

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:  
James P. Gleason, Chairman  
Dr. Oscar H. Paris  
Frederick J. Shon

DOCKETED  
USNRC

'83 MAR -1 A10:15

SECRETARY  
& SERVICE  
BRANCH

In the Matter of	)	Docket No. 50-247-SP
	)	50-286-SP
CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY	)	
OF NEW YORK	)	
	)	
(Indian Point, Unit No. 2)	)	
	)	
POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE	)	
OF NEW YORK	)	
	)	
(Indian Point, Unit No. 3)	)	

SUPPLEMENTARY TESTIMONY  
ROCKLAND COUNTY

NAME:

DONALD P. MCGUIRE

Q. State your name and position with the County of Rockland.

A. My name is Donald P. McGuire. I am Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Services for Rockland.

Q. Have you reviewed your testimony as previously submitted to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Since the submission of your direct testimony, and your cross-examination during July of 1982, have any facts arisen of which you wish to advise the Board now.

A. Yes. At the time of my prior testimony, Rockland County, by Resolution No. 320 of 1982 had disavowed the Radiological Emergency Response Plan prepared for Rockland County by Consolidated Edison and the Power Authority of the State of New York, and directed the Office of Emergency Services to develop a radiological response plan for Rockland County. On passage of the County resolution to order the Office of Emergency Services to develop the radiological response plan, it became quite apparent that this was almost an insurmountable task to have performed by December 31, 1982, which was the mandate. Subsequent to the passage of the May 18th legislation which disavowed the plan prepared by Con Edison and PASNY and the contracts that they had let to provide the plan for the four counties, Rockland County established through Resolution 473 in July, 1982, which established a Citizens Advisory Committee to review Rockland County's nuclear evacuation and preparedness plan and general disaster preparedness plan. This was perhaps the

first step in our development of the plan. The Office of Emergency Services took into consideration that there are a great number of emergencies that arise that must have the same response or a very similar response as a radiological emergency. EXAMPLE: a major flood, a major train derailment in or near the Village of Haverstraw, which could encompass a great number of people. A transportation accident also could be included as an example, whereas the releasing of gas or hazardous material would require an evacuation process of a good deal of people. Trying to take into account all the factions of development of a plan where they would be similar, the generic portion of the plan which could be used for implementation of any type of disaster or an emergency implementation was one of our first considerations. We took a look at all the agencies in the County that would have to provide services to people who would be affected by any such disaster, and surmized that most of these agencies would be providing the same service during a radiological emergency as during some other type of major disaster that could possibly happen in the County. With those thoughts in mind, we went ahead and developed our generic portion of the plan, and the response activities that would surround those actions that would have to be taken.

During this time, the Citizens Advisory Committee was in the process of being organized. This whole process appeared to have taken approximately three months from inception until the actual first meeting. At the first meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee, Mrs. Judith Kessler was appointed Chairman, and Donald Hastings, the Director of Office of Emergency Services was appointed Vice Chairman. Once organized, the committee basically broke up into sub-committees, addressing the primary concerns of the total Committee, I was given the responsibility as a resource person and coordinator to meet with the different sub-committees, obtaining information or taking information they were gathering and incorporating it into the plan as we could see necessary. Many of the items discussed did not have any validity and we did not incorporate them into our final draft that was presented by the 31st of December. In those areas where we felt there was a valid suggestion made, we tried to weigh the suggestion as to how it would work or how it would not work based on previous knowledge and on previous experience with this plan. The Office of Emergency Services was very cognizant of the fact that Rockland County did not have major highways criss-crossing the County and tried to take into consideration a proposal whereas we would utilize the Palisades Interstate Parkway and the New York State Thruway with the Garden State Parkway in New Jersey to work our evacuation portion of the plan.

We took the suggestions that had been made, discussed them with traffic people, primarily the State Police traffic people out of Troop F in Middletown, some of our local police agencies and State DOT as to the feasibility of that particular portion of the plan. Currently, those suggestions are still in the process of review. Nothing has been formally accepted and as of this date. One important aspect of the whole process was that we were finding that since we had been removed from the 4 county process, we were meeting with some minor problems in dealing with getting information from organizations that had been involved with the original process and the original plan and this means that the Power Authority and Con Edison and we had been left out of some of the training programs that were currently being conducted in the review of the 120 day process of the NRC.

