

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO: 50-352-OL  
50-353-OL

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

(Limerick Generating Station,  
Units 1 and 2)

LOCATION: PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA PAGES: 13,080 - 13,170

DATE: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1984

TR. 01 0/1  
Return Orig to E. Pleasants  
1121 - H.H.  
/Add'l to ASLBP-439EN/W

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters  
444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 347-3700

8411270195 841121  
PDR ADDCK 05000352  
T PDR

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - -

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

- - -

In the Matter of:                    ]  
  ]  
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY ]       Docket Nos. 50-352-OL  
  ]                               50-353-OL  
(Limerick Generating Station, ]  
Units 1 & 2)                            ]

Old Customs Courtroom  
U. S. Customs House  
2nd and Chestnut Streets  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Wednesday, November 21, 1984

The hearing in the above-entitled matter convened,  
pursuant to recess, at 9:20 o'clock a.m.

BEFORE:

HELEN F. HOYT, Esquire, Chairwoman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

DR. RICHARD F. COLE, Member  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

DR. JERRY HARBOUR, Esquire, Member  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 2-555

nations

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of Philadelphia Electric Company:

3 TROY B. CONNER, JR., Esquire  
4 NILS N. NICHOLS, Esquire  
5 ROBERT M. RADER, Esquire  
6 Conner & Wetterhahn, P.C.  
7 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.  
8 Washington, D. C. 20006

9 On behalf of Limerick Ecology Action:

10 PHYLLIS ZITZER, President  
11 DAVID STONE  
12 Limerick Ecology Action  
13 Box 761  
14 Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464

15 On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

16 ZORI FERKIN, Esquire  
17 Governor's Energy Council  
18 Post Office Box 8010  
19 1625 Front Street  
20 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

21 On behalf of Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency:

22 RALPH HIPPERT, Esquire  
23 B-151  
24 Transportation and Safety Building  
25 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

26 On behalf of the Federal Emergency Management Agency:

27 MICHAEL HIRSCH, Esquire  
28 Associate General Counsel  
29 FEMA  
30 Room 840  
31 500 "C" Street, S. W.  
32 Washington, D. C. 20472

33 On behalf of the NRC Staff:

34 NATHENE WRIGHT, Esquire  
35 DONALD F. HASSELL, Esquire  
36 Office of the Executive Legal Director  
37 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
38 Washington, D. C. 20555

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

On behalf of the City of Philadelphia:

MARTHA BUSH, ESQ.  
Municipal Services Building  
15th and JFK Boulevard  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

MEMLOCK  
ERASABLE  
OPTION CONTENT

REBECCA

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

C O N T E N T S

<u>WITNESS</u>	<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	<u>REDIRECT</u>	<u>RECROSS</u>
Robert Bradshaw				
John Cunnington				
Robin Hoffman				
Wenger				
by Ms. Zitzer			13,085	

E X H I B I T S

<u>EXHIBIT NO.</u>	<u>IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>RECEIVED</u>
LEA E-5 through E-14	13,118	

Recess . . . . . Page 13,124

TAKE 1  
Page 1

P R O C E E D I N G S

JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will come to order.

I will let the record reflect that the parties to the proceeding are again in the hearing room and that the panel has taken its place on the witness stand.

Again, I will remind the witnesses that you are still under oath.

I will also note that the counsel for the city of Philadelphia is not with us this morning, that Miss Ercole, representing Limerick Ecology Action, Intervenor, is not present, and that at her place at counsel table is Mrs. Phyllis Zitzer.

I think that completes the preliminary assessment of our status.

Ms. Ferkin, you indicated you wished to make some representation on the record.

MS. FERKIN: Yes. This is in regard to the filing of the written testimony on the group of LEA deferred contentions.

JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

MS. FERKIN: In your prior orders you have set the date for filing of written testimony by parties on those contentions as this Monday, October 26.

The Commonwealth intends to file written testimony on those contentions. As we have done with the

1 LEA admitted contentions, we intend to present the  
2 testimony not only of Commonwealth officials but of the  
3 Chester and Berks County emergency management coordinators.

4 As of this morning, it has now become clear  
5 to me that the written testimony being prepared by those two  
6 county coordinators is not going to be in final form by  
7 Monday. I would, therefore, ask the Board's  
8 leave to file the written testimony of the Chester  
9 and Berks County coordinators with you at a later  
10 time.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Can you give us a time most  
12 certain?

13 MS. PERKIN: I would suggest at this point by  
14 next Thursday, the 29th. By then I would have had  
15 time to review it and put that testimony in final form  
16 and have copies available for the parties here in the  
17 hearing room and for the Board.

18 JUDGE HOYT: Thursday, the 29th of October?

19 MS. PERKIN: Yes.

20 JUDGE HOYT: Of November.

21 MS. PERKIN: Of November, yes.

22 Given the information I have today from the  
23 county coordinators, I think that is possible.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. I think that that would  
25 serve the interest of everyone.

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

MR. HASSELL: Staff has no objection.

JUDGE HOYT: How about the Applicant?

MR. RADER: No objection.

JUDGE HOYT: And LEA?

MS. ZITZER: No objection.

JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

We will go off the record for a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE HOYT: Back on the record.

Thank you for your indulgence.

Very well. I believe the panel is ready if  
counsel for Limerick Ecology Action will begin, please.

Whereupon,

ROBERT BRADSHAW

JOHN CUNNINGTON

ROBIN HOFFMAN WENGER

resumed the stand and, having been previously duly  
sworn, were examined and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. ZITZER:

Q Mrs. Wenger, yesterday you were asked to  
provide some information, if you could, regarding the  
training that had been completed for school staff by  
school district. I am not certain that you have that  
information available at this time. If you do, it would

XXXXXXX



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

be helpful.

A (Witness Wenger) Yes, I have it available.

Yesterday, Ms. Ercole had asked for any training that had been conducted at each school district. Would you like any training or specifically as you just now requested by staff?

Q In this regard right now on contention 12, I am particularly interested in school staff.

A In Berks County, Boyertown School District; in Chester County, Owen J. Roberts School District; in Montgomery County, Perkiomen Valley, Pottstown School District and Upper Perkiomen. Also in Chester County, Phoenixville.

That is a total of six school districts inside the Limerack EPZ where we have conducted staff training.

Q Do you have any kind of a breakdown of the number of staff that were trained at each particular school?

A Yes, I do.

Q I would appreciate that.

(Pause.)

A Do you want a total or by school district?

Q By school district, if possible.

A For Owen J. Roberts, we have a question mark

1 for staff. Unfortunately, not all sections turned  
2 in attendance sheets, so we have a question mark  
3 on that one.

4 Q Could you give me an approximate number?

5 (Pause.)

6 If you are aware of that.

7 A I would say probably close to about 300 total.

8 For Phoenixville, 208. That is under  
9 Chester County.

10 Under Berks County, for staff for Boyertown,  
11 475. Under Montgomery County, Perkiomen Valley  
12 staff 199. For Pottstown, 241; and for Upper  
13 Perkiomen, 117.

14 Q Ms. Wenger, are you aware that when these  
15 training sessions were conducted whether teachers  
16 were specifically instructed that those training  
17 sessions were to train them with regard to their  
18 specific roles and responsibilities in the event of  
19 a radiological emergency at Limerick?

20 A The training sessions were to provide background  
21 information to them on some of the terminology that  
22 could be used in the event of a radiological emergency,  
23 background information on radiation as well, and also  
24 biological effects. And also an outline of some of  
25 the planning concepts and responsibilities contained in

1 their school district's plan.

2 Q Is it your -- what is your opinion regarding  
3 whether or not specific instructions were given to these  
4 teachers before the training sessions began to make  
5 certain that they understood that they were receiving  
6 "training" as opposed to what might be more described  
7 as orientation or background information?

8 A I am not sure if we could get into a  
9 discussion of what is training and what is not, is  
10 orientation or is the provision of background  
11 information training?

12 In my mind orientation and providing background  
13 information is training.

14 Q Is it your position that these teachers  
15 fully understood that they were being trained for  
16 the purpose of carrying out their specific responsibilities  
17 in the event of a radiological emergency at Limerick?

18 A I don't know if I would say specific activities.  
19 They were being provided background information and  
20 as much specific information as we could provide on their  
21 own school district plan.

22 Q Do you believe that these teachers who participated  
23 in these training programs have been fully informed  
24 of the contents of their school district radiological  
25 emergency response plans as they currently exist?

1           A     I feel they have been trained in them,  
2     yes.

3           Q     And you feel they understand their specific  
4     individual roles in regards to what these plans contain?

5           A     I believe they understand the general  
6     operating procedures of their school district plans.  
7     Again, the plans do allow for school superintendents  
8     to have last-minute instructions and even, I understand,  
9     the last-minute assignment of staff and selection of  
10    key staff.

11                  That, of course, we couldn't give them. That  
12    would be decided at the time.

13           Q     But it is your testimony that these teachers  
14    understand that this training was provided to prepare  
15    them for responsibilities that they might be asked  
16    to assume in the event of a radiological emergency  
17    at Limerick?

18           A     Yes.

19                  MR. RADER: Objection. Asked and answered.

20                  JUDGE HOYT: The objection is sustained.

21                  BY MS. ZITZER:

22           Q     Are you aware of any exit interviews or  
23    surveys that were conducted following the training  
24    to determine teachers' willingness to carry out the  
25    responsibility that was explained to them during the

1 training session in the event of a radiological  
2 emergency at Limerick?

3 MR. RADER: Objection. Asked and answered.

4 This was covered in yesterday's cross-examination.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1

HEMLOCK  
ERASABLE  
COTTON CONTENT

T2 MM/mml

1 If it would help the Board, I believe it was  
2 specifically discussed in context of Methacton and Owen J.  
3 Roberts School District.

4 JUDGE HOYT: I can't recall the testimony  
5 precisely, counsel.

6 The Board will permit the question. I think you  
7 are right, but I am not going to sustain the objection.

8 Go ahead.

9 WITNESS WENGER: Mr. Cunningham testified  
10 regarding the Owen J. Roberts and Methacton question. I  
11 think it might be more appropriate for Mr. Cunningham to  
12 answer that. I only have secondhand information.

13 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: I testified yesterday at  
14 the conclusion of the Owen J. Roberts training sessions,  
15 the school district provided a survey.

16 BY MS. ZITZER:

17 Q You are not aware of any other schools that  
18 have conducted such a survey following training, is that  
19 correct?

20 A (Witness Cunningham) I am not aware of any other  
21 school district that conducted surveys following training,  
22 no.

23 Q Thank you.

24 Mr. Bradshaw, yesterday you testified that you  
25 believe that the history of human response in disaster

*Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.*

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

(202) 347-3700

mm2

1 situations from documents you have studied, has led you  
2 to the conclusion that it can be assumed that school staff,  
3 as responsible adults, will carry on any responsibility  
4 assigned to them in the event of a radiological emergency  
5 at Limerick.

6 I would like to ask you if any of the documents  
7 you were referring to involved incidents where school  
8 districts were evacuated because of a radiological  
9 emergency.

10 MR. RADER: Objection. No foundation.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Yes. I think you must lay a  
12 foundation for that, ma'am.

13 Sustained.

14 MR. RADER: If I may amend my objection as well,  
15 I believe this is also covered 'n yesterday's cross  
16 examination.

17 JUDGE HOYT: We will not permit the objection to  
18 be amended.

19 MS. ZITZER: I am sorry, Judge Hoyt, I didn't  
20 hear what he said.

21 JUDGE HOYT: I'm sorry. We will not permit the  
22 objection to be amended.

23 You will proceed with laying the foundation we  
24 have asked for.

25 MR. HIRSCH: Could we go off the record for

lmm2

1 a moment?

2 JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

3 (Discussion off the record.)

