

WATERFORD-3 STEAM ELECTRIC STATION

TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2

SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

Approval:

Frank J. Eynow
Emergency Planning Manager

Approval:

N/A
General Manager Plant Operations

Approval:

N/A
Vice President Operations

WATERFORD 3 SES TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2
SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO. TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2 CUE CARD NO. 2

TO: All Participants TIME: N/A

FROM: Lead Controller T = N/A

THIS IS A DRILL
DO NOT initiate actions affecting normal plant operations

ANNUAL EXERCISE LESSONS LEARNED:

NRC WEAKNESSES: (Refer to Weakness Response Letter W3F1-93-0374)

1. The issuance of Protective Action Recommendations (PARs), the failure to follow applicable procedures for completing notification messages containing PARs, and the failure to receive the Emergency Coordinator's approval to modify previously approved PARs were identified as an exercise weakness.
2. The inability to timely assess the source of the release and implement mitigation strategies was identified as a weakness.

TSC/OSC IMPROVEMENT ITEMS: (Refer to W3 exercise report and NRC report.)

1. Although plant page announcements were frequently made to update plant personnel on the status of the emergency, plant personnel were not informed of the identity of the person making the announcement, their emergency position or their emergency facility. This is also a good practice during "round table" status briefings, especially if personnel from the NRC or other agencies are present.
2. Transfer of responsibilities from the TSC to the EOF could have been performed more efficiently, especially transfer of communications.
3. The TSC did not always keep the EOF informed of their activities in a timely manner. For example, the EOF asked at least three times for the status of Containment isolation.
4. The OSC HP did an excellent job of keeping informed of plant radiological status, but always had to ask for the information. The RCC should do a better job of notifying the OSC of changes in conditions.
5. Personnel were not aware of how to react to the problem with the Accountability Keycard Readers. It would have helped if Security made an announcement indicating how to proceed.
6. Status boards were not always kept updated. The NRC noted the PARs were not kept current on the dose assessment status boards.
7. There was some confusion relating to computerized dose assessment results from monitoring teams outside of the plume.

WATERFORD 3 SES TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2
SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO. TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2 CUE CARD NO. 2

TO: All Participants TIME: N/A

FROM: Lead Controller T = N/A

THIS IS A DRILL

DO NOT initiate actions affecting normal plant operations

ANTICIPATED RESPONSE

COMMENTS

Participants should be encouraged to ask questions or comment on the issues discussed.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. The Lead Controller will use the Response to the NRC to discuss the NRC Weaknesses in detail.
2. The Lead Controller will use the W3 exercise report and the NRC report to discuss the improvement items in detail.
3. The Lead Controller should also discuss the changes being made to EP-001-001 as a result of the recent NRC inspection. Additional indicators are being added to the three barrier General Emergency EALs to clarify how to determine if the cladding barrier has been breached.
4. The Lead Controller may discuss additional improvement items at his discretion.

WATERFORD 3 SES TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2
SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO. TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2 CUE CARD NO. 3

TO: All Participants TIME: N/A

FROM: Lead Controller T = N/A

THIS IS A DRILL

DO NOT initiate actions affecting normal plant operations

The following three practice scenarios will be provided to the participants to discuss Protective Action Recommendations:

1. Scenario #1

You have just declared a General Emergency due to a LOCA with cladding damage and Containment pressure of 36 psi and increasing. The wind is from 202 degrees at 3 miles per hour.

2. Scenario #2

A General Emergency was declared due to dose projection calculation as follows:

	<u>TDE</u>	<u>CDE</u>
EAB	7334 MR	8692 MR
2 miles	611 MR	724 MR
5 miles	105 MR	105 MR
10 miles	56 MR	67 MR

Wind direction is from 18 degrees at 2 miles per hour.

3. Scenario #3

A General Emergency had been declared 45 minutes ago and the minimum PARs provided to the offsite agencies. New dose projection information is received as follows:

	<u>TDE</u>	<u>CDE</u>
EAB	14,325 MR	170,402 MR
2 miles	3,539 MR	42,099 MR
5 miles	1,112 MR	13,231 MR
10 miles	471 MR	5613 MR

Wind direction is from 180 degrees at 6.3 miles per hour.

