



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20566

May 3, 1988

NOTE TO: Gary G. Zech, Chief, IRB:DOA:AEOD  
FROM: Bernard H. Weiss, IRB:DOA:AEOD  
SUBJECT: IMPRESSIONS OF FEMA APRIL 29 MEETING WITH  
LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (LILCO)

On April 29, NRC Headquarters and regional staff attended a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) meeting with LILCO. An agenda and list of attendees is enclosed. The purpose of the meeting was to assure that all parties concerned with the conduct of the Shoreham exercise had a consistent understanding of the situation, discuss the milestones and schedules that were agreed to at the last meeting and settle items of mutual concern. The meeting was disappointing. It appears to the NRC staff that the exercise preparations are moving along, but not like they should be. FEMA Region II is acting more like an anchor than a propeller. Unfortunately, Ihor Husar, FEMA Radiological Assessment Committee (RAC) Chairman, could not attend the meeting due to his wife's illness and a junior member of the staff, Gary Seidenfeld, chaired the meeting. He was not effective at this job, particularly since Ihor apparently gave him little authority to make any decisions and would not make a commitment on any issue.

Where there should have been progress, there was just status reports. Little appeared to be accomplished. There were several status reports but problems or concerns related to these were mostly put on hold.

One thing that has struck me in working on both the Shoreham and Seabrook exercise preparation is the difference between the FEMA preparation for the Massachusetts portion of the Seabrook exercise and the Shoreham exercise. In the case of Seabrook, I have had detailed discussions with Dick Donovan, FEMA Region X, assigned to help FEMA Region I, about how the exercise will be conducted. We have been able to agree to the detailed approach of the use of NRC staff, exactly how many people he will need, what they will do, how they will do it, how the control plan will be constructed. We have exchanged control plan drafts and understand what work he will do and what I will do. He is now reviewing in detail the Shoreham Control Plan which will then be used as the basis for the Seabrook Control Plan.

In the case of Shoreham, I have not been able to have any satisfying discussions with Ihor, nor has he expressed much interest in the NRC support. It appears to me to be due to Ihor's lack of experience and knowledge which makes him rather tentative and feel a need to check too many things out with FEMA Headquarters. This might be satisfactory if we had more time, but this has already become a real problem as the exercise is getting closer. FEMA Head-

C/12

quarters expresses interest, but has never sent anyone to these meetings. We came prepared to discuss the Shoreham Control Plan and the manner in which it would be implemented. Half-way through the meeting, Seidenfeld told us he spoke to Ihor and we were not to discuss the Control Plan at the meeting, pending a meeting in Washington, D.C. on May 2-3.

This FEMA meeting, as far as I can tell, is partly to finalize the new FEMA evaluation modules, but, mainly, to get the Shoreham and Seabrook principals together to discuss the exercise issues and assure that there is consistency between the two exercises.

I am concerned that FEMA seemed to be excluding NRC from portions of the process that we believe this agency should be involved in. However, there is not much time for isolation and games. FEMA has requested NRC support in a manner similar to the last Shoreham exercise. In order to accomplish this significant task, the two agencies must coordinate better.

It is good that FEMA is meeting for two days to determine uniform and consistent approaches for unique aspects of these exercises, although very late since Shoreham will be conducted in five weeks. It would be useful for NRC to attend these sessions. However, it is necessary for NRC to meet with FEMA at the end of these sessions, i.e., the last half-day, while all principal parties are still available in Washington, to discuss those decisions and policy matters of interest to NRC. These discussions would be much more valuable if done with Shoreham and Seabrook RAC Chairman present, rather than someone telling them what Headquarters managers agreed to. I understand that NRC is scheduled to meet with FEMA on Tuesday, May 3, to discuss the effect of Connecticut's non-participation on the Shoreham exercise. However, below are some candidate issues that I believe may also be useful to discuss at our meeting with FEMA. There are others:

- (1) Exercise dates
- (2) Sampling rationale.
- (3) NRC/FEMA evaluation of extent of exercise play.
- (4) Realism - how it will be factored into the exercise and evaluation.
- (5) NRC review to make a determination as to "qualifying exercise."
- (6) Differences between conduct of Shoreham and Seabrook exercises.
- (7) Required NRC support to conduct the exercises.
- (8) Limitations of final FEMA reports to NRC.
- (9) Control cell concepts and operation.
- (10) Effects, if any, of WPLR decision.
- (11) Federal exercise participation as players.
- (12) NRC concerns about the pace of preparation and management commitment.

The participants at the meeting decided to hold weekly meetings in New York City to discuss outstanding exercise related issues these last several weeks. We indicated that this approach would be useful since the exercise is so

Gary G. Zech

- 3 -

May 3, 1988

close. However, we expressed the need to obtain an agenda prior to these meetings so that we could evaluate the extent of NRC participation in any particular meeting.

I am ready to discuss this further as you think it is necessary.

51

Bernard H. Weiss, IRB:DOA:AEOD

Enclosures:

- 1. List of Meeting Attendees
- 2. Meeting Agenda

cc: E. L. Jordan, AEOD  
 R. L. Spessard, AEOD

Distribution:

B. H. Weiss, AEOD  
 DOA Reading File  
 IRB Reading File

OFC : IRB:DOA:AEOD:				
NAME : BH Weiss				
TE : 05/3/88 fml:				

AGENDA  
FEMA/NRC/LILCO MEETING  
April 29, 1988

SHOREHAM NUCLEAR POWER STATION

1. Revision 9, final RAC comments
  - o LILCO submittal of Revision 10 (May 9?)
2. Update on outside organization participation
  - a. School Districts
  - b. Connecticut
  - c. Special Facilities
  - d. Department of Energy
  - e. US Coast Guard
  - f. American Red Cross
  - g. Other Federal Participants
3. Revised Milestones
4. FEMA needs from LILCO prior to exercise
5. LILCO needs from FEMA prior to exercise
6. Schedule next meeting
7. Status of FEMA evaluation of Prompt Notification System (REP 10)
8. Status of FEMA evaluation of Public Information Brochure
9. Disposition of EV-2 and school districts issue
10. Sampling issue
11. Exercise Objectives, final RAC comments\*
11. Extent of exercise play\*

\* NOT FOR DISCUSSION WITH POTENTIAL EXERCISE PARTICIPANTS

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
MEETING ATTENDANCE RECORD

LOCATION

FEMA REGION II

DATE

April 29, 1988

NATURE OF MEETING

FEMA / NRC / LILCO

NAME (Please print)	ORGANIZATION (Please print)	PHONE
GARY SEIDENFELD	FEMA	212-238-8202
Joe Keller	INEL	208-520-2123 FTS-583-2123
HERBERT FISH	USDOE	FTS-340-3700
John A Weismantle	LILCO	516-433-4224
Bill Crocker	LILCO	516-436-4238
Dennis Behr	LILCO	(516) 864-1458
BRANT AIDIKOFF	LILCO (AAI)	516 436 4261
		516 436 4261
Raymond Seiter	LILCO	516 420 3421
Philip Kier	ANL	(312) 472-3989
Edward H. Smith	ANL	516-882-9035
Edward F. Fox Jr	US NRC, RI	215 207 5044
Rosemary T. Hogan	NRC, HG	(301) 492-1053
Bernard Weiss	NRC, AEOD	301/492-7053
Erie Weinstein	NRC, AEOD	301/492-7836
STEWART BROWN	NRC, PROJECTS	301/492-1444
TOM BALDWIN	ANL	(516) 883-0030