAMISH: And what we do is we take the
6 industry's paper, we run it through a technical and a
7 legal review. It's a process. It's an Agency process
8 for us that we go through and, in this case, we found
9 that the industry's guidance was consistent with our
10 rules and regulations and guidance.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

12 MR. MAMISH: So that's why we endorsed it.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right.

14 MR. MAMISH: You know, we can sit and
15 debate. I think you have a good point about --

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Right, right.

17 MR. MAMISH: -- the use of the word.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: This is good
19 information and I will go to Debbie and Paul quickly,
20 but Rochelle?

21 MS. BECKER: That really didn't answer my
22 question. That rule has been around a long time.
23 Does that mean the industry is just implementing it
24 now and getting, you know, the A+, whatever you get,
25 or does that mean or shouldn't this have been done a

1 long time ago? I don't understand the timing.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, I think that--

3 MS. BECKER: I mean, the timing is causing
4 my head problems.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: The rule, the NRC
6 staff is always developing and revising the guidance
7 on how to implement the rule. As they get new
8 information, there is a need to revise this. So
9 that's why the NRC rule was revised. The industry
10 does the same thing and that's why, I think, that
11 explains the timing. That's my unartful expression on
12 that, but your whole point is it looks --

13 MS. BECKER: Looks fishy.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- looks fishy.
15 Okay. And I think that some of the information we got
16 -- let me go to Roy, Director.

17 MR. JANATI: Paul, can I make a comment?

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

19 MR. JANATI: I'm breaking the rules, I
20 guess, but just --

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Can we hold for a
22 minute, Rich? I want Roy to get on the record here
23 and then we have a couple cards and we still need to
24 get to Mary, but go ahead, Roy, and then we'll go to
25 you, Rich.

1 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Chip is allowed to break
2 the rules first, I guess. All I want to say is I
3 think that the dialogue --

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, you'll need to
5 speak into that mike. Have a seat. Thank you.

6 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I think that the dialogue
7 that we have been having on this topic, we have been
8 trying to unravel the history of this, I think it
9 needs to be a take-away for us and I think we need to
10 respond on the website with a clear response and give
11 the opportunity for some additional interaction to
12 take place on it, because I'm not sure we're going to
13 get to the bottom line that's going to satisfy many of
14 us in the room on this topic.

15 So it's one for me that is not necessarily
16 a parking lot issue. It's an active issue and we need
17 to correspond and communicate on it as a take-away
18 from this and we'll commit to do that.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good. And, Roy, do
20 you see the perception?

21 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Definitely.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Why Rochelle is
23 reacting the way she is?

24 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Definitely.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

1 MR. ZIMMERMAN: And that's why I think we
2 need to be able to do a better job in providing a
3 clear, succinct answer on it. We're trying.
4 Everybody is trying.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

6 MR. ZIMMERMAN: But I don't think we're
7 going to get there in this meeting.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Today.

9 MR. ZIMMERMAN: So we need to get there
10 after this meeting.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Great.
12 Debbie?

13 MS. GRINNELL: Can I ask a direct question
14 to the NRC? Is the reduction to two miles in
15 preparation for the new generation of nukes in the new
16 Energy Bill? Are we preparing to reduce the EPZ in
17 order to make sure that the new generation of nukes
18 does not have the public --

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Nader?

20 MR. MAMISH: Simple answer, no.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And you use
22 the word reduction and I think that from what I heard
23 this morning is that it's not a reduction, it's a
24 beginning guideline that Ned and Tony and others are
25 going to start with and then enhance. Do you want to?

1 Go ahead, either you or Stacey or both.

2 MR. MOODY: I would just like to restate
3 that the guidance in Supplement 3 to NUREG-0654/FEMA-
4 REP-1 is guidance. The guidance relates to a two mile
5 radius and a five mile zone downwind. It is guidance.
6 It is one acceptable way to meet the regulations. It
7 is not a reduction in the requirement to have an
8 evacuation plan for the 10 mile EPZ.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

10 MS. GRINNELL: The wheels are in motion.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Paul?

12 MR. GUNTER: Thank you, Chip. And you
13 know, the issue here is that we're trying to push an
14 elephant through the eye of a needle, you know, a
15 historic problem particularly in context and you know,
16 I take Debbie's point, particularly in context of
17 proposed new reactors.

18 And it's my understanding, correct me if
19 I'm wrong, but that, you know, for new reactors that
20 would be collocated with existing reactors, that
21 NUREG-0654 would apply, but for green field reactors,
22 new reactors coming to new sites, that all bets are
23 off on emergency planning outside the exclusion zone
24 of the reactor itself.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

1 MR. GUNTER: I think I would just add that
2 we have another request with regard to this whole
3 question. We would like not only for the technical
4 justification for NUREG-0654 be attached to the
5 transcript, but also we would request that the May 19,
6 2004 letter, White Paper, also be attached to the
7 transcript [see ADAMS number ML0422301870].

8 And I think it's important to note that in
9 the context of a number of issues, not only just this
10 issue of evacuation, but the NRC apparently has also
11 endorsed sheltering recommendations of the industry,
12 which include a licensee may choose not to integrate
13 use of sheltering for short-term releases into their
14 protective action recommendation scheme primarily
15 because prediction of a short-term release is
16 inherently inaccurate.

17 Another quote here is that the industry is
18 recommending that the licensee should incorporate
19 sheltering into their emergency planning consistent
20 with existing guidelines, noting that the use of
21 sheltering as an alternative to evacuation is a
22 decision that will be made by off-site officials.
23 Now, these recommendations do not foster public
24 confidence in sheltering.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

1 Thank you, Paul. We're going to go to Rich Janati
2 from Pennsylvania and we have some more information
3 from Bob Kahler on this, and then we're going back to
4 Mary. Okay? And then we're going to go to the rest
5 of the group for some closing comments. I don't know
6 what that masking tape, but I think we need duct tape.
7 No, that's for -- okay. Sorry. Rich?

