



***NRC Emergency Preparedness Breakout  
Region IV  
Training/Outreach/Planning Workshop  
Austin, TX  
January 28-31, 2008***

Anthony McMurtray, Chief  
*Regulatory Improvements and Outreach Branch*

## Different Approach....

- Really looking for interactions from you today
- Feedback on how we're doing
  - Keeping you in the loop
  - Listening and responding to your concerns

## Proposed Topics

- Rulemaking for the Update for EP Regulations and Guidance
- Protective Action Recommendation Study
- Interaction w/States During Drills & Exercises
- EP Readiness Following Natural Disasters and Malevolent Events



## **Rulemaking for the Enhancement of EP Regulations and Guidance**



## Enhancements to Emergency Preparedness Regulations and Guidance

- How we got here...
- How are we working with FEMA...
- What are the issues?

## The First Eleven for Rulemaking

- ERO Augmentation
- Protection of On-Site Personnel
- Coordination w/OROs during Security Events
- On-Shift Collateral Duties
- Hostile Action-Based Drills & Exercises
- ANS Backup
- ETE Updates
- Decrease in Effectiveness
- EAL Classification Timeliness
- Performance-Based EOF
- EALs for Security Events



## Rulemaking Planned Activities

Draft Proposed Rule Language	February 2008
Proposed Rule in Federal Register	February 2009
Resolution of public comments	July 2009
Publication of Final Rule	March 2010
Guidance Documents	September 2010

## Next Steps for Rulemaking

- Draft rulemaking language
- Public meetings planned
  - March 5<sup>th</sup> at NRC Headquarters
    - Logistics being finalized for teleconference
- Working towards a Proposed Final Rule in February **2009**
- Final Rule published in March 2010





# **Protective Action Recommendations (PARs) Studies**



# PAR Study

## Objective

Investigate if the use of alternative protective actions can reduce public dose during severe accidents

## How we did our research

- Technical work done by Sandia Labs
- Focus groups of both emergency responders and members of the public
- Coming - Telephone survey of the EPZ residents to see how to best communicate to the public if they needed to take actions.

## What we learned...(from the technical study)

- Evacuation remains a major element
- Consider early and staged evacuations
- Shelter in place followed by evacuation can be more protective in certain cases
- Precautionary actions at Site Area Emergency are prudent
- Strategies that reduce evacuation times can reduce consequences
- Consider reviewing evacuation planning for the special needs populations

## Sociological Review (what the focus groups told us...)

- People will generally do what they are asked (*key is trust and consistent information*)
- The effectiveness of notification influences decisions
- Emergency Responders **will** report for duty and are confident in their training
- Infrastructure may not have kept up with evacuation demand

## Recommendations

- Consider revision of NUREG-0654, Supplement 3
- Evacuation remains the major element
- Consider early and staged evacuation
- Precautionary actions at Site Area Emergency are prudent
- Consider action regarding strategies that reduce evacuation times in order to reduce consequences
- Enhance the usefulness of the ETEs

## Next Steps

- NUREG/CR-6953, Vol. 1 published  
<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/contract/cr6953/>
- NRC is considering revising NUREG-0654, Supplement 3
- Complete the telephone survey of the public (Vol. 2 of the NUREG)

# PAR Study Public Survey

What about the general public?

How will they respond?

- National telephone survey (within EPZs) to be conducted (Projected for Spring 2008)
  - Public willingness to follow direction for alternative protective actions
  - Best methods to communicate advanced PAR strategies to the public



## PAR Study Public Survey

- Conducted *randomly* in the EPZs  
Data compiled nationally, with some broad regional analysis of results possible
- ***Data cannot be analyzed by site***
  - 2,500 phone calls to collect about 800 completed surveys
  - About 5 million people live in EPZs
  - Households of licensee employees are excluded

## Summary

- PAR Study (technical) published
  - Supports revision of NUREG-0654, Supp 3
- Public survey planned for Spring 08
- Outreach before survey
- Initial results expected by NREP



# **Interaction With States During Drills & Exercises**



## **We heard you....**

- Lots of feedback about NRC “interference” during evaluated exercises
- Taking steps to improve those relationships
- Began a program to host States at NRC Headquarters during exercises



# **EP Readiness Following Natural Disasters and Malevolent Events**

## Current Process

- FEMA - Disaster Initiated Review (DIR)
  - Review of offsite EP resources and infrastructure to verify adequacy to support emergency response functions if needed
- NRC - Manual Chapter (MC) 1601
  - Outlines the process for NRC to authorize a re-start

## When is a disaster a “Disaster”?

- Many Natural Disasters don’t require entrance into the MC 1601 or DIR process
  - Lake effects Snow in Oswego
  - Floods in New England
  - Tornado in Midwest
  - Even some Hurricanes

***The key is whether emergency response is still possible and status of nuclear units...***



***My turn to listen....***

***What's on your  
mind???***



## Points of Contact

- Tony McMurtray (301) 415-2746 or [Anthony.McMurtray@NRC.GOV](mailto:Anthony.McMurtray@NRC.GOV)
- **Rulemaking:** Kathryn Brock  
(301) 415-2015 or [KMB3@nrc.gov](mailto:KMB3@nrc.gov)
- **PAR Study:** Randy Sullivan  
(301) 415-1123 or [RXS3@nrc.gov](mailto:RXS3@nrc.gov)
- **Outreach:** Lisa Gibney (301) 415-8376 or [LAG1@nrc.gov](mailto:LAG1@nrc.gov)