4 JUDGE HOYT: We are back on the record. Go  
5 ahead, counsel.

6 BY MS. ZITZER:

7 Q Mr. Bradshaw, didn't you testify yesterday that  
8 in your opinion from documents that you had read, the  
9 history of human response in disaster situations led you  
10 to believe that responsible adults would carry out any  
11 responsibility that was assigned to them at the time of  
12 an emergency situation, and therefore that it could be  
13 assumed that individuals, particularly bus drivers and  
14 school teachers that have responsibilities to insure the  
15 evacuation of school children, could be assumed to carry  
16 out those responsibilities in the event of such a crisis?

17 A (Witness Bradshaw) That's correct.

18 Q Isn't it true that yesterday you testified that  
19 that opinion was based on documents that you have reviewed?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Would you please state which of those documents,  
22 if any, referred to the response of teachers or bus  
23 drivers in an instance requiring -- in a radiological  
24 emergency situation requiring the evacuation of the  
25 school districts or school-related buildings?



mm4

1 MR. RADER: Objection. Same objection, lack  
2 of foundation.

3 Also, this was a matter specifically covered  
4 in yesterday's cross examination by Ms. Ercole.

5 MS. ZITZER: I will rephrase the question.

6 (Board conferring)

7 JUDGE HOYT: Ms. Zitzer, are you going to con-  
8 tinue -- so far, the feeling I am getting is that we are  
9 going over the same testimony as yesterday. And, as I  
10 recall, you were present in the hearing room.

11 Do we need to go over this again? Can you ask  
12 specific questions along the lines of this LEA-12 contention  
13 that we are talking about?

14 MS. ZITZER: I don't believe the witness was  
15 asked this question yesterday. He was asked --

16 JUDGE HOYT: The way you are phrasing the  
17 questions is, each time you say, "Didn't you testify  
18 yesterday."

19 Now, if he testified and you have a question on  
20 that, that's fine. But, I'm having difficulty hearing  
21 the same testimony again. And, counsel for Applicant  
22 is making what amounts to really, a legitimate objection.

23 MS. ZITZER: I am very willing to rephrase  
24 the question.

25 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. But, let's see in

mm5  
1 the continuing question if we can elicit some new  
2 information. I think we have got the old information all  
3 in the record now.

4 If you will, let's elicit some new information.

5 I am going to overrule your objection, counsellor.

6 BY MR. ZITZER:

7 Q Mr. Bradshaw, you have stated that you have  
8 reviewed documents regarding human response in  
9 disaster situations, is that correct?

10 A (Witness Bradshaw) That's correct.

11 Q And you have relied upon these documents as a  
12 basis for your testimony, is that correct?

13 A Yes, I have.

14 Q Can you state for the record whether or not  
15 any of the documents that you are relying upon deal with  
16 specific instances of the response of school teachers or  
17 bus drivers in a radiological emergency requiring  
18 evacuation of any school-related buildings?

19 A Those documents speak of disaster response in  
20 general, and categories of individuals, not specific.

21 However, as I pointed out yesterday, there is  
22 no reason to believe that the radiological emergency  
23 would be any different than the other type of disaster  
24 response.

25 Q But the documents that you are specifically

mm

1 referring to do not directly deal with the radiological  
2 emergency, is that correct?

3 A That's correct. They speak in general terms of  
4 all disasters.

5 Q Okay. Thank you.

6 In paragraph 27 on page 13 of your testimony--  
7 this is to the entire panel -- the statement is made  
8 that "school district plans can be implemented with less  
9 than full school staff."

10 Are you aware whether or not school administra-  
11 tors have determined the number of staff required to  
12 implement their plans, or even an estimate if they don't  
13 have the specific numbers available?

14 MR. RADER: Objection. There is no foundation  
15 laid as to any specific number of school teachers that  
16 would be necessary to implement the plans.

17 Therefore, no foundation for the question as to  
18 whether that number has been determined.

19 MS. ZITZER: I am willing to rephrase the  
20 question.

21 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Proceed.

22 MS. ZITZER: Thank you.

23 BY MS. ZITZER:

24 Q This is to the panel. Your testimony states  
25 that school district plans can be implemented with less

mm7

1 than full school staff.

2 Are you aware whether or not school administrators  
3 have yet determined what the appropriate ratio under  
4 such circumstances as a radiological emergency might require  
5 in the event of an evacuation to be able to implement their  
6 respective school plans?

7 A (Witness Cunningham) In general terms, the  
8 determination of the staff available and the assignment of  
9 staff to supervise students and to perform the other  
10 functions of the radiological emergency response plan  
11 within the plan itself are to be determined at the time of  
12 an incident.

13 I am aware that one school superintendent at  
14 Owen J. Roberts School District has estimated the number  
15 of staff that he would assume would be necessary to be  
16 available in student supervisory capacity during a  
17 radiological emergency.

18 Q Thank you. Are you aware of any other school  
19 superintendents who have made similar estimates,  
20 Mr. Cunningham?

21 A No. An estimate as to a number, I am not aware  
22 of any other superintendent that has estimated in any  
23 other way, other than Owen J. Roberts.

end T2

CR21011  
nations  
#3-1

1 Q Thank you. This is to the Panel, is it your  
2 testimony that when the training has been given to school  
3 staff that they have been instructed with regard to procedures  
4 that they should be prepared to implement in the event that  
5 sheltering is called for as a protective measure?

6 A (Witness Wenger) Yes, they have been instructed on  
7 sheltering procedures.

8 Q Is it your opinion that the school districts which  
9 you have provided us information regarding the number of  
10 teachers that have been trained, that this information to the  
11 best of your knowledge has been provided as a routine matter  
12 at all of those training sessions?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Is it your testimony that these teachers fully  
15 understand these procedures?

16 A There was no post-testing to determine whether or  
17 not they fully understood all sheltering procedures. I was  
18 in attendance at I think three or four of the classes and  
19 there were so many numerous questions that were answered  
20 that I think that if they had any more questions on sheltering  
21 procedures, they would have asked.

22 A (Witness Bradshaw) The training program is  
23 obviously designed to answers those kinds of questions and  
24 prepare the teachers for the procedures and the responsibilities  
25 outlined in the plan. I don't know whether we could speak on

1 behalf of the teachers certainly as to their exact understanding  
2 as a result of those training sessions.

3 Q But it is your opinion that based on the training  
4 programs which you have provided that you do believe that the  
5 teachers do understand their role and the procedures to be  
6 implemented in the event that sheltering is ordered as a  
7 protective measure to the best of your knowledge?

8 A (Witness Wenger) To the best of my knowledge, yes.

9 Q This is the panel. In the event that there are  
10 shortages of school staff determined to exist in the event of  
11 a radiological emergency, do you have any information regarding  
12 how those unmet needs would be satisfied?

13 A (Witness Bradshaw) As we have stated previously  
14 the plans are designed to be implemented with less than a full  
15 staff and they will do so. We don't see an unmet need for  
16 staff being passed on to another agency.

17 Q Is there to the best of your knowledge a mechanism  
18 in place, however, that if for some reason there was a shortage  
19 of staff that would insure that the evacuation or other  
20 protective measure that was ordered would be implemented in an  
21 orderly fashion?

22 A There is nothing that has pointed to my knowledge  
23 to a fact that there will be a staff deficiency such that  
24 the plans would not be capable of being implemented. However,  
25 as anyone understands there are ad hoc measures that could be

1 taken and are taken at times of disaster where other people  
2 would help out if need be.

3 Q With specific regard to Owen J. Roberts High School,  
4 Mr. Cunnington, you stated that you were familiar with the  
5 results of the survey that had been conducted to determine  
6 the number of teachers at the time that the survey was taken  
7 that indicated that they were willing to remain in the event  
8 of a radiological emergency, is that correct?

9 A. (Witness Cunnington) Yes.

10 Q. What was the number of school staff that responded  
11 affirmatively that they would be willing to participate in  
12 these activities?

13 A. The number that is presented by Owen J. Roberts at  
14 this time is between 60 and 65 staff. That number was  
15 developed by the superintendent's review of the responses  
16 that were provided on the survey.

17 Q. Mr. Cunnington, do you have any knowledge which  
18 schools they were from, these response were from? Were they  
19 all from one of the schools involved in the school district  
20 or were they spread throughout the school district?

21 A. The survey was conducted at training sessions that  
22 covered the entire staff of the entire district. That would  
23 include six buildings which are summed in Owen J. to three  
24 elementary centers, the middle school and the high school  
25 and it also included some staff other than the professional

1 faculty.

2 Q Mr. Cunningham, do you have any knowledge of which  
3 of the school district buildings that are involved these  
4 60 to 65 teachers who are willing to remain were from?

5 A The specific 60 or 65 that Owen J. Roberts  
6 superintendent has now identified as available, you would  
7 have to ask the superintendent as to which of those buildings.  
8 I do know that there were responses from all of the buildings  
9 and I was in attendance at a meeting where the preliminary  
10 results were presented. Those preliminary results indicated  
11 more than 60 to 65 staff answering in the affirmative but  
12 there were considerations that the superintendent must have  
13 applied to obtain the result of 60 to 65 and you would have  
14 to address that to him as to how he came up with 60 to 65.

15 Q In your testimony in discussing on page 13 under  
16 paragraph 29 the situation with the staff at the Owen J.  
17 Roberts School District, you state that if necessary Chester  
18 County will respond to needed additional staff requested by  
19 the school district as an unmet need. However, is it your  
20 testimony that you believe there are sufficient school staff  
21 identified or that would be available in the event of a  
22 radiological emergency?

23 A I believe I testified yesterday that the survey  
24 provides for the willingness of a teacher stated at a point  
25 in time, namely I believe it was November or December of last



1 year subsequent to their training session to their willingness  
2 to remain with students for sheltering and evacuation -- during  
3 sheltering and during evacuation-- and the survey also provided  
4 information as to their willingness to respond to other  
5 emergencies, also. The correlation between an individual's  
6 expressed willingness at one time and their actual availability  
7 at the time of an emergency are not the same. I testified  
8 yesterday that the plan calls for an assessment to be made  
9 at the time of an incident as to the staff that is available  
10 and contains procedures to tailor the staff that is available  
11 to the needs for the various functions that are to be  
12 performed.

13 I also indicated that the general historical record  
14 would indicate that there would be at a time of emergency  
15 sufficient personnel to meet the needs. I cannot find a  
16 documented incident where there were insufficient personnel  
17 to meet the initial demands of an emergency situation.

18 Q Is that true with regard to a radiological emergency  
19 situation?

20 A We have testified that it is information that is  
21 summed in general to all emergencies. It is not specific to  
22 a radiological emergency nor is it specific to a tornado, nor  
23 is it specific to a monsoon or any other particular type of  
24 emergency.

25 A (Witness Bradshaw) I can also state that in Energy

1 Consultants experience at the other sites that we have been  
2 involved in and in my personal experience with school planning  
3 in Pennsylvania we have not encountered one school district  
4 who has said that it could not implement its radiological  
5 emergency response plan because of staffing considerations.

6 Q You testified earlier with regard to what power  
7 plants that you have been involved in, is that correct?

8 A That is correct.

9 Q Could you please state for the record how many  
10 school districts were involved with regard to those plants  
11 that you just referred to?

12 A I have no idea of the number of school districts  
13 involved. I can only say that there were school districts  
14 involved.

15 Q But you don't have any idea what number?

16 A No, I do not.

17 Q What instructions have been given to school staff  
18 with regard to provisions for possible evacuation of other  
19 children that school members may have either in preschool and  
20 daycare centers or children who might for some other reason  
21 not be at the same school that the teacher is at? Have the  
22 training sessions included information regarding what provisions  
23 would be implemented to insure the safety of the other members  
24 of a teacher's family?