8 MR. JANATI: Thanks, Paul. I'm going to
9 be very short. I think one of the reasons the
10 sheltering issue has been raised is the fact that some
11 utilities did not consider sheltering as a protective
12 action measure. I think that's probably one of the
13 things and that raised some issues and concerns.
14 That's why we're talking about sheltering. If I'm
15 wrong, please, let me know.

16 In any case, states have the final -- they
17 make the final decision on any protective action
18 recommendation. In Pennsylvania we have chosen, we
19 have selected to go 10 miles 360 degrees. We get
20 recommendations from our utilities. We have done it
21 during events exercises, but that doesn't mean that we
22 necessarily agree or concur with the utilities'
23 recommendation.

24 It's our job. We make the final decision.
25 The Governor of the State of Pennsylvania makes the

1 final decision as to what an appropriate protective
2 action measure is and that may include sheltering.

3 MR. NELSON: Chip, he's absolutely right.
4 What happened was the licensee sat down with their
5 state counterparts and the state said look, licensee,
6 no matter what you advise us to do, we're going to
7 evacuate. So therefore, don't even recommend
8 sheltering. The NRC took a look at that and said that
9 hey, you know, the licensee really needs to have,
10 based on the regulations, sheltering as part of that
11 protective action even though that particular state
12 was not going to adhere to that protective action. So
13 that, you know, kicked us off to say hey, what are the
14 criteria?

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And that's -- okay.

16 MR. NELSON: And that's what generated the
17 paper.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
19 Alan. Are we going to Bob?

20 MS. ROSENBERG: I think Bob can answer the
21 question about the timing, Rochelle's question about
22 the timing.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

24 MS. ROSENBERG: As to why this came about
25 when it did.

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. We're going
2 to go to timing. We already heard from Roy about the
3 take-away to try to provide a cogent explanation of
4 this and, Bob, please. Bob can answer it.

5 MR. KAHLER: Unfortunately, I guess I get
6 to explain this in two minutes or less. So this is
7 strictly on the on-site protective action
8 recommendation and the genesis of why this White Paper
9 ended up where it was. And to start out with, it was
10 a result of what is currently pre-decisional
11 enforcement action, so I can't go into the details as
12 to the very initial event at this point.

13 But needless to say, what we have
14 discovered was that there was confusion,
15 misunderstanding and sometimes not a cohesion between
16 plants or whatever on the interpretation of the
17 federal guidance that was out there in 0654,
18 Supplement 3, EPA 400 PAGs and so on and so forth,
19 such that everybody had a different viewpoint as to
20 what that federal guidance was trying to tell them.

21 So we as a regulatory agency, we have a
22 generic communication process, the Regulatory
23 Information Summary in which we can clarify existing
24 regulation and that's what a RIS does. In RIS 2004
25 13, okay, which is the genesis of all this, we

1 provided that clarification of the existing
2 regulation. Okay.

3 Upon that the industry wanted to put
4 together a White Paper for our endorsement as to what
5 they believe they could do to try to pull all of that
6 federal guidance together in order of making an
7 approach to implement that federal guidance, and we
8 endorsed that through, so there was no new regulation.

9 But the origination of this was as a
10 result of inspection activity and finding out that
11 there was this, at times, inconsistency in the
12 application of the federal guidance. So we needed to
13 clarify that through RIS 2004 13 and that's what
14 generated the White Paper.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So that stimulated
16 the White Paper.

17 MR. KAHLER: That stimulated it.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And just one
19 further comment on new plants. Dan, introduce
20 yourself.

21 MR. BARSS: Yes, Dan Barss. I am the Team
22 Leader for the Licensing Team in the Emergency
23 Preparedness Directorate working on, basically,
24 creating the infrastructure for the new plants we may
25 build since nobody has applied for one yet, but there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 has been no discussion in the Licensing Team about
2 reducing the size of the EPZ.

3 The policy of the Agency has been a 10
4 mile EPZ. It has stayed that and it will stay there
5 until, as was mentioned by Andrew Feeney, there would
6 need to be an awful lot of discussion held and a lot
7 of open meetings to discuss that. So from a licensing
8 perspective, we consider a 10 mile EPZ and we will
9 stay with that until the policy changes.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank
11 you, all. Mary?

12 MS. LAMPERT: Yes. I think I'll focus on
13 one thing that we have discussed. Post-9/11 I think
14 everybody expected, at least citizens did, that
15 emergency planning measures would become tighter, and
16 what we seem to see is a relaxation of regulation and
17 requirements by the NRC.

18 A perfect example is the discussion that
19 was held here on potassium iodide. You go back to
20 right after Three Mile Island when the Kennedy
21 Commission was formed. One of the lessons learned was
22 to stockpile, that was the recommendation, potassium
23 iodide in all communities around reactors and it
24 didn't happen.

25 We had the same old arguments back then as

1 we heard actually from Mr. Conklin, but it only
2 protects against the thyroid. It doesn't protect
3 against the other elements that can be released.
4 Well, flu shots just protect against the flu. That
5 doesn't mean they are not worthwhile. It doesn't
6 protect against cancer, but you do what you can do in
7 an emergency and we know that in a radioactive release
8 that radioactive iodine will be released. It will go
9 to the thyroid.

10 We have evidence beyond evidence that
11 thyroid cancer disease, growth disorders, particularly
12 severe amongst young children, will result. However,
13 if you take a pill before or shortly after exposure,
14 this can be prevented. It should be a no brainer. It
15 has been done in countries around the world.

16 We had Congress suggest, well, here is
17 another example. The American Thyroid Association
18 recommends that potassium iodide should be available
19 to populations within 200 miles and it should be pre-
20 distributed in place at 50 miles. The Massachusetts
21 Medical Society advised that potassium iodide should
22 be available to all Massachusetts residents. NRC's
23 NUREG-1623 pointed out, now this is an old document of
24 the NRC's, that radioactive iodine can travel hundreds
25 of miles on winds and increase in cancer caused by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chernobyl, and they give the numbers, was high.

