



Edward F. Jacoby, Jr., Director

**New York State Emergency Management Office**  
1220 Washington Avenue  
Building 22, Suite 101  
Albany, NY 12226-2251

88

October 4, 1996

Ms. Corrine Macaluso  
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
c/o Lois Smith  
TRW Environmental Systems  
600 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Suite 695  
Washington, D.C. 20024

Subject: Comments on Notice of Proposed Policy, Safe Transportation and Emergency Response Training; Technical Assistance and Funding (61F.R.24772).

Dear Ms. Macaluso:

The New York State Emergency Management Office (SEMO), as the coordinating agency for emergency response in New York State, is responding to the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Notice of Proposed Policy and Procedures, on "Safe Transportation and Emergency Response Training; Technical Assistance and Funding," published in the Federal Register on May 16, 1996.

I am pleased to offer the following comments:

1. New York State supports the policy of giving the states flexibility in the use of funds as stated in 61FR24787. The funding mechanism, however, should use existing programs for distribution of funds, rather than create an entirely new program. For example, DOE could use the cooperative agreement process under the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the HMTA program administered already by USDOT. Doing this would ensure that administrative costs are kept to a minimum and allow the maximum application of resources in the field. The funding mechanism should consider up-front distribution instead of reimbursement for costs incurred because of strained State and local budgets.
2. The variable amount funding basis of 160 miles (FR24783) is inappropriate for New York State. Population densities must be factored into the funding program. In New York, more populated areas have a larger and more complex response organization and therefore require a greater training effort as compared to a rural area with less complex organization. An example would be in a traffic control situation for rerouting traffic around an incident. A populated area would require more responders than would the rural area.

Warning Point: (518) 457-2200

Fax: (518) 457-9930

Executive Office: (518) 457-2222

3. New York State strongly disagrees with the statement that 61FR24774, Section 180C funds would not be available to conduct drills and exercises. New York state has extensive experience with drills and exercises in our radiological emergency preparedness (REP) program which supports offsite emergency planning in communities hosting or near nuclear power plants. Drills and exercises are an integral part of the training program. They reinforce the principles learned during training and are necessary to prove the implementation of the plan. They also provide a mechanism for plan improvement, provide for multi-agency response activities into a functioning unit, and demonstrate to the public that State and local governments have the capabilities to respond. This increases public confidence in our capabilities.
4. The section at 61FR24744 related to purchases of appropriate equipment should be amended to allow for maintenance and calibration of equipment as necessary. This will ensure operational capabilities for the long term.

New York State appreciates the opportunity to comment and looks forward to participating in the development of the final policy. If you have any questions or comments on this letter, please contact Mr. James Baranski of SEMO's REP Program at (518) 457-9934.

Sincerely,



Edward F. Jacoby, Jr.  
Director

EFJ/JB:lw