25 A (Witness Wenger) As we testified yesterday teachers

mn3-7

1 were generally advised that they should discuss family  
2 arrangements with their family members to determine what would  
3 happen during a radiological emergency.

4 A. (Witness Bradshaw) Further, Ms. Zitzer, as we also  
5 indicated the training sessions include an overview of the  
6 planning process. That overview states the planning consider-  
7 ations for the general public at large including municipal and  
8 and county plans.

9 A. (Witness Cunningham) In addition, the training  
10 sessions described the procedures of sheltering, evacuation  
11 and selective evacuation and their impact on the general  
12 public and their indirect impact on schools.

13 Q. I ask this to any member of the panel that can answer  
14 To the best of your knowledge has any information been yet  
15 provided to the general public with regard to the procedures  
16 for evacuation in the event of a radiological emergency at  
17 Limerick?

18 A. (Witness Bradshaw) There has been a great deal of  
19 information available through the press. There has also been  
20 a great deal of information distributed at public meetings  
21 which Energy Consultants has participated in. The formal  
22 public education, public information program outlined in the  
23 county plans, is in the process of getting underway now.

24 As an example, the public information brochure has  
25 been drafted and is under review by the county and Commonwealth

mn3-8

1 authorities and I believe in my last contact with the Common-  
2 wealth it was presently scheduled for distribution to the  
3 general public in December.

4 Q With regard to teachers who have children that are  
5 involved in preschool and daycare programs, is it your  
6 opinion that these teachers are aware of the procedures to be  
7 utilized for the evacuation of those children?

8 A We described the general process, the information  
9 that was provided to the teachers and that is, that plans  
10 for the general public are being developed. We gave an  
11 overview of that planning process. I am not aware that they  
12 would have any additional detail beyond that.

13 Q What is the role of the teacher at a host school?  
14 Let me clarify that. When students have been evacuated from  
15 a risk school district and they accompany the students to a  
16 host school, what role does the teacher who is accompanied  
17 the evacuated students play at that point?

18 A (Witness Cunnington) The teacher participates with  
19 other staff that have volunteered and have been assigned by the  
20 administration in supervising the children in the areas of the  
21 host school that are designated for the risk students to  
22 occupy. They would be involved as would the other staff who  
23 volunteered in student accountability which is a matter of  
24 keeping records and providing for pick-up of the student by his  
25 parent, his guardian or the parent's designee or guardian's

mn3-9

1 designee.

2           They would perform similar functions to what they  
3 would perform on their sheltering or in general in that they  
4 would supervise and maintain discipline and order and follow  
5 any other instructions that might get provided by the building  
6 principal who would be communicating with their superintendent.

7           Q.   How long is the teacher expected to stay at the  
8 host school?

9           A.   The situation is that it is not possible to determine  
10 the absolute time that any particular teacher would be asked to  
11 be there. They have volunteered and the plans particularly  
12 specify that as the student enrollment drops because of  
13 parental or guardian pick-up, that appropriate staff should  
14 be released.

15                   It also specifies to help the district maintain  
16 an accountability and a record that before a teacher leaves  
17 they check with the appropriate administrative person, usually  
18 the building principal or his designate so that they can be  
19 excused which would include being recorded as having left.

20                   The time would be dependent on a number of factors  
21 of which obviously the student enrollment that remains at a  
22 host school being one of them, the time it would take for  
23 parents to arrive at the host school is another. The  
24 estimates, I have discussed this with several school districts  
25 and it is not possible to get estimates as to the amount of

3-10

1 time that a teacher would be required but not all of the  
2 teachers that would be required at the beginning of student  
3 pick-up would be required through the entire process.

4 Q At what point in time would students be transported  
5 from the host school to a mass care center?

6 A The time is consistent to all of the plans with  
7 the exception that a few schools are not transported and that  
8 time was arbitrarily selected to be 8:00 p.m. It is a target  
9 time.

10 Q Who is expected at least according to the way the  
11 plans are presently drafted to accompany students to the mass  
12 care centers if they are further transported from the host  
13 school?

14 A Again, the appropriate number of staff or the  
15 staff that would be available and willing to volunteer to  
16 assist the administration in accompanying whatever students  
17 remained, the numbers or those individuals that would be  
18 designated would obviously be dependent upon the number of  
19 students that remained. If four students remained, it would  
20 be certainly different than if 64 or 84 or 124 remained. That  
21 would be a decision that would need be made by the administra-  
22 tion which includes the superintendent or his building  
23 principals.

24 Q You have continued to use the word "teachers have  
25 volunteered" or "volunteers" would be carrying out these

mn3-11

1 various roles and responsibilities. Is it your assumption that  
2 in the event of a radiological emergency that these teachers  
3 will come forward and volunteer willingly as opposed to being  
4 ordered by the school superintendent that they are expected  
5 to carry out these roles and responsibilities?

6 MR. RADER: Objection, asked and answered.

7 JUDGE HOYT: Objection sustained.

8 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

9 Q According to the plans as they are presently drafted,  
10 how long is school staff expected to stay at the mass care  
11 center with evacuated students?

12 A. (Witness Cunningham) The plans do not specify  
13 to my knowledge a time that the staff would be required to  
14 stay at a mass care center. The situation upon arriving at  
15 a student mass care feeding center would be that the Red Cross  
16 would at that point in time be involved in operating that  
17 center and providing for the basic needs of the students.

18 It is similar to a mass care center. The only  
19 distinction is the clientele that it serves. A mass care  
20 center serves the general public and a student center is just  
21 basically designated for those students that remain. Again  
22 the time, the number of staff that would remain would be  
23 dependent upon the administrative needs.

24 There would be Red Cross personnel operating the  
25 center and they have experience in running mass care centers and

mn3-12

1 shelters and that may affect the number of school staff that  
2 are needed. Again, it is a decision to be made by the  
3 administration.

4 A. (Witness Bradshaw) If we can put this process pro-  
5 cedure in perspective a little bit, please. Assuming the  
6 schools obviously are in session at the time of the  
7 evacuation is declared, it couldn't occur later than about  
8 3:00 in the afternoon. The student pick-up points are  
9 staffed by the teachers until 8:00 p.m., after which time  
10 they are moved to a mass care center situation.

11 This is a five hour period. It is consistent with  
12 the evacuation time estimate study for the EPZ. So it is  
13 obvious that the general public is going to have been  
14 evacuated in that time, that the majority of the students are  
15 going to be picked up. So the students moving to mass care  
16 centers are going to be very few and it is envisioned that  
17 probably an administrative person from the school district would  
18 be involved.

19 A. (Witness Cunnington) In addition, a review of the  
20 school district plans will indicate that there are far fewer  
21 numbers of student mass care centers than there are host  
22 schools. The intent is to allow a smaller number of students  
23 from a number of facilities to be grouped together and that  
24 does allow cooperative effort on the part of the school  
25 administrative officials that would remain and that again should



1 reduce the need or requirement at the time to ask for staff  
2 volunteers and faculty are one of the groups, teachers are  
3 one of the groups that could be numbered in those staff  
4 volunteers.

END#3

REE flws

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

1 Q At what point in time during these procedures  
2 is the school district relieved of its responsibilities  
3 to oversee the safety and protection of the children?

4 Is it when they arrive at the mas care center or  
5 is it when they are picked up by a designated guardian  
6 or their parent?

7 A The plans indicate that the administration  
8 retains responsibility for all students until they  
9 are picked up by their parent, legal guardian, or  
10 designate.

11 Q Mr. Bradshaw, you just made reference to the  
12 evacuation time estimate study with regard to the time  
13 periods involved or likely to be involved in evacuation  
14 scenarios with regard to transportation of children to  
15 both host schools and mass care centers.

16 Isn't it true that that evacuation time estimate  
17 study assumes approximately an hour mobilization time for  
18 busses to carry out these activities that you have  
19 just described?

20 MR. RADER: Objection. Mobilization time for  
21 busses was specifically excluded by this Board as an  
22 issue in its order of September 25, 1984 at page 6  
23 and again at page 8.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Page?

25 MR. RADER: Page 6 and page 8, and this was the

1 same point in which the Board ruled yesterday in sustain-  
2 ing the same objection.

3 JUDGE HOYT: The objection is sustained.

4 MS. ZITZER: For the record, your Honor,  
5 the only reason I brought it up was because the witness  
6 mentioned it in his answer.

7 (Pause.)

8 BY MS. ZITZER:

9 Q This is to the panel: Are you aware of any  
10 evaluation that has been conducted regarding the  
11 adequacy of school district buildings for  
12 sheltering purposes?

13 A (Witness Bradshaw) No. Not with regard to  
14 the Limerick Generating Station. There are government  
15 studies that assess protection factors for buildings,  
16 all public buildings, in event of a nuclear  
17 emergency, particularly a war scenario.

18 (Pause.)

19 Q This is to the panel: With regard to the  
20 statement made in paragraph 28 of your testimony on  
21 page 13, with regard to your statement that radiation  
22 is not a tangible, visible hazard and, therefore,  
23 the impact on implementation of any protective measures  
24 that might require, in your opinion, are not likely  
25 to be psychologically traumatic or cause the students

1 to be unruly.

2           Could you please provide the basis for  
3 that statement?

4           MR. RADER: Objection.

5           Your Honor, I recognize that this is, in fact,  
6 covered in the Applicant's testimony. However,  
7 referring to the Board's order of September 24, it  
8 does appear that the Board did exclude any issue  
9 regarding minimum staffing requirements to cope with  
10 the psychological trauma the children will undergo  
11 during a radiological emergency and that exclusion  
12 appears with regard to LEA 12 at page 8 of the Board's  
13 order.

14           JUDGE COLE: Where does it appear in the  
15 testimony?

16           MS. ZITZER: On page 13, right after number 28.  
17 It is the first sentence.

18           MR. RADER: As I say, I recognize Miss Zitzer  
19 is correct, that statement does appear in the  
20 Applicant's written testimony. However, the fact  
21 remains that the Board has excluded that as an issue.

22           MS. ZITZER: Page 13, ma'am.

23           JUDGE HOYT: Where on page 13?

24           MS. ZITZER: Item 28, the first sentence.

25           (Board conferring.)

1 MR. RADER: The sentence which I referred  
2 the Board to in its September 24 order appears --

3 JUDGE HOYT: I have that.

4 MR. RADER: You have that, Judge Hoyt?

5 JUDGE HOYT: Yes. I have that.

6 Would counsel for the Applicant be willing  
7 to strike that section of the testimony in paragraph 28  
8 that refers to that?

9 MR. RADER: If the Board is sustaining my  
10 objection, yes.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Probably would.

12 MR. RADER: If it would assist the Board,  
13 yes, I would be willing to strike that.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

15 So the testimony of the Applicant in  
16 Applicant's testimony relating to LEA offsite emergency  
17 planning contentions as contained on page 13, paragraph 28,  
18 which reads as follows: "Inasmuch as radiation is not  
19 a tangible" and on down through the fifth line  
20 "traumatized or unruly" will be struck.

21 MS. ZITZER: If the Board would permit, there  
22 is another reference to the same section on page 22,  
23 item 49. It refers back to that item with regard to the  
24 training of school staff.

25 I would ask the Board to take that statement also

1 into consideration.

2 JUDGE HOYT: Let me have that identification  
3 on page 22, please?

4 MS. ZITZER: Top of page 22, the first sentence  
5 after 49.

6 MR. RADER: I have no objection to that,  
7 if it is similarly understood that there is no  
8 training required, that that is not part of the  
9 admitted contention for the purpose of this hearing.

10 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

11 You will agree then to striking that portion  
12 of the testimony, counsel?

13 Sir?

14 MR. RADER: Yes. I believe that we are  
15 agreeing to the striking of the first sentence of  
16 that paragraph, paragraph 49.

