

June 20, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Roy P. Zimmerman, Director
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

THRU: Eric J. Leeds, Director */RA/* Nader L. Mamish for
Division of Preparedness and Response
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

FROM: Patricia A. Milligan, Sr. Advisor for Emergency Preparedness */RA/*
Division of Preparedness and Response
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

SUBJECT: FOREIGN TRAVEL TRIP REPORT

A summary of staff participation at the Office of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters (WPNEM) workshop on the International Exercise 3 (INEX-3) and working group meeting is enclosed. INEX-3 was focused on radiological terrorism, rather than on nuclear power plant accidents as in past exercises. Sixteen member countries hosted INEX-3 exercises. Representatives from twenty-seven countries attended the INEX-3 workshop. There are no issues that require Commission attention.

Enclosures:
1. Trip Report
2. Meeting Attendees
3. Meeting Agenda

CONTACT: Patricia A. Milligan, NSIR/DPR
301-415-2223

NRC FOREIGN TRIP REPORT

Subject: Office of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters (WPNEM) reviews of the International Exercise 3 (INEX-3) and working group meeting.

Dates of Travel and Countries/Organizations Visited: May 29-June 2, 2006, OECD/NEA Paris, France.

Author, Title, and Agency Affiliation: Patricia A. Milligan, Senior Advisor for Emergency Preparedness, Division of Preparedness and Response, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

Sensitivity: Not sensitive

Background/Purpose: The Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters (WPNEM) is primarily focused on events related to nuclear power plant accidents and events. However, in the post 9/11 environment, radiological terrorism has become a more real threat and members of the working party identified a need to exercise a response to such a terrorist event. The WPNEM scenario development subcommittee developed two generic scenarios involving non nuclear power related terrorist events. The first scenario involved the distribution of radioactive materials onto agricultural fields and the second scenario involved the dispersion and distribution either from a fire at a facility with radioactive material inventory or the accidental melting of a radioactive source. These scenarios were designed to be flexible and to address the four common objectives identified by the WPNEM as critical. The identified objectives include: 1) agricultural countermeasures; 2) decision making on soft countermeasures such as trade, travel and tourism; 3) recovery management; and 4) public information.

Sixteen countries in Europe, North America and Asia participated in some variation of the identified scenarios between 2005 and early 2006. Five countries used the agriculture scenario and eight countries chose to use the fire scenario. One country developed its own scenario. At the conclusion of the exercises, members were asked to complete a detailed questionnaire. These questionnaires were analyzed and common issues between countries and the different scenarios were identified for further discussion.

Abstract: Summary of Pertinent Points/Issues: The detailed questionnaire completed by INEX3 participating countries were evaluated to look for commonalities as well as isolated or country specific issues. A multitude of common key issues were identified. These key issues were discussed in working groups and included:

- How is the lifting of agriculture and food countermeasures affected by public confidence and acceptance, as well as other social and technical considerations?
- If the extent of contamination is unknown, how are the types and scales of countermeasures or precautionary actions determined, what is the basis for such decisions, and what is the process for modifying these as more information becomes available?

Enclosure 1

- Who is responsible for communicating, implementing and verifying countermeasures, and how is this done?
- What criteria or strategies would aid the decision-making process for soft countermeasures?
- How is consistency with advice to local populations ensured?
- How are appropriate and mutually acceptable limits for withdrawal of countermeasures and for recovery/clean up established “how clean is clean?”
- What communications strategies can be developed as part of consequence management, and how could these evolve to handle the stakeholder needs during the longer term response?
- Could the types of public information disseminated be coordinated among countries, and agencies within countries to ensure the information is consistent?
- What types of “tools” can be used in communication with media to ensure that the official messages are heard?
- What types of protective actions need to be considered for items that may have a radioactive residue and remain in the environment?
- What is the role of monitoring for human and ecosystem health within recovery management?

Discussion: The meeting was attended by 82 participants from 27 countries, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the Nuclear Energy Agency. As a result, the group was quite diverse in many aspects, but sharing a number of similar concerns.

The first working session was on interaction with the media and featured a presentation by Marguerita Choy of the Reuters News Service. Ms. Choy is an energy correspondent based in Paris. She was knowledgeable in the issues surrounding nuclear emergency preparedness. Her overall messages to the group were “be first, be accurate, and don’t be afraid to say you don’t know” and “make it sexy and helicopter it up” (making your message “eye-catching,” big picture, then fill in details).

The participants discussed a number of questions including:

- How to compete with anti-nuclear organizations in getting your message to the public;
- How to communicate that the event has no health hazards while at the same time precautionary countermeasures have been implemented;
- How well developed are communication arrangements for areas where detailed plans are not already in place;
- How the types of public information disseminated could be coordinated among countries, as well as between agencies within countries to ensure the information disseminated is consistent.

A number of countries had sophisticated tools available for dissemination of public information and volunteered to share these with the group. The IAEA representative discussed the various Conventions and the CONVEX exercises which are designed to facilitate/test information flow.