2 So why isn't this a priority? Why are we
3 backsliding? Why is the Health and Human Services
4 document containing the same old false statements that
5 should have been buried? I thought Peter Carine of
6 the NRC did bury them years ago. No, he didn't bury
7 them.

8 But the point is how can the public have
9 confidence? How can this be seen as a difficult, a
10 difficult distribution problem where the guy from
11 Tennessee pointed out all that has to be done is
12 provide it to the local community. The local
13 community can put it in the schools, in the shelters
14 and group homes and the public can go to their health
15 department and get it.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
17 Thank you, Mary. And Mary referred to the Health and
18 Human Services Federal Register notice that I believe
19 was issued on Monday for comment. Is that correct?
20 Correct. Okay. I want to go around the table for
21 those of you who have not spoken right here to just
22 get a closing remark from you, and I'm going to start
23 with Ned.

24 We need to put a further clarification on
25 the record, Dan?

1 MR. BARSS: I just need to clarify
2 something I said. I said before we would build
3 nuclear plants. The NRC does not build nuclear
4 plants. The industry builds nuclear plants. We
5 license those nuclear plants that they build.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Ned?

7 MR. WRIGHT: I want to thank the NRC,
8 Homeland Security, FEMA and all of the other partners
9 here. I think this is very important for us at the
10 local level to be a part of the process. One of the
11 things that we need to be done in these things is to
12 be heard about our concerns, because as said, we're
13 where the rubber meets the road and it is our
14 responsibility to implement all of the things that
15 come through the system, and it's very important for
16 us to be a part of the decision making process.

17 It's also important for us to be involved
18 early on not after and just during the comment process
19 afterwards. I think it has been brought up several
20 times and it needs to be stressed that one size does
21 not fit all. You can't have a cookie cutter issue
22 when you have got facilities like we are where we are
23 not on the coastline or things like that.

24 So each of our demographics are different
25 and those of us at the local level and working with

1 the states and the NRC, FEMA, etcetera, need to be
2 able to work those plans and procedures that work for
3 our public. What works for me may not work for a
4 coastal facility, and we need to have that latitude.

5 As has been mentioned, that the new
6 Homeland Security directives are going for a risk-
7 based planning, funding and support, and right now my
8 concern is that, as we have noticed here, the effort
9 seems to be putting all that burden on one industry.

10 We have a lot of our other industries and
11 the other things that we have around our various
12 locations provide a hazard and a risk to the public,
13 but it seems like that everyone wants to use one
14 utility and the nuclear utility is very regulated, but
15 especially in my community we have greater risks from
16 a nuclear power plant that will have immediate impact
17 on the health and safety of our public, but there is
18 no support for that group. So I think that these
19 things, as we're looking at an all hazard approach, if
20 you have a nuclear power plant in your location, that
21 is one of the risks that you have. It's not the only
22 risk.

23 And again, I think that further meetings
24 and all that has been discussed, getting the
25 interaction with my counterparts from across the

1 country to address these issues, it also gives us a
2 chance to interface with the headquarters staff of all
3 of our agencies, so that we can make sure that we
4 understand and at least we have a dialogue, but we
5 understand why the things are happening or, as we
6 mentioned here, why did the White Papers come out and
7 stuff like that, so that we have a greater
8 appreciation of the total picture.

9 And again, thank you for the opportunity
10 to participate.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much.
12 Alan?

13 MR. NELSON: Yes. In closing, I mean, I
14 certainly want to thank NRC and FEMA for holding this
15 first of a kind meeting, but most of all I want to
16 thank the people that attended that may or may not
17 have had their opinions expressed, and I hope that
18 it's a first of a meeting in the future where the
19 people that actually do emergency preparedness for a
20 profession, not only with the nuclear sites but all
21 hazards, because their experiences are where we need
22 to be.

23 They know how to do many of these
24 applications and processes that we have talked today,
25 and I'm not sure we resolved all the issues or we just

1 aired them, but we need to get together. I think what
2 Jill had said in her remarks of meeting in smaller
3 groups with the technical basis and the
4 professionalism to come to conclusions and make
5 recommendations to the NRC and FEMA as well as
6 everybody else.

7 The industry will support such an effort
8 and, as we go forward, we will be implementing the EP
9 enhancements, the Emergency Action Levels, the drill
10 and the exercise program, protective actions on-site
11 as well as ERO response during a security. Many of
12 those processes overlap the interactions with the off-
13 site and that is what is critical about the tabletops
14 and the outreaches that will work with our partners
15 off-site with the state and local and the public as
16 well. And thank you very much for your efforts.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
18 And before we go to Jana, the record, we are taking
19 comments on these issues.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay? Written
22 comments. Okay. I just want to remind people of
23 that. Jana?

24 MS. FAIROW: Again, thank you for hosting
25 this meeting. I think it was a good forum, but I'll

1 echo what has been said earlier. It's a beginning.
2 We need to maybe form some of these working groups to
3 work out the nuts and bolts to go from theory to
4 practice and talk about how some of these things can
5 be implemented, different possibilities, keeping
6 flexibility in mind, but I think it was a good start
7 and I look forward to more interaction.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Jana.
9 And, Shannon, I just have to thank you for tribal
10 representation at the meeting and do you have any
11 final words for us?

12 MS. RINDFLEISCH: Since I have taken up so
13 much time during this meeting, I apologize profusely
14 for that. I just want to thank you for inviting the
15 tribal community to participate in this meeting. I
16 think it's very important that tribes -- that people
17 remember there are sovereign nations out there that
18 make decisions for their communities.