17 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. So much of the  
18 paragraph of the previously identified documents  
19 contained on page 22, paragraph 49 which reads "there  
20 are no plans" and through the seventh line down  
21 which reads "stressful conditions," that portion will  
22 be stricken.

23 MS. ZITZER: Thank you.

24 JUDGE HOYT: The objection to the question is  
25 sustained.

1                   Would you please proceed.

2                   BY MS. ZITZER:

3                   Q     This is to the panel: Do you have any  
4 knowledge of whether or not the current contracts,  
5 teachers' employment contracts, cover duties and  
6 responsibilities after normal school hours are over?

7                   MR. RADER: Objection, your Honor. The  
8 very same objection was sustained yesterday with  
9 regard to the contractual provisions of the teachers  
10 in the schools.

11                  JUDGE HOYT: Yes, I believe counsel is right.  
12 That objection was sustained. It is again sustained  
13 this morning.

14                  MS. ZITZER: If it would be agreeable to the  
15 Board, I have completed my question on LEA 12 at this  
16 point in time. Because the questioning for the  
17 bus drivers, which is the subject of LEA 15, is so very  
18 much related to what we have just covered and what was  
19 covered yesterday on LEA 11, I would like to move into that  
20 now to try to complete that line of questioning and  
21 skip over 13 and 14.

22                  I think it would simplify the time involved.  
23 So with the Board's permission, I would like to move  
24 to contention LEA 15 which is with regard to the  
25 willingness and participation of bus drivers.

1 JUDGE HOYT: Does that pose any problem  
2 for --

3 MR. RADER: No. The Applicant agrees  
4 with any procedure which would expedite the hearing.  
5 And if that would, then we agree with it.

6 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

7 MR. HASSELL: Staff has no objection.

8 MS. FERKIN: No objection.

9 JUDGE HOYT: I guess we better hear from  
10 FEMA.

11 MR. HIRSCH: I have no objection.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

13 Miss Zitzer, I think that is a logical way  
14 of proceeding.

15 MS. ZITZER: Thank you very much.

16 JUDGE HOYT: Surely.

17 MS. ZITZER: While I am just turning to  
18 that section of the testimony, I would like to ask  
19 Mr. Stone to distribute a number of letters of  
20 agreement that I have identified as exhibits which I  
21 will discuss during the cross-examination; I think  
22 for efficiency purposes I would like to distribute  
23 them now and let the parties have an opportunity to  
24 look them over, if that would be acceptable.

25 (Mr. Stone distributes documents.)



1 JUDGE HOYT: These exhibits will be  
2 marked LEA Exhibits E-5, 6,, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
3 13 and 14 for identification only.

4 (The documents referred to  
5 were marked LEA Exhibit Nos.  
6 E-5 through E-14 for  
7 identification.)

8 BY MS. ZITZER:

9 Q This is to the panel: I would like to  
10 start out with some general questions.

11 With regard to the Chester County plans, I  
12 believe in your testimony yesterday on the information  
13 regarding bus availability, there was considerable  
14 discussion of the portions of the Chester County draft 7  
15 plan that you were relying upon as your basis, the basis  
16 for your testimony with regard to the availability of  
17 busses.

18 Is there anything else other than the  
19 information you provided yesterday that you could  
20 provide now with regard to arrangements for the  
21 provisions for drivers for the evacuation of schools  
22 in Chester County?

23 MR. RADER: I object to the form of the  
24 question. I don't know what the witnesses are being  
25 asked to answer. I don't think it is proper to ask the

1 witness if he wishes to supplement his  
2 answer in any way from the previously asked question.

3 MS. ZITZER: I will rephrase it.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Please rephrase it then, and  
5 the objection will be overruled.

6 BY MS. ZITZER:

7 Q This is to the panel: Could you please  
8 provide any information you are aware of with regard  
9 to the availability of drivers for busses that are  
10 intended to be used to evacuate schools in Chester  
11 County?

12 A (Witness Bradshaw) The information we  
13 presented yesterday with regard to Chester County  
14 busses included drivers. We do not differentiate  
15 the two since they were pursued jointly. The agreements  
16 include busses and drivers and, as such, they have been  
17 addressed in that manner in the plans.

18 We indicated in our table 11-A and the  
19 accompanying information was developed based on the  
20 county and underlying supporting school district plans.

21 Q Isn't it true that yesterday you testified  
22 that there were no written agreements as yet  
23 completed in Chester County for the provision of  
24 busses to evacuate the schools?

25 A To the best of our knowledge, there are not.

1 There are only verbal agreements.

2 Q Can you name any of the companies with which  
3 there are verbal agreements?

4 A I understand that SEPTA is one of the organizations.  
5 That is the only one I have direct knowledge of.

6 Q Do you have any knowledge of how many  
7 busses SEPTA is considering providing or is able to  
8 make available?

9 A Indirectly through the county.

10 Q Could you provide that number?

11 A I believe it is 130 of the 137 busses  
12 presently listed as unmet need in the Chester County  
13 plan.

14 Q Is it your testimony that these busses are  
15 available for Chester County's use?

16 A Yes. The county plan indicates that  
17 they have identified over 200 busses that would  
18 be available for Limerick emergency.

19 Q Is it your testimony that SEPTA is also willing  
20 to provide drivers for these busses?

21 A As I said, I only have indirect knowledge.  
22 I wouldn't comment any further than that.

23 Q Could you elaborate what your knowledge is  
24 based on?

25 A Based on our discussions with county staff,  
Chester County staff.

END 4

*Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.*

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

(202) 347-3700

T5 MM/mm1

1 Q Are you aware of any other providers of either  
2 buses or drivers in Chester County with which there are  
3 verbal agreements, other than SEPTA?

4 A Only that there are others. I am not aware of the  
5 specifics.

6 Q With regard to the arrangements for Montgomery  
7 County, yesterday I believe you testified that there were  
8 certain portions of the Montgomery County Plan that you  
9 were relying upon at least as part of your -- the basis for  
10 your knowledge with regard to the provisions of buses and  
11 drivers for the evacuation of schools in Montgomery County.

12 Is that correct?

13 A Yes, that's correct.

14 Q Could I ask you to turn to the table of  
15 transportation providers in the Montgomery County Plan, so  
16 that I might ask a few questions about the availability of  
17 those drivers.

18 I am specifically referring to, I believe it is  
19 Annex I. There is a listing of transportation providers.

20 For the record, I would like to note that I  
21 have notes based on the Limerick assignment information,  
22 which relates to units of both buses and drivers that  
23 was discussed yesterday. I have loaned that out to have  
24 phonecalls made with regard to the superintendents' names,  
25 and it will be returned in a minute. I do have detailed

mm2

1 notes that I am going to be asking you some questions from.  
2 There is a possibility in some places the reference pages  
3 on the Draft 6 copy which I have, may be one page behind  
4 the copy that you have. And I just wanted to make sure that  
5 you were able to find the place in Draft 7 that I refer to.

6 A (Witness Cunningham) We were able to so locate  
7 that yesterday.

8 Q Thank you very much.

9 Yesterday there was concern over discussion  
10 about the arrangements for buses, in particular, in  
11 evacuation of school districts in Montgomery County.  
12 Arrangements that have been made by the Montgomery County  
13 Emergency Coordinator were referred to, and specific  
14 survey information that was used to obtain the information  
15 with regard to units available for mobilization, as well  
16 as other information in the table which we are now discussing  
17 which is entitled, I believe, Transportation Providers,  
18 which starts on page I-2-5 of Draft 7 of the Montgomery  
19 County Plan.

20 I have distributed to you a number of exhibits,  
21 and I would like to ask you to refer to LEA Exhibit E-5,  
22 which is a letter from the Montgomery County Office of  
23 Emergency Preparedness that was sent to one of the  
24 transportation providers listed on this list, the Upper  
25 Moreland School District. It is dated September 7, 1984,

*Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.*

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

(202) 347-3700

mm3

1 and it is a letter to Mr. William Mathers, who is the  
2 Supervisor of Operations for the School District from the  
3 Montgomery County Office of Emergency Preparedness.

4 I would note that the bottom of the letter on  
5 page 2 indicates that a copy was sent to Energy Consultants,  
6 addressed to Robin Wenger.

7 Is this letter some of the information which  
8 you discussed yesterday with regards to the communications  
9 between the bus providers and the Montgomery County Office  
10 of Emergency Preparedness with regard to the development of  
11 arrangements and information regarding the provision of  
12 buses for evacuation from Montgomery County schools?

13 A I believe I testified yesterday that Montgomery  
14 County at some point in September had sent a request to  
15 update information for school year 1984-1985. This letter  
16 is part of that request.

17 Q Thank you.

18 JUDGE HOYT: One minute, Ms. Zitzer.

19 I wonder if there is another copy of that --  
20 are you going to be referring to this plan very often?

21 MS. ZITZER: Yes. Because that is the basis,  
22 the source of the information with regard --

23 JUDGE HOYT: On the school buses?

24 MS. ZITZER: Drivers.

25 JUDGE HOYT: I wonder if there is another copy

*Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.*

441 NORTH CAPITOL STREET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

(202) 347-3700

mm4

1 of that available in the hearing room?

2 MR. RADER: Yes. We can make one available for  
3 the Board.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Ms. Zitzer, will you let me know if  
5 this is a good time, or when a good time would be to take  
6 a break. We have been going along for about an hour and a  
7 half.

8 MS. ZITZER: If you would like to do it now,  
9 that would be fine.

10 JUDGE HOYT: Very well, we will recess for ten  
11 minutes.

12 (Recess.)

13 JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will come to order.

14 Let the record reflect that all the parties to  
15 the hearing who were present in the hearing room when  
16 the hearing recessed, are again present; that the witnesses  
17 have taken their places on the stand and are still under  
18 the same oath.

19 Agreed?

20 (Witnesses nodding affirmatively.)

21 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Thank you.

22 BY MS. ZITZER:

23 Q To the panel. We are discussing LEA Exhibit E-5.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Ms. Zitzer, could you give us a  
25 reference to that portion of the Montgomery County Plan. We

mm5

1 have a copy of it here and would like to follow along with  
2 you.

3 MS. ZITZER: Certainly. It is in Appendix I.  
4 The table is entitled Transportation Providers. It is on  
5 page I-2-5. It is Tab 3 entitled Bus Companies.

6 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

7 BY MS. ZITZER:

8 Q With regard to LEA Exhibit 5 dated September 7,  
9 1984, isn't it true this letter is a letter from Mr. Lindley  
10 Bigelow, the Montgomery County Emergency Coordinator, to  
11 one of the bus providers listed in the Montgomery County  
12 Plan?

13 A (Witness Bradshaw) Yes.

14 MR. RADER: Objection. The document speaks for  
15 itself.

16 Mr. Bradshaw having answered the question, I  
17 withdraw my objection.

18 JUDGE HOYT: Proceed.

19 BY MS. ZITZER:

20 Q Isn't it true that this letter makes a reference  
21 to a training program that could be available for those  
22 transportation companies that might request it, and that  
23 it is recommended because it provides in depth orientation  
24 in response to those that might be involved in a radiologi-  
25 cal emergency?



mm6

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

MR. RADER: Objection. The document speaks for itself.

JUDGE HOYT: I am going to overrule your objection counsel. I think that she was merely describing the document and what is contained in there.

Now I think a question is coming, is it not? Hopefully?

MS. ZITZER: One moment.

BY MS. ZITZER:

Q Isn't it true that this letter states that an important part of the planned response is training for individuals or organizations who could be involved in such a response?

MR. RADER: Same objection.

JUDGE HOYT: I am going to sustain the objection. I think the information you want can be elicited from the witness with a question.

I understand your situation, but try it again.

BY MS. ZITZER:

Q Does this letter inform the Upper Moreland School District that they specifically have any Limerick assignment for which they should consider having drivers trained to participate in any potential radiological emergency at Limerick?

