

YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY



1671 Worcester Road, Framingham, Massachusetts 01701

March 1

88 30 10 56

DOCKETED USNRC
RULES & PROCEDURES BR

DSP G. Matthews
Add: B. Matthews
Telephone (617) 872-8100
TWX 710-380-7619
M. Sanders

FYC 88-003
GLA 88-030

February 29, 1988

December 2, 1987
52 FR 45866
(10)

Secretary of the Commission
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Attention: David Meyer
Chief
Rules and Procedures Branch
Mail Stop 4000 MNBB

Subject: Comments pertaining to Supplement 1 to NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Rev. 1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants" (52FR45866).

Dear Sir:

Yankee Atomic Electric Company (YAEC) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the supplement to NUREG-0654 regarding criteria for utility offsite planning and preparedness. YAEC owns and operates the Yankee Nuclear Power Station in Rowe, Massachusetts. Our Nuclear Services Division also provides engineering and licensing services for other nuclear power plants in the Northeast, including Vermont Yankee, Maine Yankee and New Hampshire Yankee (Seabrook).

YAEC endorses the effort expended by the NRC and the FEMA to develop this supplement. We agree that utility developed compensatory measures resulting from the non-participation of state and/or local governments in emergency preparedness must be included in the subject document. With that in view, we have several comments which we believe will augment the evaluation of emergency planning and preparedness.

First, criteria for explicit inclusion of the concept of the "graded approach" in the document would improve overall protection of public health and safety in the plans. The graded approach mandates that protective actions must be instituted commensurate with the public risk presented. The advantage is that resources are allocated on the basis of degree of actual risk. Under this regime sheltering is identifiable as a legitimate and sometimes preferred response to an event. In addition, this change helps to mitigate public perception that a massive evacuation is always necessary or that it is either the best or the only response.

Second, we recommend that a federal emergency preparedness team be set up for

8803080121 880229
PDR NUREG
0654 C PDR

Letter sent 3/2/88

any state which chooses not to participate in emergency planning and drills. A team consisting of Department of Energy and Federal Emergency Management Agency representatives located within that state could respond quickly under the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan (FRERP) in the event of a real emergency and thus more effectively support the state as it fulfills its obligations.

Thirdly, we agree with and support the "realism" concept. That is: in an actual radiological emergency, state and local officials that have declined to participate in emergency planning will exercise their best efforts to protect the health and safety of the public. We believe that state and local officials will exercise their best efforts to respond to a real emergency. This concept should be further developed in the introduction with specific actions that delineate how these governments will discharge their responsibilities as follows:

- Manning existing emergency response facilities;
- Establishing communications links with the utility, the offsite response organization and other appropriate response organizations;
- Mobilizing and applying available state and local resources;
- Cooperating with the utility, following the utility offsite plan and providing timely coordination of response efforts;
- Having the resources sufficient to implement those portions of the utility offsite plan where state and local response is necessary; and
- Avail themselves, to the fullest extent possible under the circumstances, of capabilities, existing emergency preparedness procedures, training and resources.

Fourth, some specific clarifications should be added, as follows:

- o The scope section of the document states that utility plans will be expected to account for the varying degrees of participation from state and local organizations. We recommend that this section be clarified to indicate that plans should account for predefined or existing state or local capabilities, like communications systems or emergency response facilities, which may be relied upon in the offsite plan. The section should be clear that a plan is not required to account for arbitrarily varying degrees of participation during the planning process.
- o The organizational control section of the document requires a block diagram in the plan which illustrates interrelationships, defines roles, and identifies lead interfaces. These roles vary with each emergency mode. Illustration of this multifaceted array in a one block diagram is unrealistic. This requirement should be deleted in favor of a narrative.
- o The organizational control section lists a number of state and local government functions, which should not be requirements of utility sponsored off site plans. Functions such as fire and rescue, law enforcement, public health and sanitation, snow removal, and emergency medical services are

routine, day-to-day responsibilities independent of any radiological emergency. They should be deleted from this section.

- o Some emergency planning zones extend across state lines and could involve both participating and non-participating states. Evaluation criterion G.5 should be expanded to allow credit for news media orientation programs conducted by another state for a portion of the zone.
- o The section on Medical and Public Health Support should be revised to include FEMA Guidance Memorandum MS-1, "Medical Services".

In conclusion, we reiterate our belief that this supplement is needed to address compensatory measures for non-participating states. We believe that this objective is strengthened by the above comments.

Sincerely,



Donald W. Edwards
Director of Industry Affairs

VLK/dma