19 They are their own government. They make
20 their own decisions and they make a lot of their own
21 laws. Keep that in mind when you're out doing your
22 planning. If you have a tribal community in your
23 group, talk to them, invite them to your meetings.
24 They do things a little differently, their background,
25 their history, but they have a lot of good ideas and

1 they have a lot of good input. So remember to keep
2 the tribes included in your planning and in your
3 meetings. They are truly a wonderful group of people
4 and they have a lot of good ideas.

5 I would also like to recommend that more
6 tribes, if these meetings continue, please, make sure
7 that your tribes know about these meetings and invite
8 them. Make sure you have some type of representation
9 from your tribes in your states.

10 I think one of the key things that I have
11 pulled from this is communication, communication
12 between the utility, federal, state, local and tribal
13 agencies. It has been said before. Not all the
14 issues are going to fit the cookie cutter situations,
15 but I think if we can keep open lines of
16 communications between all agencies, maybe we don't
17 have to keep blaming people for things and pointing
18 fingers. Maybe we can just work together to protect
19 our communities.

20 I would like to thank the advocacy groups
21 for being here today. Wow. Could you guys like come
22 and help the tribes a little sometimes? We need
23 voices like yours to help fight for the tribes, but I
24 would also like to remind you to, please, keep an open
25 mind. If you haven't had the opportunity to sit down

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with your local state emergency planners, please, find
2 the time to do that.

3 It makes me very nervous that you have no
4 confidence in your emergency planners. That really,
5 really scares me, because I know I work very hard for
6 my community. So if you have that opportunity, sit
7 down with your local planners and chat with them and
8 ask them to review their plans and see what their
9 decisions are or their suggestions for the different
10 areas.

11 MS. LAMPERT: For the record, I never said
12 I had no confidence. I am a local planner. I wear
13 two hats so I have read it, but I never said I had no
14 confidence in the local planners. I expressed a lack
15 of confidence in those who are making the regulations.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. I think that
17 the point about --

18 MS. GRINNELL: I think for the record --
19 I'm sorry, Chip. I also have to speak here, because
20 I think there isn't an advocacy group represented at
21 this table and I certainly don't want to speak for
22 anyone else, but our issues have been -- in Washington
23 they have not been with our -- we partnered at the C-
24 10 Foundation with NEMA and the Department of Public
25 Health the moment Seabrook went online. We have been

1 complete partners in the process. Our issues are
2 regulatory issues at the NRC and with FEMA.

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you
4 both, and still an important point about communication
5 with local planners. And, Shannon, would you finish
6 up?

7 MS. RINDFLEISCH: Thanks.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Thank
9 you very much. Onalee?

10 MS. GRADY-ERICKSON: I, too, would like to
11 thank you for the opportunity to have a voice at the
12 table. It has been an eye opening experience. If
13 you're glad to live in Iowa, I'm quite happy to live
14 in the State of Minnesota and the fact that we are
15 kind of Minnesota nice, that's kind of nice to see as
16 well.

17 The continued discussions for state,
18 locals and feds and the advocacy groups for this type
19 of venue is awesome. It would be tremendous, because
20 then I think that the confidence in the way that
21 things are working for emergency planning for security
22 threats, etcetera, would be -- I think you would have
23 more confidence then as far as the way that the
24 decision and the route that the decision was made, and
25 maybe better transcripts or better laying out of, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, how you got from A to B to equal C, that would
2 also benefit.

3 Off-site and on-site need to work together
4 and we do and we do it very well. Our ultimate goal
5 is to protect the health and safety of the general
6 population out to 20, out to 50, for the entire state
7 and it doesn't matter. It's not incident-dependent.
8 It's not a nuke incident-dependent. We're all hazard.
9 We have always been all hazard.

10 And I think what our boss is telling us
11 from the Homeland Security meetings that happened, was
12 it last week, that they are finally realizing that the
13 plan for response that works is FEMA's response and
14 it's not going to matter what type of incident it is.
15 And again, thanks for letting us have a voice.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you for being
17 here, Onalee. Andrew?

18 MR. FEENEY: Thanks and, again, I will add
19 my voice to those who are here to commend you for
20 having the forum and I want to thank you for that.
21 Certainly, we have talked about openness and that is
22 something, and I will give you kind of a compliment
23 here.

24 Earlier in the year there was an advisory
25 that went out from the NRC that caused a little hubbub

1 in New York, and what I want to say is there was a lot
2 of willingness by the NRC to come up and meet with us
3 and explain that and that was good. And in that Eric
4 admitted, and I think it's something that needs to be
5 admitted by the NRC, by ourselves, frankly, and by
6 anybody in Government is that sometimes we don't do
7 public outreach very, very well. Sometimes, you know,
8 we're kind of in our own little ivory tower and we
9 don't necessarily reach out as well as we could and
10 we're doing better with that.

11 Certainly, the media helps us with that as
12 much as sometimes in the middle of an event, we may
13 view them as an adversary. The media is the most
14 effective way to get information out to the public.
15 You know, it's 24/7 right now and the whole process is
16 really about building trust.

17 I mean, and one thing I want to commend
18 the advocacy groups here today for sticking it out,
19 because obviously when you heard some of the rhetoric
20 that was going by and the feelings that were coming
21 out about the lack of trust, you know, towards the NRC
22 and towards the regulators, I'm glad that they stayed.
23 I'm glad that the discussion was had, because I have
24 been in public meetings where the intent of the
25 advocates was really to disrupt them.

1 And what it did, in fact, was it made it
2 unable for people who had come there to listen to
3 issues and to try to get information on emergency
4 planning, make that whole process just completely
5 break down. And I didn't see that happen here. I
6 didn't see a disruptive atmosphere here.

7 I saw more of -- obviously, it was
8 adversarial, but it's essential and we face that, you
9 know, not so much in our upstate areas, but around
10 Indian Point where it's difficult to reach out in a
11 real sustained way without drawing the ire of those
12 who have an agenda of, say, closing the plant and that
13 is their point of view and, you know, we're a society
14 that welcomes different points of view, so I support
15 that.