MR. RADER: Same objection. The document speaks

mm7

1 for itself.

2 JUDGE HOYT: I am going to overrule the objection,  
3 counsellor. I don't think we will ever get the answer  
4 unless I do. Go ahead, counsellor, see if you can get the  
5 answer you want.

6 WITNESS BRADSHAW: I don't see reference to  
7 Limerick in the cover letter.

8 BY MS. ZITZER:

9 Q Doesn't the letter use the words that organiza-  
10 tions who could be involved in a radiological response,  
11 but not contain any specific reference to the fact that  
12 Upper Moreland School District has a specific Limerick  
13 assignment?

14 MR. RADER: I object. That is argumentative.

15 JUDGE HOYT: I'm going to have to sustain the  
16 objection, Ms. Zitzer.

17 BY MS. ZITZER:

18 Q Could you please turn to Exhibit LEA E-6, which  
19 is the bus transportation providers survey completed by  
20 Upper Moreland School District dated March 13th, 1984.

21 Is that correct?

22 A (Witness Cunningham) Yes, ma'am.

23 JUDGE HOYT: You don't have to ask the witness  
24 because that is on the face of the document. It speaks,  
25 as counsel continually tells us, for itself.

mm8

1 MS. ZITZER: Okay.

2 BY MS. ZITZER:

3 Q Do you have any knowledge whether or not this  
4 information was provided for general use with regard to  
5 any emergency that the County might need transportation  
6 assistance with, or whether or not it takes into  
7 consideration a specific Limerick assignment?

8 MR. RADER: Objection, your Honor.

9 Preliminarily there has been no foundation laid  
10 as to the authenticity of this document. I don't know who  
11 it came from or who prepared this particular page, or who  
12 provided the information.

13 In addition, I would respectfully remind  
14 the Board that we went over this information in these charts  
15 yesterday with regard to a number of school districts in  
16 Annex I of the Montgomery County Plan, and particularly the  
17 Wissahickon and the Hagey providers. And I believe this  
18 particular line of questioning is repetitive and redundant  
19 at best.

20 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, this line of questioning  
21 deals with specific arrangements for bus drivers which  
22 the witness has testified that this table is the basis for.  
23 This table and conversations he has had with the Montgomery  
24 County Office of Emergency Preparedness is the basis for  
25 his opinion and his testimony that there are sufficient bus

mm9

1 resources identified.

2 JUDGE HOYT: Let's see if the witnesses have  
3 ever seen what has been marked LEA Exhibit E-6.

4 Have you seen this? It is entitled Bus  
5 Transportation Providers Survey?

6 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: Documents similar to this  
7 were prepared subsequent to the meetings in March and  
8 April of this year as I testified yesterday. The County  
9 met with each and every individual provider and collected  
10 information, summarized that information and sent it out  
11 for verification.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Having said all the above, have  
13 you ever seen E-6 before?

14 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: I can't be -- again, I've  
15 seen E-6 -- I've seen a document like this in March of this  
16 year, that has been sent to a school district and come  
17 back to Montgomery County. And I'm aware from reading of  
18 my letter, Exhibit E-5, that the County resubmitted a  
19 document to them in September of this year for correction.  
20 But I don't know whether this document is the original, the  
21 corrected document, or whatever.

22 But, it certainly is typical.

23 JUDGE HOYT: Are you aware of the Bus Transporta-  
24 tion Provider Survey in Montgomery County at all?

25 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: Yes, ma'am. This is that

mm10

1 document, one of 33. But I am not sure if this is -- I  
2 don't know if this is a document from March or a document  
3 from September or whatever.

4 But it is typical.

end T5

5 JUDGE HOYT: Why don't you look at the figures  
6 and see?  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MS. ZITZER: I have only a very limited number of  
2 questions.

3 JUDGE HOYT: All right. Let's see if you can get  
4 what you want. Apparently they have seen something along  
5 this line at least.

6 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

7 Q Do you have knowledge whether or not this information  
8 was provided with the understanding that it was specifically in  
9 reference to planning for a radiological emergency at Limerick?

10 A (Witness Cunningham) It should not have been  
11 provided with the specific understanding that it was for just  
12 a radiological emergency at Limerick. The discussion that  
13 was held between the bus provider and Montgomery County  
14 indicated it was any emergency, natural or man-made, with the  
15 qualifier including an incident at the Limerick Generating  
16 Station so that there could be no confusion on the part of the  
17 provider that the Limerick Generating Station was one of  
18 the potential man-made disasters, one of the potential man-made  
19 emergencies that could be confronted by the Montgomery County  
20 Office of Emergency Preparedness.

21 Q Is it your opinion that when the answers to this  
22 survey and I realize that there have been several of them,  
23 an update this past September but the earlier ones in the  
24 spring of 1984, is it your opinion that the transportation  
25 providers were fully aware that there was a likelihood that

mn6-2

1 this information would be utilized with regard to radiological  
2 emergency response planning for Limerick?

3 A. As I just testified they were aware that Montgomery  
4 County was planning for all emergencies, natural and man-made  
5 including an incident at the Limerick Generation Station. In  
6 addition, they were made aware that at the current time  
7 Montgomery County was preparing a radiological emergency  
8 response plan and they were also in the course of the  
9 discussions provided information that training was available  
10 for radiological emergencies.

11 A. (Witness Bradshaw) In fact, your exhibit E-7 includes  
12 what is represented as the completed agreement that so states  
13 that they are offering these services and includes specifically  
14 a reference to services provided for an emergency at the  
15 Limerick Generating Station and it includes both buses and  
16 drivers.

17 Q. Do you have any knowledge of whether or not the  
18 Upper Moreland School District is aware of its Limerick  
19 assignment to provide ten school buses to evacuate the Hill  
20 school?

21 A. (Witness Cunnington) I testified yesterday that the  
22 County indicated that they were not necessarily going to  
23 provide the Limerick assignments. I am not aware that the  
24 Upper Moreland School District is aware of its Limerick  
25 assignment, no.

1 Q Are you aware of whether or not the Upper Moreland  
2 School District knows that it has any Limerick assignment at  
3 all?

4 MR. RADER: Objection, Your Honor. I object to this  
5 line of questioning. I believe the contention is limited in  
6 scope to the number of buses. Assignment of buses would at  
7 best go to a mobilization/time issue which this Board has  
8 expressly excluded in its September 24th order and which  
9 objection the Board previously sustained at least twice,  
10 once today and once yesterday.

11 (Board conferring off the record.)

12 MR. RADER: The mobilization time was rejected by  
13 the Board on page six and again on page eight of its  
14 September 24th order.

15 (Board conferring off the record.)

16 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, I am specifically trying  
17 to determine the basis for the witness' opinion that there  
18 are sufficient buses and driers available and he has relied  
19 upon the information in this table as a basis for that  
20 opinion. I am simply trying to determine the extent to his  
21 knowledge of the information in the table or if he is simply  
22 taking information that was provided by the Montgomery County  
23 Office of Emergency Preparedness at face value without any  
24 specific direct knowledge of the contents of those arrangements.

25 MR. RADER: And as the Board ruled yesterday, the



mn6-4

1 issue of the assignment of those buses is irrelevant to the  
2 number of buses available under that table as the witnesses  
3 have testified.

4 JUDGE HOYT: The objection is sustained. I think  
5 you may wish, Ms. Zitzer, to read again this Board's order  
6 of September 24, 1984 specifically at page eight of that  
7 order, what it is in your contention LEA-15 as it was  
8 originally formulated and how the Board excluded portions of  
9 that. That is what counsel has objected to and which the  
10 Board has sustained here because of its order. We have  
11 gone back over and looked at your contention and those grounds  
12 and the specifications of the contention and specifically  
13 indicated where those were crossed out. I think you may wish  
14 to refresh your recollection on that order. Please continue.

15 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

16 Q Is it your testimony that based on the information  
17 in this table as well as your knowledge of the arrangements  
18 made by the Montgomery County Office of Emergency Preparedness  
19 that sufficient buses and drivers have been identified to  
20 evacuate the schools in Montgomery County?

21 A (Witness Cunningham) Yes, that was my testimony.

22 Q But you have no specific knowledge if the bus company  
23 providers here are aware of the number of units that they are  
24 expected to provide, is that correct.

25 MR. RADER: Objection, Your Honor. We went over this

1 time and time again yesterday and it has been fully covered  
2 as to the number of units.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Can we start getting the new information  
4 Ms. Zitzer, otherwise we are never going to finish these  
5 hearings without our foreseeable lifetime. I think you have  
6 to get the new information into the record. I will give you  
7 as much latitude as possible on that but where the testimony  
8 has been given before, it is already a matter of record.

9 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, there are a lot of  
10 inaccuracies in this table with regard to the resources  
11 available.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Will you please examine on those  
13 inaccuracies as you see them? We would appreciate your  
14 cross-examination of the witnesses in pointing them out to us.  
15 But we must have questions on those inaccuracies, not on  
16 testimony that was given yesterday. If those are the same  
17 inaccuracies that they testified before, they are already in  
18 the record. Those points were made by your counsel yesterday.

19 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, there are many additional  
20 misrepresentations in this table.

21 JUDGE HOYT: And those we want you to point out to us  
22 through your cross-examination of this panel.

23 MS. ZITZER: Only one or two examples.

24 JUDGE HOYT: As many as you have or that you know  
25 about or that you suspect or have reasonable cause to may believe

mn6-6

1 they are there.

2 MS. ZITZER: That is what I am attempting to do.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Please, let's get some new information  
4 into the record.

5 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

6 Q Is it your testimony that this information in the  
7 tables is the extent of your knowledge with regard to the  
8 available drivers for the units identified in this table to  
9 assist in the evacuation of school districts in the event of  
10 a radiological emergency at Limerick?

11 A (Witness Cunnington) I testified yesterday that  
12 specifically the headings "drivers" indicated drivers employed  
13 by the district or service. I did not testify on fuel. I did  
14 say that vehicles operated reflected the numbers of vehicles  
15 owned or contracted by the particular provider. I indicated  
16 that the figures in mobilization time, units available for  
17 mobilization indicated buses and drivers as reflected from a  
18 discussion between Montgomery County and the providers based  
19 on differing times of the day and estimates of the manager or  
20 operator's understanding of his particular service and I  
21 testified as to what the Limerick assignments were those  
22 made by Montgomery County to facilitate the planning process.

23 Q Let me take an example. CMB Services is listed  
24 as having a Limerick assignment of 15 buses. That is all of  
25 their buses. Have they guaranteed 15 drivers?

mn6-7

1           A.     I testified yesterday that any service that was in  
2 the emergency planning zone and was contracted or owned by a  
3 school district in the emergency planning zone that the  
4 Montgomery County reserved any assignment to the assignments  
5 that had been made by the school districts in their plans  
6 so the plans of the school districts make the assignments.

7                     What is reflected here, I testified yesterday, was  
8 Montgomery County's recognition of that. That is not a  
9 different assignment that is in the school district plans.

10           Q.     When you say in the school district plans, do you  
11 mean the radiological emergency response plans?

12           A.     Yes, ma'am.

13           Q.     Do you have any knowledge whether or not CMD Services  
14 is aware that it is expected to provide 15 buses and drivers?

15                     MR. RADER:    Objection. That has been asked and  
16 answered.

17                     (Board conferring off the record.)

18                     JUDGE HOYT:   The question will be permitted. Your  
19 objection is overruled.

20                     WITNESS CUNNINGTON:  CMD Services contracts with the  
21 Pottstown School District to provide busing. They also  
22 provide the drivers to the Pottsgrove School District and the  
23 Pottstown and Pottsgrove School Districts have made the  
24 assignments of the buses that they contract for and in the  
25 case of Pottsgrove, the buses that they own and the drivers

6-8-mn

1 that they contract for. Those assignments are reflected in their  
2 plan and Montgomery County recognized those assignments in  
3 establishing their Limerick assignments.