The Office of Emergency Services personnel attended two or three of these sessions and it appeared that we were being criticized by some of the citizens in Rockland County because we were looked upon as being participants, although in each case, we stated that we were only there as observers and went back to the County Legislature and asked that two resolved clauses in the original legislation passed on May 18th be changed. These two resolved clauses that prohibited us from seeking or prohibiting us from taking part in any of this process that we felt we should be a part of was amended with resolution passed on December 7, 1982 by the County Legislature, changing those two resolved clauses that were mentioned just previously. After the passage of those two resolved clauses, it appeared that, and we have to remember that this did not happen until December, we had a mandate to reach by the 31st of December to submit a plan. With a great deal of assistance from a person contracted by the State of New York, we were able to get much of the information out together and submitted to the Legislature by our deadline of December 31st.

There has been much activity surrounding this response plan by the Citizens Advisory Committee. In review, although no formal conclusion or adoption of the plan has come forward as of this time, we still feel that there is a lot of progress being made. Since May, 1982, there has been continuous training being accomplished in regard to police agencies, although to say that all police departments have been represented is not a true statement. We have been able to reach a good deal of police officers in at least presenting some information on radiological incidents. We anticipate that since the income of monies from the State of New York to the County has been processed, we are attempting to get the training accomplished to meet our mandates in those lines with ambulance corps, fire departments of the County, the entire County, and police departments in the entire County. There presently is the need for County training programs.

As with any other process, it is a lengthy processing in doing training, making sure that we get in contact with all these people, setting up training sessions, etc., and the State Office of Disaster Preparedness has been very helpful in view of the fact that we do not have a radiological officer on board at this time in the County to provide us with the assistance in the training areas that we have felt we require. It is certain a valid point that I think should be made that the position that Rockland County took in May certainly was of a beneficial nature not only to the Office of Emergency Services in Rockland County, but to the various other counties considering that we set a precedent in this County by not accepting something that had been processed as the plan that we should go with. In review of this, it has given us the opportunity to be able to draw up this plan, and really take a close look at what we had to deal with.

At the present time, we, meaning the Office of Emergency Services, would have to say that we are probably much better equipped, much better able to respond to any type of an emergency that we were at this time a year ago.

The awareness of any type of an emergency that would threaten the lives and safety of the people of Rockland County certainly has been brought to light in view of all the controversy surrounding Indian Point, and we must place emphasis that these emergencies can develop in this County many times without any warning, any notice of whether it was with the radiological incident or whether it was with another serious type of accident or with a natural disaster. In regard to the implementation of the draft of our plan, it is very difficult at this particular time to comment, inasmuch as there are many aspects that have not been fulfilled.

The training requirements are not complete and will be an ongoing process. We have received equipment we thought we needed, and more equipment is on order. But as far as the total amount of equipment which may be required to implement this plan, it appears at this time that we have to rely on other resources. We have to have agreements with our police and fire agencies within the County, ambulance agencies operating within the County, plus letters of agreement with Bergen County to supplement us on many aspects of the plan. One particular aspect in Bergen County's relationship is that we have taken steps to meet with them. They have taken steps to proceed along the lines of providing a congregate care shelter for our people as required. They have been put on our notification list for emergencies, so that they are made aware of an incident at the same time or within reasonable time of our own County notification. One of the aspects of the testimony presented in July last year was in the communication field. We have taken the steps to try to correct some of the gaps that exist in the communication lines. We understand and fully recognize that this is not the ultimate, and our approach to completely meet all the requirements that have been suggested and/or are to be put into place.

I previously stated that we did receive some money from the State of New York for various items. It did take what seemed to us an unreasonable amount of time from which process of the State passing the money that had been collected from the utilities was funneled down to Rockland County, and it did create a difficult position for the County. We could not go out and start the process of acquiring any of the equipment we thought we needed until we were reasonably assured that the money was in hand. Once that money was processed through our County, we took steps to acquire some of the equipment. Rockland County has, to date, received approximately \$88,000, and has been promised an additional \$30,000 for additional staff for assistance in development of our plan. At this point, the process continues in respect to training and acquisition of equipment and in respect to planned development, I would not venture to guess at which time this plan would be ready for formal acceptance due to the process that has to go through with the Citizens Advisory Committee from the Office of Emergency Service's aspect of reviewing the plan. It is very difficult at this time to ascertain what will be the final direction recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee. At the time of an appearance before the hearing, additional testimony will be discussed.