16 However, you know, again, we're trying,
17 and I'll end on this, to make sure that the public is
18 as informed as it can be, you know, and we as an
19 agency, SEMO, put out information on all the different
20 types of hazards that are out there. We have weather
21 awareness hazards. We have heat awareness. We put
22 out regular public information. We have it on our
23 website and it really does get down. And we heard
24 about the electricity issue, which is a really
25 important issue for us to be talking about, but it

1 really gets down to the individual's own sense of
2 responsibility and personal preparedness.

3 I mean, I have a family. I have children
4 so, you know, it harkens to me. I need to know in my
5 local community, you know, because we have a train
6 that runs through town, you know, what our plans are
7 if there is a need for an evacuation or those sorts of
8 things. So that's really what it gets down to, is
9 getting that information out to the public.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
11 Thank you, Andrew. I'm going to wait to let you two
12 and Stacey go last. Susan?

13 MS. PERKINS-GREW: Thanks, Chip. I would
14 also like to amplify the recognition of the NRC and
15 FEMA for initiating this type of discussion. Chip, I
16 have to applaud you for your facilitation skills. I
17 learned a lot about what you did, because I think your
18 talent at facilitating enabled us and at some points
19 with the advocacy groups and different opinions, I
20 think it was managed very well and I applaud you for
21 that.

22 As a Manager for Emergency Preparedness
23 for Seabrook Station, I want everyone to recognize
24 that we are a learning industry. We do recognize the
25 playing field keeps changing. We have new challenges

1 on our plate in our post-September 11th environment.

2 We also know that with technological
3 changes that are available that it's constantly
4 changing and we appreciate these efforts through
5 outreach, because we understand that continued
6 collaboration with our federal partners, our state and
7 local partners and now largely our law enforcement
8 partners, we are working together to change the way we
9 do business to enhance our current practices and
10 processes to make sure we're better prepared for any
11 contingency.

12 As a representative here at the table over
13 the last few days, I really can't tell you how much I
14 value the experiences of our state and local partners
15 here at this table. I think the contribution that is
16 made by those folks is totally invaluable. We can all
17 learn from them. They are the experts in their field.
18 They are the experts at helping us achieve our
19 objective that ultimately culminates into public
20 health and safety. So it was a great, valuable and
21 rich experience and I appreciate all of you at the
22 table for making it that way. Thank you.

23 MR. MULLIGAN: On behalf of Tom Kerr, the
24 Executive Director for the Conference of Radiation
25 Control Program Directors, I want to extend my

1 appreciation to both NRC and to FEMA for allowing me
2 the opportunity to sit at the round table and
3 participate in this discussion.

4 Aside from some of the issues that we
5 raised regarding the scheduled agenda items, I can't
6 emphasize enough the need to have stakeholders
7 involved in the process very early on, and I think
8 that based on what we have seen here over the last two
9 days, you can certainly recognize that there is the
10 expertise in the field to bring relevant and
11 applicable comments to the process during the
12 development phases that can result in better
13 publications and more acceptability among all the
14 communities once it comes out and is issued.

15 I want to offer you the CRCPD, you know,
16 for many years has been a venue for the federal
17 agencies to come through us as an avenue for
18 requesting and getting feedback. Very early on in the
19 process, I want to make sure and emphasize, that that
20 avenue is always open and we welcome the opportunity
21 to get involved as early on as we can.

22 And I think that you will find that as an
23 organization what we try to do is not just point out
24 the downfalls and the problems with issues. We also
25 like to bring resolutions to the table. So I think

1 that that can be very helpful in the process as we
2 don't like to just, you know, throw grenades across
3 the bow and run away. You know, we'll also bring
4 solutions and possible alternatives to the table with
5 us and not just point out the flaws in what we see.

6 So again, I thank you for the opportunity
7 and look forward to more opportunities for these kinds
8 of discussions. Thank you.

9 MR. JACKSON: The State of Georgia would
10 certainly like to thank Craig from FEMA, Nader and the
11 whole team from NRC for hosting this meeting. It has
12 been important and useful, eye opening in some
13 respects. I have sort of noticed and I'm actually
14 glad to not hear a particular term used a lot and that
15 is stakeholder.

16 I don't know if you guys ever looked up
17 the word stakeholder in a dictionary, but it sort of
18 pertains to card playing and poker particularly and
19 that, you know, a stakeholder is a person that holds
20 the money while others play. Now, I don't know about
21 the rest of you guys in the state, local, tribal, we
22 haven't seen a whole lot of money to be holding. So
23 obviously, Georgia is not a stakeholder and that's
24 great. Actually, we tend to think and act and
25 sometimes we'll even say the word partner, because, in

1 fact, that's really what we do.

2 We work with Southern Nuclear, our nuclear
3 power plant provider. We work hand-in-hand, hand-in-
4 glove, with our local law enforcement, emergency
5 management agencies, state agencies and, frankly, even
6 FEMA and NRC on occasion. So a partnership really is
7 key to all this, and I actually picked up on one of
8 the things that has been a theme that has popped up in
9 the last couple of days, and that is really a
10 continuing dialogue and regular meetings.

11 And one of the things that I'll offer is
12 that there is actually a model that we might want to
13 look at and that is through something called the
14 National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation
15 Conference. It's basically a conference of state,
16 local, laboratory, this is industry, federal partners
17 that actually meet, have a constitution and meet
18 actually twice a year and deal with the issues in that
19 particular segment.

20 And that model probably could be used in
21 some sort of continuing dialogue if we would like to
22 do this in the emergency preparedness, because unlike
23 a poker game, this really is not a game. Emergency
24 preparedness is serious business. Consequence
25 management is a serious business. Recovery is a

1 serious business, as we have seen in Louisiana in the
2 last few days and will be seeing in the next few
3 years, actually.