4 I was not present at a meeting between the CMD Services  
5 and either the Pottstown or the Pottsgrove School District, but  
6 I was provided the information that is in the school plans  
7 by the Pottstown and Pottsgrove School Districts.

8 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

9 Q With regard to Custer's Garage in Oaks, the company  
10 has Limerick assignment to provide 40 buses. Have they given  
11 any kind of guarantee or assurance that they will be able  
12 to provide 40 drivers for those buses?

13 A (Witness Cunningham) Custer's Garage is under  
14 contract to the Spring Ford Area School District. The  
15 assignments for Limerick were made by the Spring Ford Area  
16 School District and Montgomery County's assignments reflect  
17 that. As I indicated before when a provider was within the  
18 EPZ, Montgomery County reviewed the assignments, the school  
19 assignments, that were made by the districts and honored those  
20 assignments and did not assign any additional responsibilities  
21 to those providers.

22 Q With regard to North Penn School District, they have  
23 been given assignment to provide 40 buses and drivers in the  
24 event of a radiological emergency at Limerick. Are you aware  
25 of whether they have provided any assurance that they can

mn6-9

1 provide 40 drivers for those buses or that those 40 buses are  
2 available?

3 A The assignment, Your Honor, that I have in the  
4 Montgomery County plan is for 42 units. I believe it is  
5 39 buses, a van and a handicapped vehicle. I can testify  
6 only to what I have testified to before. The information  
7 was collected in an interview between Montgomery County  
8 and the district transportation provider. It was summarized  
9 as we have indicated today, sent back to the district.  
10 The district has checked it and I believe in September of this  
11 year based on the information provided today, there would  
12 have been a request to update that information.

13 Q And you have no other information available to you  
14 with regard to any of those arrangements for buses and drivers  
15 other than what you have just testified to, is that correct?

16 A That is correct.

17 A (Witness Bradshaw) With the exception that the  
18 signed agreement is listed in Annex T for the North Penn  
19 School District as completed.

20 A (Witness Cunningham) That is correct.

21 Q Doesn't that agreement which I don't believe has been  
22 provided to the parties yet, to the best of your knowledge  
23 is that agreement typical of the other agreements that have  
24 been provided which state that the school district will  
25 provide buses and drivers to the maximum extent possible?

1           A.     I believe I testified yesterday that Montgomery  
2 County prepared the agreement, had it reviewed by its  
3 solicitor and it was my understanding that to all 33 of the  
4 providers they offered the same agreement. I believe I also  
5 testified that I could not testify to what agreements were  
6 returned but that the agreements that were offered would have  
7 been similar to the ones that had been offered in the  
8 exhibit.

9           MR. RADER: Judge Hoyt, may I add very briefly  
10 on counsel's representation that she had not yet received  
11 those agreements, that the witness testified yesterday that  
12 those agreements were in previous or earlier drafts of  
13 the Montgomery County plan but were deleted from Annex T of  
14 that plan at the request of Montgomery County because of  
15 their bulk. So all earlier revisions of that plan have been  
16 served upon the parties including LEA. So I do believe  
17 that they have been served with those agreements.

18           JUDGE COLE: Why were they deleted?

19           MR. RADER: I will let Mr. Bradshaw again rather  
20 than characterize it.

21           WITNESS BRADSHAW: There are some 33 transportation  
22 agreements listed in Annex I of the plan. Because of the bulk  
23 involved, the County requested that only a listing of the  
24 agreements be provided in that Annex with an indication as  
25 to their status. Actual copies would be retained on file at

1 the county office.

mn6-11

2 MS. ZITZER: For the record, I would like to note  
3 that draft six which is the prior draft of the Montgomery  
4 County plan lists eight agreements and it does not --

5 JUDGE HOYT: I believe, Ms. Zitzer, counsel stated  
6 in some previous drafts of the plan not necessarily draft six,  
7 is that right, counsel?

8 MR. RADER: That is correct.

9 JUDGE HOYT: So although it may not be in draft six,  
10 it may be in draft five or four or three or two.

11 WITNESS BRADSHAW: If I may Judge Hoyt, just to  
12 clarify it, it may well be the case that that agreement would  
13 have been completed since draft six and with the change in  
14 policy of the County would not have been previously circulated.

15 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: Without having the opportunity  
16 to look at each of the Annex T's of each of the drafts, I could  
17 not give you a listing of which were in it at one time and  
18 which were not.

19 JUDGE HOYT: I believe this is going to keep coming  
20 up and we might as well get it nailed down. Counsel, would  
21 you please check the various agreements and see what was left  
22 out of what and when it was going to be put in if ever and  
23 when the policy changed or we are just going to spend hours  
24 going over this same ground.

25 MR. RADER: I will undertake to do that, Your Honor.



mn6-12

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

JUDGE HOYT: Thank you. Please continue.

BY MS. ZITAER: (Resuming)

Q Do the plans call for buses to come to any staging area before they proceed to their specific assigned school in the event of a radiological emergency?

MR. RADER: Objection, asked and answered. This was again fully covered yesterday as to how the buses would be provided.

JUDGE HOYT: Sustained.

END#6

1 Q Referring back to the table in the  
2 Montgomery County plan entitled Transportation Providers,  
3 under Ashbourne Transportation Incorporated it states  
4 that that company is being considered for reserve  
5 assignment and it states that there are busses available  
6 with no drivers.

7 Specifically it states there are 100 busses  
8 available with no drivers.

9 In the event that those busses are  
10 needed for a reserve function, who would  
11 drive those busses?

12 MS. FERKIN: Can I ask counsel for LEA to  
13 repeat the name of the bus company.

14 MS. ZITZER: Ashbourne, A-s-h-b-o-u-r-n-e.

15 JUDGE HOYT: That is the company on  
16 page 3?

17 MS. ZITZER: Yes, ma'am.

18 JUDGE HOYT: I-2-5?

19 MS. ZITZER: Yes, ma'am.

20 JUDGE HOYT: Did you say 100? I have 150  
21 drivers.

22 MS. ZITZER: Under the assignment, it says that  
23 there are 100 busses available with no drivers at all  
24 times.

25 JUDGE HOYT: We have it now. Thank you.

1 WITNESS BRADSHAW: Are we waiting for a  
2 response?

3 JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

4 WITNESS BRADSHAW: I'm sorry.

5 That company is not listed as having a  
6 Limerick assignment. It is not included in the 476  
7 busses assigned to evacuation emergency. It is a reserve.

8 If need be, the source of drivers for that  
9 company could come from any number of sources -- National  
10 Guard personnel, other volunteers, any number of places.

11 BY MS. ZITZER:

12 Q Other than the National Guard, what are the  
13 other places you are referring to?

14 A The other bus companies that have made  
15 commitments to drivers is one example.

16 Q With regard to the busses available from  
17 SEPTA, which is on page I-2-11, it indicates that  
18 there are busses available for reserve function and  
19 there has been considerable discussion about using  
20 SEPTA busses for the Chester County schools as well.

21 Who is envisioned to drive the SEPTA busses  
22 that might be used either for schools in Montgomery  
23 County or Chester County either for direct Limerick  
24 assignment or in the event that they were needed for  
25 some kind of a reserve function?

1           A     (Witness Cunningham) Specifically in  
2 reference to the table on SEPTA for Montgomery  
3 County, the county, upon meeting with the representatives  
4 of SEPTA, did not receive a completed -- did not  
5 obtain sufficient information to complete a provider  
6 survey and did not receive back from SEPTA an agreement  
7 and the information and, therefore, requested that I  
8 place the busses in reserve only.

9           These are Frontier SEPTA busses. There are  
10 not SEPTA -- these are busses specific to SEPTA Frontier.

11          Q     What do you mean by SEPTA Frontier?

12          A     That is the division of SEPTA that is garaged  
13 in Norristown, Pennsylvania.

14          A     (Witness Bradshaw) Again, I would point out  
15 that this is a reserve. This is not a Limerick  
16 assignment. It is not included in the busses we  
17 are listing for availability in the Limerick emergency.

18                It is also, as I understand it, not the same  
19 busses that Chester County has requested. This is a parti-  
20 cular line that is kept located in Montgomery County.

21          A     (Witness Cunningham) And Montgomery County  
22 is pursuing the information and trying to reduce the  
23 SEPTA Frontier commitment to an agreement.

24          Q     Would that agreement include for the provision  
25 of drivers as well?

1           A     As I testified before, all agreements that  
2     are offered by Montgomery County, to my knowledge, would  
3     say for busses and drivers to the maximum extent  
4     possible and would request the additional information to  
5     be provided.

6           Q     With regard to the SEPTA busses for Chester  
7     County, are those also Frontier busses that are being  
8     investigated as far as their availability?

9           A     (Witness Bradshaw) I have stated that we  
10    don't have any direct knowledge of those negotiations,  
11    only that SEPTA has been approached by Chester County.  
12    It is my understanding that it is not the  
13    same busses or drivers involved, but you would have to  
14    confirm that through the county.

15          Q     With regard to the reserve -- the busses that  
16    you have identified that you believe will be available  
17    to assist with evacuation in Chester County that are  
18    the basis for your indicating that there are no unmet  
19    needs in your opinion for the provision of busses for  
20    Chester County school evacuation, these busses that you  
21    are referring to are these SEPTA busses which you have now  
22    stated you have no specific knowledge of the exact  
23    arrangements of; is that correct?

24          A     I so stated that I had no direct knowledge and  
25    that SEPTA was one of the companies that I understood

1 Chester County was including in its figure for over  
2 200 busses and drivers available in the event of a  
3 Limerick emergency, yes. And it is so indicated in the  
4 Chester County plan.

5 Q In your testimony you state that sections of  
6 the -- just a second.

7 You state that there are state laws that  
8 could be modified to allow other than certified bus  
9 drivers to operate school busses in the event of an  
10 actual emergency.

11 In your testimony, you referred to the specific  
12 sections of the code involved. I believe it is under the  
13 section referring to busses, not drivers, on page 6 of your  
14 testimony.

15 Could you explain the circumstances under  
16 which this section of the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code,  
17 Section 6108, would be invoked which would result in  
18 the possibility that other than certified bus drivers would  
19 be allowed to operate school busses in the event of  
20 a radiological emergency?

21 A Yes. In Pennsylvania the governor has the  
22 authority to declare a state of disaster emergency,  
23 and one of his authorities under that provision is to  
24 alter any state code or regulation to assist in the  
25 disaster.

1 This section is one of those that could be  
2 modified. It so states in the regulation that that is  
3 the case. And under a state of disaster emergency,  
4 the governor would do so.

5 MR. RADER: Since it appears that Miss Zitzer  
6 has finished her line of questioning with regard to  
7 Annex I and the statements therein as to the availability  
8 of bus drivers and busses, I would like to point out that at  
9 the beginning of that inquiry, Miss Zitzer made an  
10 offer of proof to this Board that she would inquire as  
11 to certain alleged errors in that table.

12 I wish to note that no such errors were pointed  
13 out or testified to by the witnesses. I request the  
14 Board to strike Miss Zitzer's comments as to any errors  
15 in that table.

16 JUDGE HOYT: Miss Zitzer, are you finished  
17 with your line of cross-examination on this?

18 MS. ZITZER: Of this panel. There are other  
19 witnesses that I would intend to -- of this panel at  
20 this time, yes.

21 JUDGE COLE: On that subject?

22 MS. ZITZER: Yes.

23 JUDGE HOYT: The Board will note that the  
24 errors were not pointed out. We will not strike  
25 Miss Zitzer's comments.