The discussions on agricultural countermeasures raised a number of issues. Many of the countries which hosted an exercise had participation with representatives from the agricultural community, including producers/farmers, processors, and consumers. Participants identified that regardless of the intervention levels, agricultural producers and consumers in their countries did not want to purchase any contaminated foods. Disposal of the contaminated foods/soils was problematic for all participants. A proposal was put forth to hold a tabletop exercise focused on waste issues.

The impact of radiological terrorism on tourism, travel and trade was discussed under “soft” countermeasures. While participants recognized the impact on tourism, travel, and trade, no specific actions were recommended during the exercise. Participants identified a general lack of decision-making frameworks for such countermeasures. A need for guidance on “soft” countermeasures was identified and forwarded to the NEA Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters (WPNEM) for action.

The objective of recovery management appeared to be less well understood and implemented during the exercise. Participants identified a general lack of appropriate and mutually acceptable limits for recovery and cleanup, processed for effectively involving stakeholders in the recovery process, and guidance to ensure comprehensive recovery management. The U.S. representatives discussed the recently published Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Radiological Dispersion Devices Recovery Protective Action Guidelines (RDD PAGs) with its emphasis on optimization rather than on fixed limits. The representative from the Netherlands discussed the problem of stakeholder involvement in recovery decisions and how it has effectively stopped many projects. The Dutch government passed a law that enables officials to cease stakeholder involvement if certain input criteria from stakeholders have not been met. The representative from Russia stressed the importance of lessons learned as a result of the Chernobyl accident. In particular, he emphasized how important it is to allow people to return to as normal an existence as is possible given such events and to avoid “victimizing” the impacted public. This discussion session identified a need for further guidance in the area of recovery management and it was forwarded to the WPNEM for action.

The WPNEM held a biannual meeting after the exercise conference ended. The working party meeting reviewed the recommendations from the conference and assigned task items to members. It was requested that members be prepared to present their task items at the next WPNEM meeting in November 2006. The representative from Germany discussed in general terms the preparedness for potential acts of radiological terrorism during the World Cup Games hosted by Germany. Attendance at the conference and WPNEM meeting was very worthwhile and participation in the international emergency preparedness community should be continued. The United States and the NRC have much to offer other countries as they enhance their nuclear emergency preparedness programs as well as learn from the programs already in place in other countries.

Pending Actions/Planned Next Steps for NRC: The staff will submit the DHS RDD PAGs to the working party for their information as well as provide the web link to the fact sheets and brochures on the NRC public website. The staff will continue active participation on the NEA Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters.

Points for Commission Consideration/Items of Interest: There was considerable interest by meeting participants in the U.S. DHS RDD PAGs “optimization” philosophy that does not focus on strict numerical limits but considers societal and economic impacts. This concept was well received by the meeting participants.

- Member countries that utilized the agriculture scenario identified that international intervention levels would not be considered in the decisions by food producers, distributors and import/export facilities. The overall conclusions by the agricultural community are that no level of contamination in the food supply was acceptable.
- The WPNEM discussed possible scenarios for future table top or full exercises to include exercises focused on waste, recovery, and public information/media.

MEMORANDUM TO: Roy P. Zimmerman, Director
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

THRU: Eric J. Leeds, Director **/RA/** Nader L. Mamish for
Division of Preparedness and Response
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

FROM: Patricia A. Milligan, Sr. Advisor for Emergency Preparedness **/RA/**
Emergency Preparedness Directorate
Division of Preparedness and Response
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

SUBJECT: FOREIGN TRAVEL TRIP REPORT

A summary of staff participation at the Office of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters (WPNEM) workshop on the International Exercise 3 (INEX-3) and working group meeting is enclosed. INEX-3 was focused on radiological terrorism, rather than on nuclear power plant accidents as in past exercises. Sixteen member countries hosted INEX-3 exercises. Representatives from twenty-seven countries attended the INEX-3 workshop. There are no issues that require Commission attention.

Enclosures:

1. Trip Report
2. Meeting Attendees
3. Meeting Agenda

CONTACT: Patricia A. Milligan, NSIR/DPR
301-415-2223

DISTRIBUTION:

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| L. Reyes, EDO | T. Rothchild, OGC |
| W. Kane, EDO | E. Leeds, NSIR |
| W. Dean, EDO | N. Mamish, NSIR/EPD |
| J. Lee, OIP | R. Borchardt, NSIR/OD |
| M. Cohen, NSIR/PMDA | L. Silvius, NSIR/DNS |
| C. Harris, NSIR | NSIR Foreign Travel |
| EPD Reading File | |

ADAMS Accession Number: ML061700087 (Package)
ML061700070 (Memo & Enclosure 1)
ML061660260 (Enclosure 2)
ML061660261 (Enclosure 3)

| OFFICE | NSIR/EPD | NSIR/EPD | NSIR | NSIR/EPD |
|--------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| NAME | PMilligan | NMamish | ELeeds*NMamish for | PMilligan |
| DATE | 06/19 /06 | 06/19 /06 | 06/19 /06 | 06/20/06 |