4 So Georgia would like to offer just as a
5 for instance, if you guys would like as a group to
6 maybe look at a future meeting, we will be happy to
7 offer our training facility. I mean, I'm in control
8 of that, so I think I can offer that. It holds maybe
9 about 70 people, 70 comfortably, but we can offer kind
10 of a smaller thing and maybe as an offer, think about
11 maybe hosting some of these types of meetings in each
12 of the NRC regions, the four here in the United
13 States. Just kind of move things around and kind of
14 get maybe a different mix of folks here.

15 But again, thank you so much, NRC. Thank
16 you, FEMA or whatever you're going to become, DHS
17 anyway, and we look forward to continuing and
18 strengthening our partnership.

19 MR. SUTTON: Sounds like a broken record,
20 but I want to thank the NRC and I want to thank FEMA
21 and particularly Craig. I understand, you know,
22 there's probably a lot of demands on your agency right
23 now and it was particularly encouraging to see that
24 you were here. You know, I think that one of the best
25 things about this session was the fact that we were

1 able to sit here and discuss our varying viewpoints.

2 I said it yesterday. I think we all have
3 some very tough jobs here and I think that we are all
4 here for the right reason. Everybody is here for the
5 right reason. I talked yesterday about communications
6 and I think it's so important, and I will just point
7 out an example.

8 There was a discussion yesterday about the
9 dark site, and that's one of those things where almost
10 it wasn't communicated exactly what that was and it
11 was perceived as something that was clandestine when,
12 in fact, it was one of those good deeds and this is a
13 prime example of, you know, no good deed goes
14 unpunished unless it's articulated.

15 You know, we all do great things on a
16 daily basis and we're really very, very busy in doing
17 them and sometimes we don't stop to tell people what
18 we're doing or why we're doing it, and that is
19 perceived by people as being less than up front. So
20 I think that, you know, it is about communication. I
21 will say it again.

22 I guess one of the acid tests of how
23 successful we have been here for the last two days is,
24 you know, the follow through on the things that we
25 parked in the paddock or the parking lot, whichever it

1 may be, you know, and attach a priority to them, what
2 is really, really important for us to address and
3 follow through on.

4 Coming from probably the most
5 controversial site in the country for a power plant,
6 I am very much aware of the advocacy groups' positions
7 and, you know, again, I don't want to intimate that I
8 heard anybody say here at this table, but we came
9 dangerously close to that and I understand the need to
10 advocate for the position.

11 It's difficult sometimes because, you
12 know, to the public out there, sometimes they don't
13 differentiate between the levels of Government, the
14 difference between the locals, the states and the
15 feds. It's, you know, all the Government and we're
16 here to help kind of thing and through sometimes less
17 than stellar performance, the questioning that our
18 best intentions, you know, is justified in some cases.

19 Again, you know, I think following through
20 on some of these parking lot issues. I do want to
21 thank the NRC for hosting this. I think that, you
22 know, on a daily basis we have relationships with our
23 licensees, on a daily basis the NRC works with the
24 industry and that relationship sometimes is viewed as
25 incestuous from the outside.

1 You know, but again, to effectively
2 regulate, you have to know the business inside and
3 out. For me to effectively plan locally, I have to
4 have a daily dialogue with the licensee and, you know,
5 do we create personal relationships as a result of
6 that? Yes, we do. But you know what? That also
7 serves us, because one of the biggest benefits of all
8 of this planning process is you have that
9 relationship.

10 You know who you're talking to on the
11 other end of the phone when you are dealing with a
12 crisis. You're not hearing this voice for the first
13 time questioning gee, I wonder who this guy is and I
14 wonder if he really knows what he is talking about,
15 and I wonder if I can believe him and take him on his
16 word.

17 So it's all of this process. You know,
18 you hear the cliches. It's not the plan, it's the
19 planning process, and that, in fact, is true. It's
20 the process that we go through that puts us in a
21 position to better respond to emergencies every day.
22 And I do want to compliment you on your facilitation
23 here. It was done in a very professional manner. I
24 think everybody had a fair opportunity to express
25 their opinions and I applaud the NRC and FEMA for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doing this.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
3 Tony. And, Sam, do you -- it's great that Sam Collins
4 came down from Region I to join us, and do you want to
5 say anything at this point or do you want to wait?

6 MR. COLLINS: I would just like to
7 acknowledge the opportunity to represent the regions
8 and the implementation of the programs. I think
9 that's a unique aspect of this round table and I do
10 appreciate that.

11 Finally, I would like to acknowledge the
12 role of the first responders here and being in the
13 region and being closer to the plants perhaps, we
14 understand the importance and I think the NRC team
15 here understands the importance of the ability of the
16 first responders to have the right tools and be
17 willing to perform those very difficult jobs. And I
18 do appreciate that and I wanted to acknowledge the
19 importance of it.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Sam.
21 Mike?

22 MR. ROSE: I just want to echo my thanks
23 to the NRC and FEMA for the opportunity to be here and
24 say a few words. It seems to me that over the last
25 couple of days we have heard two kinds of issues. We

1 have heard a lot of what seemed to be site-specific
2 issues or concerns and then we have heard some issues
3 and concerns that seemed to be more industry-wide.

4 And with that being said, I think it's
5 important that as we move down the road to updating
6 regulations or creating new regulations, that those
7 regulations focus more on the industry-wide issues,
8 not focus on any site-specific concerns for any one
9 location or another.

10 I think it's important that opportunities
11 like this continue. I think it's important to focus
12 on the local jurisdictions, state, county, municipal
13 level decision making. Allow us the opportunity to
14 make those decisions based on incident-specific, site-
15 specific, time-specific, all those conditions at and
16 during an event. Allow us to make the decisions
17 appropriate for the protection of the public's health
18 and safety.