1                   However, Miss Zitzer, I will caution you,  
2 unless you are going to make those inaccuracies noted  
3 in your questions, I think you are ill-advised to  
4 make that representation.

5                   You may wish to withdraw it.

6                   MS. ZITZER: I am willing to withdraw it. I  
7 don't believe that these witness have the significant  
8 knowledge for me to be able to establish that.

9                   JUDGE HOYT: If at a later date you do have  
10 a witness, you may inquire on that subject, however.

11                   MS. ZITZER: If the bus company providers  
12 are permitted to testify, they will be able to provide  
13 that information.

14                   JUDGE HOYT: Are those the witnesses that you  
15 have subpoenaed?

16                   MS. ZITZER: Yes, ma'am.

17                   JUDGE HOYT: They will testify.

18                   MS. ZITZER: Thank you.

19                   JUDGE HOYT: Thank you.

20                   Are we aready to continue on the next --

21                   BY MS. ZITZER:

22                   Q    Have the bus companies involved been fully  
23 informed of these arrangements?

24                   MR. RADER: Objection. Asked and answered.

25                   JUDGE HOYT: I think it has been. Let's see if



1 we can speed it up.

2 MR. RADER: Perhaps it was unclear in the  
3 question as to what "arrangements" referred to.

4 JUDGE HOYT: Let's see if the witnesses can  
5 testify. I will overrule the objection at this time.

6 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: On these arrangements,  
7 I am having difficulty -- after the long discussion --  
8 of coming up with that "these" is.

9 JUDGE HOYT: Miss Zitzer --

10 MS. ZITZER: I will rephrase the question.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Just tell them what arrangements  
12 it is you are talking about.

13 MS. ZITZER: The section of the  
14 Pennsylvania Vehicle Code which would result in other  
15 than -- if invoked, which would result in other than  
16 certified bus drivers operating school busses for  
17 the purposes of carrying out an evacuation in the  
18 event of a radiological emergency.

19 WITNESS BRADSHAW: The arrangements made in  
20 the plans do not invoke that section or the governor's  
21 authority. They are based not on the fact that we  
22 may have to rely on an additional pool of drivers.

23 The busses and bus drivers have been arranged  
24 for in the plans from these sources under agreement, and  
25 this is only to point out that there are additional

1 safeguards to back up that initial reserve.

2 BY MS. ZITZER:

3 Q My question to you was, do you believe that  
4 or do you have specific knowledge that the bus companies  
5 involved are aware of this provision?

6 A I am aware that the counties commonly  
7 discuss the powers of the governor with regard to  
8 commandeering of vehicles, yes. So at least some of  
9 them do know.

10 Q But you are not aware of whether they all do?

11 A No, I am not. The counties made the  
12 primary contact with the companies, not Energy Consultants.

13 Q Could you provide information regarding the  
14 number of bus drivers that have completed training  
15 programs and also which school districts they involve?

16 A (Witness Wenger) Bus drivers were trained  
17 at Boyertown School District, total I have listed is 46.

18 Bus drivers were trained at Owen J. Roberts;  
19 I have a total of 43.

20 Bus drivers were trained for Perkiomen  
21 Valley, a total of 38.

22 And I am aware of at least one training session  
23 that was canceled due to weather conditions last year.

24 Q To the best of your knowledge, that is  
25 the extent to which the training for bus drivers has

1 progressed?

2 A These figures are from the training that  
3 was conducted last year. Just recently, as you are  
4 aware, the counties are sending out letters to all the  
5 bus drivers or bus companies again offering training  
6 for the second year.

7 I have not been made aware by the counties  
8 of any new requests for training as of this time.

9 Q Are you aware of whether these bus companies  
10 are aware that they have specific Limerick assignments?

11 MR. RADER: Objection.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Sustained.

13 BY MS. ZITZER:

14 Q Have the drivers, other than those identified  
15 in previous comments with regard to surveying done  
16 at Owen J. Roberts School District and Methacton  
17 School District, been surveyed with regard to their  
18 willingness to participate in these responsibilities  
19 in the event of a radiological emergency?

20 A (Witness Cunningham) With the exception of  
21 the two that you referenced in your question, to my  
22 knowledge, I am not aware of any other surveys.

23 Q Have the bus drivers been provided any  
24 information in the training program regarding provisions  
25 to safeguard members of their own family in the event

1 that any kind of protective measures are offered --  
2 I'm sorry -- are required in the event of a radiological  
3 emergency?

4 A (Witness BRadshaw) As with the training  
5 program for teachers and other emergency workers,  
6 there is a discussion of family arrangements and that  
7 consideration should be given to those. There is  
8 a presentation on the overall planning process which  
9 describes the municipal and county plans and the  
10 arrangements which are being made for the general  
11 public at large which would pertain to the bus driver  
12 and his family if he, in fact, resided in the EPZ.

13 To that extent, they have been informed, yes.

14 Q In the three school districts that have completed  
15 training, is that correct?

16 A Yes. In all training sessions.

17 Q Do you anticipate that the other school  
18 districts will take advantage of the training programs  
19 that you are offering?

20 A (Witness Wenger) I have no knowledge of  
21 that yet, unless they contact us. Probably they  
22 will contact the counties.

23 Q On page 23 of your testimony, after item 52  
24 regarding discussion of the assignment of busses,  
25 a statement is made that bus drivers entering the EPZ will

1 obtain maps at transportation staging areas.

2 Who will provide these maps to the bus  
3 drivers?

4 A (Witness Cunningham) The counties have  
5 made arrangements for volunteers to staff transportation  
6 staging areas. The county will make the maps,  
7 procedures, and other related supplies available to  
8 the volunteers who are manning the staging areas and  
9 those volunteers will, upon the county's direction,  
10 distribute appropriate maps and materials to the  
11 bus drivers.

12 Q How will that information be transmitted to  
13 the transportation staging area?

14 A My understanding of the plans offers more  
15 than one way for that to be done.

16 In Montgomery County, which I am the most  
17 familiar with, materials are pre-distributed to the  
18 volunteers that are going to man transportation staging  
19 areas. So as Montgomery County made the materials  
20 available, it would pre-distribute them.

21 In Berks County and Chester, there are  
22 provisions for some pre-distribution and also some  
23 distribuion at the time of an incident, at an appropriate  
24 time at the time of an incident.

25

END 7

1 Q Your testimony continues to say that drivers  
2 within the EPZ may or may not be sent to the staging area  
3 depending on their familiarity with the area.

4 Are you saying that if drivers are not familiar  
5 with the area, that they will be sent to the transportation  
6 staging area to receive instructions?

7 A I testified previously that Montgomery County  
8 had -- in Montgomery County they had honored the assign-  
9 ments made by the school district of their vehicles and  
10 their drivers, either contract or owned, to the particular  
11 schools.

12 The County has assumed that those drivers are  
13 aware of where those schools are located and could find  
14 them without going to a staging area.

15 If, at the time of an incident school were not  
16 in session or some other unforeseen circumstance, and  
17 some of those drivers and vehicles would be requested to  
18 do other than their school assignments, they might be  
19 directed, as they would in any emergency, to one of the  
20 three Montgomery County transportation staging areas  
21 to receive maps and instructions.

22 I previously testified that Montgomery County  
23 collected the information and spoke to the providers in  
24 reference to all emergencies. So therefore, those providers  
25 that are in the EPZ also had to be prepared by the County

mm2

1 for other instances or incidents that could occur in other  
2 locations in the County. So, they were made aware of the  
3 transportation staging area concept.

4 Q Who makes the decision whether or not the  
5 drivers are sent to the staging area?

6 A At time of emergency that decision would be  
7 made by the Coordinator of the Montgomery County Office of  
8 Emergency Preparedness, his designate, or if the EOC had  
9 been fully established, that decision could be made by  
10 the transportation group based on its standard operating  
11 procedures.

12 Q And it is your testimony that this individual  
13 will make a decision based on his own assumption or informa-  
14 tion that he is aware of with regard to whether or not the  
15 particular drivers involved are familiar with the areas to  
16 which they will be sent, and whether or not they would need  
17 that kind of additional instruction?

18 A I believe I testified that the school districts  
19 had made assignments of bus drivers who routinely drive  
20 buses throughout the district to district schools. And so  
21 the assumption was made by the County that in the event of  
22 a radiological emergency they would be familiar with school  
23 buildings that they went to every day.

24 Then I stated that if the situation were to  
25 change and school were not in session, for example, and some

1 of those resources could voluntarily be made available to  
2 the County for other assignment, then the County would  
3 have to request -- or would request as they do for standard  
4 operations for transportation -- that they report to a  
5 staging area to receive their assignment.

6 Q Would that procedure apply to buses coming from  
7 outside the emergency planning zone that would not be  
8 making a run that is part of their normal daily activities?

9 A Yes, ma'am. Those buses would, as they would for  
10 any emergency in Montgomery County where they were needed,  
11 be directed to an appropriate staging area to receive their  
12 assignment, map and other materials.

13 Q What arrangements do the plans call for with  
14 regard to the provision of transportation from the host  
15 school to the mass care centers once an evacuation has  
16 been initiated?

17 MR. RADER: Objection, your Honor.

18 In the Board's order of September 24th at page  
19 8, the Board specifically excluded the issue of whether  
20 some drivers are being assigned to evacuate both the  
21 school population and the general public. And this included,  
22 I believe, the arrangements for the transportation to the  
23 mass care centers as well. Provision for transportation  
24 from host schools to mass care centers is also excluded  
25 as an issue under LEA-11.



mm4

1 So, I believe this is beyond the scope of either  
2 contention.

3 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, the reason I referred  
4 to it is that it is specifically in the testimony of the  
5 panel on page 24, item number 55.

6 MR. RADER: Again, the testimony was prepared  
7 by the witnesses to cover a variety of contentions.

8 If the Board should sustain the objection, I have  
9 no objection to withdrawing that portion of the testimony.

10 JUDGE HOYT: What portion is that you are speaking  
11 about?

12 MR. RADER: Ms. Zitzer referred to paragraph 55  
13 of the Applicant's written testimony.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Is that the entire paragraph that  
15 you are willing to withdraw, or portions of it?

16 MR. RADER: I would be willing to withdraw the  
17 entire paragraph, as I say, assuming that the Board agrees  
18 with Applicant that the issue of transportation to  
19 mass care centers from host schools is outside the scope  
20 of this contention.

21 (Board conferring.)

22 MR. RADER: If I may direct the Board's  
23 attention to the third paragraph on page 6 of its  
24 September 24th order, the Board stated -- the Board ruled  
25 as being beyond the scope of the admitted contention, item

mm5

1 three on provisions for transportation from host schools  
2 to mass care centers.

3 That would certainly include the provision of  
4 drivers for that purpose, or the training of drivers for  
5 that purpose.

6 (Board conferring.)

7 JUDGE HOYT: Counsellor, we find the previous  
8 Board, whose order I am living with, have ruled it out of  
9 LEA Contention 11. But, apparently did not rule it out  
10 -nder LEA-15.

11 MR. RADER: I am not sure it was ever part of  
12 LEA-15. As I say, it may --

13 JUDGE HOYT: Your objection is overruled.

14 Proceed.

15 WITNESS CUNNINGTON: The school plans specify  
16 two particular steps that are appropriate to responding  
17 to the inquiry as to how that would be done.

18 First, they specify that while students are at  
19 the host school, that there be an administrative report  
20 from the superintendent to the County every two hours to  
21 establish the number of students that would still remain  
22 at the host school, so that you can estimate by 8 p.m.  
23 how many students would need to be transported.

24 Secondly, they request -- the plans specify that  
25 when bus drivers -- when buses and drivers complete their

mm6

1 assignment of moving students from the risk school buildings  
2 to the host school, that before they are dismissed to either  
3 return -- to return to their garage or to parking the  
4 vehicles, that information that the route is complete be  
5 also transmitted to the Montgomery County -- to the County  
6 Offices of Emergency Management, so that if there would need  
7 to be any arrangements made with those bus drivers they  
8 can be made with them before they are excused.

