



FEMA

Randy Sullivan and Harry Sherwood

National Radiological Emergency Preparedness
Conference

April 21, 2011

Orlando, FL

**REVISION OF NUREG-0654,
SUPPLEMENT 3**

Overview

- PAR Study, NUREG/CR-6953 Volumes 1, 2 and 3
 - Staged evacuation and Shelter in place can be more protective
- Conclusions of PAR Study guided revision of Supp. 3
- Insights from stakeholders considered
- Technical and sociological analyses form basis of revision

Protective Action Recommendation (PAR) Study Results

The PAR Study recommendations included the following:

1. Evacuation remains major protective action
2. Sheltering-in-place use expanded and scenario specific
3. Staged evacuation use
4. Precautionary protective actions
5. Strategies that reduce evacuation time
6. Evacuation time estimate quality
7. Enhanced planning for the evacuation of special-needs populations

Areas of Concern: Comments on Supplement 3

Keywords	Total Comments	Percent of Total
PAR Development	43	10.1%
PAR Logic Diagram	46	10.8%
Shelter in Place	24	5.6%
ETE Guidance	21	4.9%
Implementation Time	18	4.2%
ORO/Licensee Responsibility	17	4.0%
Public Outreach	16	3.8%
Appendix	15	3.5%
Heightened Preparedness	14	3.3%
Staged Evacuation	14	3.3%
EAS Messages	13	3.1%
Workload/ Resource Burden	13	3.1%
TOTAL*	425	100%

*Endorsed comments counted multiple times

Shelter-In-Place

Concern:

- State policy - evacuate and only shelter-in-place as a last resort
- Federal government is dictating evacuation policy

Response:

- **OROs remain responsible for decision making**
 - Supplement 3 provides information for consideration

Concern:

- When evacuation is ordered does Supplement 3 address:
 - People in vehicles?
 - Separated family members?

Response:

- Evacuation details provided in supplemental news bulletins as situation unfolds

Staged Evacuation

Concern:

- Significant time savings not realized over current strategy
- Need training, workshops or guidance documents to assist in transition to new protective action strategy

Response:

- Staged evacuation can enhance protective action depending on EPZ population/density (ETE)
 - allows rapid and low impact decision making
- Await enhanced ETE data and consider strategy
- Workshops planned for implementation
- **OROs remain responsible for decision on best strategy for their EPZs**

Policy

Concern:

- Some State policies - evacuate and only shelter-in-place as a last resort
- In hot weather people will not turn off A/C or seal windows

Response:

- Evacuation during a large early release will maximize dose received

Emergency Messaging

Concern:

- Flooding the public with continuous messaging on PADs causes undue confusion
- A single clearly understood voice supporting the ORO is best

Response:

- Current emergency plans may address this concern but Supp 3 reinforces concept
- Public is anxious for information at the time of emergency
 - if OROs do not provide information, others will
- A single voice is good, but a single message will not elicit the compliance with protective action direction
- Supplemental information bulletins at appropriate intervals

EAS Messages

Concern:

- What is a public warning message?
- EAS Messages are limited to 2 minutes

Response:

- Draft Supp 3 should not have referenced EAS
 - ‘News Bulletins’ were intended

Heightened Preparedness

Concern:

- *'Heightened Preparedness'* is excessive terminology, think simpler

Response:

- Changed to 'Monitor and Prepare'
- Provide those not evacuating positive actions
 - Builds on ideas expressed in Emergency Messaging
 - Reduce shadow evacuation
 - Allows families to reunite, prepare for action

Workload / Resource Burden

Concern:

- Changes not funded
- Funding must be provided

Response:

- Implementation time will allow orderly development

Communication Appendix

Concern:

- Relocate material to a stand-alone document to be published later
- Valuable but best located in a stand-alone document
- Extends beyond PARs

Response:

- Stand alone document under development
- Minimal emergency messaging guidance provided

PAR Logic Diagram

Concern:

- Complexity of PAR logic diagram
 - complex and cumbersome
 - extensive quantity of supporting notes

Response:

- Strategy development tool
 - simplified when site-specific elements incorporated
- Notes condensed
- Background added

ETE Data

Concern:

- Evacuation Time Estimate information may not be available for development of strategies

Response:

- Implementation will await enhanced ETEs and 2010 census data

Conferring

Concern:

- Some actions require conferring with ORO
 - Shift staff would be busy mitigating the accident

Response:

- Conferring with ORO is intended during planning
 - not response for shift staff

Implementation

Concern:

- Implementation timing should consider resource availability concurrent with EP rule revision

Response:

- Implementation time will allow orderly development

Outreach

Concern:

- Supp 3 has not received sufficient input from stakeholders and the public

Response:

- Five PAR Study presentations 2005 – 2007
- Ten Draft Supp 3 presentations 2008 – 2010
- Four Draft Supp 3 NRC/FEMA Public Meetings
- 150 day comment period
- 425+ comments received and adjudicated jointly



FEMA

Questions?

Randy Sullivan
(301) 415-1123
randy.sullivan@nrc.gov

Harry Sherwood
(510) 712-0132
Harry.Sherwood@fema.gov

MSOffice1

Slide 18

MSOffice16 insert contact information)
, 4/4/2011