19 Finally, I just wanted to add that I
20 believe that emergency plans are living documents. I
21 believe that our job as emergency planners is never
22 done. It's a 24/7/365 constant effort to improve, and
23 I think that there is always room for improvement.
24 And with that being said, I think our efforts towards
25 nuclear power emergency planning improve our responses

1 to all hazard incidents, and I believe that our
2 responses to all hazard incidents develop learnings
3 and best practices that help us improve our nuclear
4 power planning.

5 So I think opportunities like this
6 continue to help us learn and I know that speaking on
7 behalf of the Inter-Jurisdictional Planning Committee,
8 we welcome the opportunity to continue any involvement
9 in processes like this.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
11 Mike.

12 MR. ROSE: Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And I just want to
14 thank Tracey, too, and we're sorry that you didn't
15 feel well, but we're glad you're better and thank you
16 for your participation. And can we go to Mark?

17 MR. LEMKE: Are you sure?

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, you brought it
19 on yourself, unintended consequences, but yes.

20 MR. LEMKE: I didn't mention that today.
21 Alan, do you think I ought to say something? All
22 right. I guess I'm feeling like a little bit of a
23 minority here as one who works for the utilities. We
24 have heard a lot. We have heard from a lot of people.
25 We haven't heard a lot from the utilities and maybe

1 that's the nature of the issues. I don't know, but I
2 just wanted to say a couple of words perhaps from the
3 utilities' perspective and there's a lot of my peers
4 in the audience, and I don't know that I will
5 necessarily speak for them.

6 But you know, I don't set policy. There
7 has been a lot of discussion here today about what
8 sounds like policy decisions. There has been a lot of
9 rhetoric around that. I for one don't set policy,
10 although I try to help shape it as much as I can. But
11 as a utility, I pretty much try to implement the
12 policy and the goal is, of course, to protect the
13 health and safety of the public and I think that's the
14 common ground that everybody is on here today.

15 9/11 was four years ago. It was really
16 kind of a long time ago and like Iowa, and I really
17 appreciate a lot of Ned's comments, I thought he was
18 well-spoken, I am not waiting for someone to tell me
19 what to do. Okay. I don't think we should be waiting
20 for regulations. I don't think we should be waiting
21 for someone to identify what the problems are, what
22 the issues are. I am certainly not and I know a lot
23 of my peers aren't as well.

24 What we do, what a lot of us do, is we
25 come to Washington. We listen to the NRC. We

1 dialogue with them. We listen to NEI, dialogue with
2 them and, of course, I dialogue a lot with my peers
3 and then I take that information and I take it back to
4 the power plant and integrate that into plans and
5 procedures, and work with our local off-site agencies
6 to bring them up to speed, because they don't always
7 have an opportunity to come out to Washington to hear
8 some of this.

9 So it's important that I do that, so that
10 we are on the same page in our local area. I support
11 what FEMA and the NRC are doing and what they are
12 trying to do and I can assure you, Mary, there has
13 been no relaxation of regulations and requirements
14 since 9/11, quite the contrary. The NRC has been
15 doing their level best to get us to do more and more
16 in a tremendous number of areas, and that is what
17 we're working hard to try to do.

18 I support allowing the advocacy groups an
19 opportunity to speak. I think that's important and I
20 have actually learned a few things in that regard in
21 the last day and a half. But I think that in some
22 regards, I wish we would have had more opportunity to
23 work through technical details. There were a lot of
24 technical and challenging details, and I think that in
25 some cases perhaps we spent maybe a little bit too

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much time on policy, I guess, as opposed to actually
2 trying to come up with viable solutions.

3 Anyway, I would just like to kind of close
4 by again thanking the NRC, FEMA and everybody for the
5 opportunity to do this. And I would like to -- I'm
6 going to go back and I'm going to continue to work on
7 how to best protect the health and safety of the
8 public, on how to implement the rules and regulations,
9 and I would like to encourage everybody here to work
10 to seek real and viable solutions, because that is
11 what is going to help us all as we go forward. Thank
12 you.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,
14 Mark. And we're going to go to Stacey and then to
15 Nader and then Craig, and I'm not exactly sure which
16 way you guys want to speak. But I was thinking I just
17 want to thank everybody for being around the table,
18 obviously, but I didn't want to forget Dave Lochbaum,
19 the Union of Concerned Scientists.

20 Thank you, David, for being here and we
21 got to keep going, Susan, I'm sorry, because we're
22 going to adjourn soon, I think, so we can go to the
23 other meeting. Stacey?

24 MS. ROSENBERG: Thanks, Chip. I just --

25 MS. PERKINS-GREW: (Speaking off mike.)

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Susan, we're going
2 here. Sorry. Stacey?

3 MS. ROSENBERG: I just wanted to thank
4 everybody for attending the meeting, the people at the
5 round table, the people in the audience. Thank you
6 for providing your input. We did hear what everyone
7 said and we do take it very seriously, all the
8 suggestions. We'll take them all into consideration.

9 I just wanted to note that on our
10 brochure, well, this is our agenda brochure, it tells
11 you how you can provide written comments for the
12 record if you didn't get a chance to say what you
13 wanted to say. And thanks to the NRC staff. I want
14 to make sure to thank the NRC staff for putting this
15 meeting together, Joe Anderson, Bob Moody, Molly Rock-
16 Zuccato, Prosanta Chowdhury and Sally Billings, but
17 I'm sure I'm forgetting others. Thank you.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: All right. Thank
19 you. And a good point about if someone wants to make
20 a comment from the audience, I'm afraid that you're
21 going to have to do it using one of the blue cards at
22 this point. There is another meeting at 1:00 about
23 security issues generally that I know a lot of people
24 are going to go to. There may be an opportunity there
25 to raise an issue, because I think there is some

1 overlap. Okay. It's on the record. Okay.