9 At that time the implementing procedures and  
10 the transportation coordinator of groups in the County could  
11 request that the drivers remain on standby, release them,  
12 whatever was estimated to be the need.

13 In addition, the target time of 8 p.m. is known  
14 and it is reflected in the implementing procedures at the  
15 County level. And the transportation people could treat  
16 the movement of students from the host school to the mass  
17 care center as a separate incident requiring transportation  
18 support, and contact the providers. And, after a determina-  
19 tion has been made as to the number of buses needed, make  
20 the assignments in that fashion.

21 But specifically they would, in all likelihood,  
22 ask a certain percentage of the drivers to remain on standby,  
23 to volunteer and remain on standby so that they could be  
24 recalled at 8 p.m. to effect what is a rather simple movement  
25 of a smaller number of students from one building to another

1 building outside the emergency planning zone.

2 BY MS. ZITZER:

3 Q To the best of your knowledge, is this  
4 information part of the training program that is currently  
5 provided to bus drivers?

6 A (Witness Wenger) Would you repeat exactly  
7 what information?

8 Q The information with regard to the transportation  
9 arrangements and the potential involvement or possible  
10 involvement of bus drivers in providing transportation  
11 from the host school to the mass care centers.

12 A In the very beginning of the training program  
13 it was included, because at that point in time our planners  
14 were not certain whether or not children could be  
15 evacuated in a one-lift situation.

16 Upon the information that we could do it in one  
17 lift, that portion of the training plan, or the presentations  
18 were, I guess, lessened. We did make a statement that it  
19 could be possible. However, planning efforts at this point  
20 would be that it would be done in one lift, and that a  
21 few bus drivers could be needed to transport them.

22 A (Witness Bradshaw) Perhaps Ms. Wenger is  
23 referencing another subject.

24 Yes, in the lesson plan there is reference to the  
25 procedure of transporting students from the host school to the

1 mass care center as it is in the plans.

2 Q Ms. Wenger, you mentioned that at some point in  
3 time during the planning process you were uncertain whether  
4 or not there was sufficient transportation to evacuate  
5 school students in one lift.

6 If you recall, could you provide any information  
7 with regard to when you came to the conclusion that there  
8 was sufficient transportation to evacuate the students in  
9 one lift, and what information it was that made you change  
10 your opinion of that situation?

11 A (Witness Wenger) I think I would rather refer  
12 that to the planners.

13 As I might point out though, the first training  
14 program was conducted, I believe, the very end of November  
15 with Owen J. Roberts bus drivers. We had offered to start  
16 training in January, but they pressed us to do it early,  
17 which is why we still had that question in our minds.

18 A (Witness Bradshaw) I can't recall a specific  
19 date when a decision was made not to include that information.  
20 However, it would have been early on in the planning process  
21 when it was pointed out by PEMA that planning for a one-lift  
22 is the state policy.

23 And planning proceeded from that point on on  
24 that basis and therefore that information was not presented.

25 Q And the drivers that have received the

mm9

1 information with regard to this part of their responsibility  
2 -- when I say that I mean the possible need for additional  
3 transportation assistance from the host school to the mass  
4 care center -- are those that have completed the training  
5 program, those involved in the Boyertown School District,  
6 the Owen J. Roberts School District and the Perkiomen  
7 Valley School District, is that correct?

8 A (Witness Wenger) Yes.

9 Q To the best of your knowledge, do the other  
10 bus drivers have any awareness of that responsibility?

11 A You mean bus drivers who have not yet received  
12 any training?

13 Q Yes, ma'am.

14 A I would not have knowledge whether they know of  
15 these plans or not.

16 A (Witness Bradshaw) Nor do I understand why  
17 this particular procedure seems troublesome. It is a  
18 process which takes place after the evacuation is complete  
19 at a point when the number of people to be moved is not  
20 significant. And it is at a point when more buses and  
21 drivers will be available.

22 It is a point where people would not be entering  
23 the EPZ to perform a function. I do not understand why  
24 it is inferred that drivers would be reluctant to perform  
25 these responsibilities. It seems to me to be a very simple

mm10

1 procedure.

2 Q You stated that this would probably be occurring  
3 at a time when people would not need to be reentering the  
4 EPZ.

5 What assurance is there that bus drivers may  
6 not have some need -- bus drivers who live within the  
7 EPZ -- may not have some need to return to the EPZ for  
8 personal reasons?

9 A I don't believe that is part of the issue here.  
10 Then returning to the EPZ for their own families is  
11 different than them returning as an emergency worker.

12 A (Witness Cunningham) Bus drivers are members of  
13 the general public and the policies that would govern  
14 anyone's return to the EPZ would govern the return of a  
15 bus driver as he was performing family or other related  
16 personal or family-related functions.

17 Q Isn't it possible that if a bus driver has some  
18 concerns, some personal concern about their own family  
19 or their personal belongings, that they might have a  
20 desire to return to the EPZ and not remain on duty beyond  
21 the first trip that had been made to host school?

22 MR. RADER: This is repetitive and argumentative,  
23 your Honor.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Sustained.

25 BY MS. ZITZER:

mml1

1 Q In your testimony on the top of page 25, you  
2 state almost half of the bus resources are from companies  
3 outside of the emergency planning zone where protective  
4 action recommendations would not affect the drivers'  
5 family arrangements.

6 Is that statement based on your opinion that  
7 you would not expect people beyond the emergency planning  
8 zone to take any protective actions on their own in the  
9 event of a radiological emergency?

10 MR. RADER: Objection, your Honor. I believe  
11 Ms. Zitzer is attempting to raise some kind of issue of  
12 shadow evacuation, which is certainly beyond the scope of  
13 this contention or any other contention in this hearing.

14 MS. ZITZER: Your Honor, the testimony makes  
15 reference to the fact that there is assurance that there  
16 will be plenty of buses and drivers, because more than half  
17 of them are coming from outside the EPZ where protective  
18 action measures would not affect the drivers' family  
19 arrangements.

20 I am simply trying to explore what the basis  
21 for the panel's statement there is.

22 (Board conferring.)

23 JUDGE HOYT: I am not at all sure where we are  
24 with the question or the answer, counsel.

25 I am going to overrule your objection. However,



mm12

1 with this question, Ms. Zitzer, if you are going into  
2 whatever counsel is describing I believe as shadow  
3 evacuation, we are not going that far afield.

4 Since it is 11:46 you may wish to get the answer  
5 and move on quickly to something else.

6 MS. ZITZER: I understand.

7 WITNESS BRADSHAW: Would you repeat, please?

8 BY MS. ZITZER:

9 Q On Page 25 of your testimony you state that  
10 almost half the bus resources are coming from outside the  
11 EPZ where protective action measures would not affect the  
12 drivers' family arrangements.

13 What is the basis for your making the statement  
14 that those protective action measures would not affect the  
15 drivers' family arrangements?

16 A (Witness Bradshaw) The basis is the existing  
17 planning guidance provided by the state and federal  
18 government which is planning for the ten-mile emergency  
19 planning zone.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
End p8

nations

#9-1

1 Q Are you giving any consideration to the fact that  
2 the drivers may have concerns about the well-being of their  
3 family or are you simply assuming that beyond the ten-mile  
4 radius they won't have that concern?

5 A I have stated that all bus drivers as well as all  
6 emergency workers will perform their duties in regard and  
7 as a supplement to their family arrangements and that  
8 family arrangements have been demonstrated not to interfere  
9 with the performance of their jobs.

10 Q How has that been demonstrated?

11 MR. RADER: Objection, Your Honor. This goes back  
12 to the same points that were discussed before.

13 JUDGE HOYT: Sustained.

14 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

15 Q Could you please state under what conditions or  
16 what circumstances bus drivers are considered to be defined  
17 as emergency workers according to the plans as they are  
18 currently drafted?

19 A (Witness Bradshaw) They are not defined as emergency  
20 workers.

21 MS. ZITZER: May I just have a moment, Your Honor.

22 JUDGE HOYT: Yes, certainly.

23 (Counsel conferring off record.)

24 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

25 Q Is there any kind of priority assignment made by the

1 County with regard to schools say within the zero to two or  
2 zero to five mile proximity of the Limerick Generating  
3 Station that you are aware of?

4 MR. RADER: Objection. That is beyond the scope of  
5 bus driver training and bus driver availability.

6 JUDGE HOYT: Sustained.

7 BY MS. ZITZER: (Resuming)

8 Q Is it your testimony that there is no need to pre-  
9 identify driver volunteers until and unless the time of an  
10 evacuation occurs?

11 MR. RADER: Could you refer the witnesses, please,  
12 to a particular paragraph if you are quoting from that.

13 MS. ZITZER: I will rephrase the question.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Let's go off the record for a moment.

15 (Discussion off the record.)

16 MS. ZITZER: I have no further questions.

17 JUDGE HOYT: The hearing will be off the record for  
18 a few moments.

19 (Discussion off the record.)

20 JUDGE HOYT: Back on the record. The hearing has  
21 been off the record for the last few moments. We are now back  
22 on. I would inquire of the parties, are there any other matters  
23 that we can take up this morning?

24 MS. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor. I have just entered the  
25 hearing room and on behalf of the City of Philadelphia I would

mn9-3

1 like to take this opportunity to note for the record that  
2 I would like to distribute today to the parties another copy  
3 of City Statement "3" that we did submit on November 2nd. I  
4 have not had an opportunity to review the last six or seven  
5 pages as it was down in our word processing center. There  
6 were some typographical errors which have been marked in the  
7 margins and I will explain those in more detail when the witness  
8 is on the stand, but I did want to distribute to the parties  
9 today since no one will be in their office likely for some  
10 time.

11 JUDGE HOYT: All right. Would you do that at this  
12 time please?

13 MS. BUSH: Certainly.

14 JUDGE HOYT: I hope you have a copy for us?

15 MS. BUSH: Yes.

16 JUDGE HOYT: Can you give one to Mr. Crockett as  
17 well?

18 MS. BUSH: Yes.

19 JUDGE HOYT: May I inquire of counsel, will you make  
20 this distribution through the ordinary channels so that it  
21 may be properly docketed?

22 MS. BUSH: I will. When I go back to my office  
23 I will send out copies to the Docketing Office and all the  
24 parties that were not present in the hearing room or should  
25 I send another copy to everybody?

1 JUDGE HOYT: Just follow the exact normal procedure  
2 that you would ordinarily. However, I will take note that  
3 I have received this one as have Judge Cole and Judge Harbour.

4 Do we have any other matters to consider this  
5 morning?

6 MR. RADER: Am I correct that we have now concluded  
7 LEA 15, Your Honor?

8 MS. ZITZER: Yes.

9 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. The case is rested on  
10 LEA 15 and LEA 11. We will begin cross-examination on  
11 Monday afternoon at 1:30 p.m. We will adjourn the hearings  
12 for this date, November 21, 1984. Thank you.

13 (Whereupon, the hearing was recessed at 12:04 o'clock  
14 p.m., to reconvene at 1:30 o'clock p.m., Monday, November 26,  
15 1984.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the  
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: Philadelphia Electric Company  
Limerick Generating Station  
Units 1 & 2

DOCKET NO.: 50-352-OL  
50-353-OL

PLACE: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

DATE: Wednesday, 21 November 1984

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original  
transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission.

*Mimie Meltzer*  
*Marilynn Nations*  
*Rebecca E. Eyster*  
(Sigt) Rebecca E. Eyster  
(TYPED) Mimie Meltzer, Marilyn Nations  
Official Reporter Rebecca E. Eyster

Reporter's Affiliation