WATERFORD 3 SES TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2
SEPTEMBER 20, 1994

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO. TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2 CUE CARD NO. 3

TO: All Participants TIME: N/A

FROM: Lead Controller T = N/A

THIS IS A DRILL

DO NOT initiate actions affecting normal plant operations

ANTICIPATED RESPONSE

1. Scenario #1

Participants should recommend: Evacuation for A1, B1, C1, D1, A2 & B2 and;
Shelter for the rest of the sectors (A3, A4, B3, B4, C2, C3, C4, D2, D3, & D4)

2. Scenario #2

Participants should recommend: Evacuation for A1, B1, C1, D1, C2, & D2 and;
Shelter for the rest of the sectors (A2, A3, A4, B2, B3, B4, C3, C4, D3 & D4)

3. Scenario #3

Participants should recommend: Evacuation for A1, B1, C1, D1, A2, C2, A3 & A4
and; Shelter for the rest of the sectors (B2, B3, B4, C3, C4, D2, D3, & D4)

COMMENTS

The scenarios are not related to each other. They are individual sets of conditions.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Provide the conditions for each scenario and instruct the participants to determine the correct PARs.
2. Encourage the participants to use EP-002-052 for these practice scenarios.

**NUCLEAR OPERATIONS TRAINING DEPARTMENT
ATTENDANCE RECORD**

CLASS TITLE: TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2 CLASS NUMBER: J033-94- CYCLE: N/A
INSTRUCTOR: STAFF START DATE: 9/20/94 END DATE: 9/20/94 HOURS: N/A

	LAST	NAME FIRST MI	SIGNATURE	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPANY	GRADE
1.	Kieff	Joan O	Joan O. Kieff	436-27-8183	Personnel Assurance	EOI	
2.	CRAWLEY,	Robert A	Robert A. Crawley	309 36 3454	ENV/ SAFETY	EOI	
3.	JOHN	HOUGHTALING	John Houghtaling	024-34-2742	Tech Service	EOI	
4.	DAVID	FREEMAN S.	David S. Freeman	435-70-7192	Reli. Engr	EOI	
5.	Lett,	Thomas P.	J. P. Lett	587-66-4271	Radiation Protection	EOI	
6.	McLENDON,	RONALD C	Ronald C. McLendon	254-92-5123	Radiation Protection	EOI	
7.	Fey,	GREG L.	Greg L. Fey	211-46-8864	LICENSING	EOI	
8.	LEGERE	ROBERT A	Robert A. Leger	004-30-3043	Sup. Eng-Mech	EOI	
9.	Landry	Steven F	Landry	439-13-6025	Rad. Prot.	EOI	
10.	BERGERON,	AARON S.	Aaron S. Bergeron	438-25-1702	CHEMISTRY	EOI	
11.	Hawkins	Gregory G	Gregory G. Hawkins	439-17-6244	Chemistry	EOI	
12.	TOUNA	MATT L	Matt Touna	436-37-6595	SVS ENG	EOI	
13.	JENQUINE,	ROBERT H	Robert H. Jenquine	392-53-1546	I/C	EOI	
14.	MARKEL,	JOHN E.	John E. Markel	188-26-9188	MNTC ENG	EOI	
15.	KINLER,	NED T.	Ned T. Kinler	438-19-9365	PM+C	EOI	
16.	SCHMALTZ,	C.G.	C.G. Schmalz	470 52 0039	MPK	EOI	

**NUCLEAR OPERATIONS TRAINING DEPARTMENT
ATTENDANCE RECORD**

CLASS TITLE: TSC/OSC TABLETOP #2

CLASS NUMBER: J033-94-

CYCLE: N/A

INSTRUCTOR: STAFF

START DATE: 9/20/94

END DATE: 9/20/94

HOURS: N/A

	LAST	NAME FIRST	MI	SIGNATURE	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPANY	GRADE
1.	LEDET,	John	J.	<i>John J. Ledet</i>	436-68-2486	SECURITY	EOI	
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								
13.								
14.								
15.								
16.								