2 MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. Just real quickly,
3 I want to run through about eight items here, but it
4 will only take about four minutes, so don't get scared
5 there. FEMA presence, we were planning on having all
6 9, well, 9 of the 10 FEMA regions here. We don't have
7 a REP Program in FEMA Region VIII, but the hurricane
8 botched that idea. Resources and exercises. Love to
9 do it. We're planning to do it.

10 Hurricanes and other exercises, we have
11 got to figure out a way to do this and fit it within
12 what we call the National Exercise Schedule, because
13 going into DHS there is a National Exercise Schedule,
14 which incorporates REP exercises, CCEP, TOPOFF and all
15 those other things, and so we're trying to figure out
16 a way to do that once we get our own house in gear or
17 really with the new NRP, because there are still
18 issues internally at the federal level about how we're
19 going to respond to some kinds of incidents. We're
20 learning how the hurricane response is going to go
21 right now, you know, by experiencing it.

22 A balanced approach to sheltering and
23 protective actions as a whole. This is an issue that
24 we faced in a lot of detail in the Chemical Stockpile
25 Program. When do you shelter? When do you evacuate?

1 When do you have them turn on the filtration systems
2 in the houses? When do they over-pressurize the unit?
3 When do they turn on the over-pressurization units in
4 their schools and things like that?

5 FEMA believes, and a strong belief, in a
6 balanced approach and, obviously, that means that we
7 need to have good definitions of sheltering and what
8 preferential sheltering means and any other variations
9 on those terms, and so we need to work to get that
10 clarified, so the public understands what we mean and
11 when we say it among ourselves, we know what we're
12 talking about.

13 Neutrality, and that may not be the best
14 word, but some folks in the past and even during the
15 breaks in this meeting have come up to me and asked
16 about shutting down plants. FEMA does not shut down
17 plants. That's not our role. It's not our
18 responsibility. We don't have that authority. What
19 we do is we provide input to the process that the NRC
20 uses as they make their evaluations.

21 So we evaluate the biennial exercises. We
22 assist in training. We do site assistance visits, is
23 what we call them, and do all those things and we
24 provide our feedback on reasonable assurance, and
25 that's a good term that needs to be well-defined and

1 we'll take that back and get that done. And we
2 provide that determination to FEMA and they build that
3 into their licensing and operational decision making
4 process.

5 Risk focus. A key thing here with DHS is
6 putting money where the risk is, and you will hear
7 Secretary Chertoff talk about that at probably every
8 meeting he goes to and, obviously, for those inside
9 the beltway and read the Washington Post, it's a big
10 issue with Congress, because the word about small
11 cities being left out of the mix and that there is
12 risk everywhere and not just in New York, not just in
13 Los Angeles, but even in the small cities.

14 So DHS looks at risk closely to try to
15 allocate its resources and for DHS, risk is a
16 combination of consequence, vulnerability and threat
17 and at other meetings I can go into more detail on how
18 that stuff is analyzed and assessed.

19 Reorganization. There were some concerns
20 about the reorganization. The FEMA folks in the
21 regions will stay in those regions. We will not be
22 moving them. In fact, my intent and the promises that
23 have been made to me so far is that they will stay
24 right in their current buildings in FEMA in the
25 regions.

1 You should not see any great changes in
2 how the regional folks interact with the state and
3 local folks, interact with the federal partners on the
4 radiological assistance committees and things like
5 that. If you do notice any of those changes, let me
6 know, because I'm doing my best to make sure they
7 don't happen.

8 They may have a different reporting chain.
9 There's definitely going to be a different command
10 structure put in and I don't know where I'm going to
11 fit into that, but that should be the only real
12 difference. Everything else should be status quo. So
13 if you see any degradation in support activities, let
14 me know and my email is on one of these slideshows, so
15 it should be a part of the package that you have got.
16 Let's see. And I'm looking forward to follow-on
17 collaborative processes. I appreciate the dialogue
18 and look forward to it.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Craig.
20 Nader?

21 MR. MAMISH: Thank you, Chip. I think
22 that we talked a lot in the last day and a half about
23 the comments and the input that we have received. We
24 do have the meeting transcribed. Stacey talked about
25 the Federal Register notice. I would also like to

1 encourage those that haven't filled out their feedback
2 form to do so. Those are the three vehicles with
3 which we're going to be looking at all the input that
4 we received.

5 I want to tell you and give you my
6 commitment that we are going to look at the transcript
7 and the feedback forms and the responses to the
8 Federal Register notice, and we're going to work
9 closely with FEMA on all the issues that we heard
10 about in the last day and a half.

11 Policy issues are going to be in a
12 different process than site-specific issues. Policy
13 issues will be considered carefully. We will have
14 continued dialogue on these policy issues and then
15 they are going to be sent up to the Commission for
16 potential recommendations on rules and guidance and in
17 coordination with FEMA.

18 I want to confirm the NRC's focus on
19 safety, security and emergency preparedness, we take
20 our jobs very seriously, and also confirm our focus on
21 openness as evidenced by having this meeting. We
22 heard a lot about the partnership of state, local and
23 the federal Governments and the need to continue to
24 obtain stakeholder input, and we intend to continue to
25 do so.

1 Our goal is to enhance emergency
2 preparedness. This is the goal of everybody here
3 collectively, not just the NRC, and we are going to
4 continue to do that. I especially want to thank
5 everybody here for their candor, the willingness to
6 respect each other's views and to listen carefully to
7 all the issues that were raised. There was a lot of
8 dialogue about continued involvement in these type of
9 issues and I think that's a very good suggestion.
10 We're going to take it back to the office with us and
11 consider that.

12 I want to especially thank Chip for
13 helping us in this meeting.

14 (Applause)

15 MR. MAMISH: You know, Chip, I applaud you
16 for working with us so long and hard. You know, you
17 have been with us for a couple of months putting this
18 together and in addition to your normal duties, so
19 thank you very much.

20 And again, thank you all for your patience
21 and willingness to listen to each other. And with
22 that, I would like to close this meeting.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Great. Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at
25 12:19 p.m.)