

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of

Philadelphia Electric Company

(Limerick Generating Station,
Units 1 and 2

)
)
)
)
)

Docket Nos. 50-352
50-353

*85 JUL -8 P12:42

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES H. ZIMMERMAN,
SUPERINTENDENT,
STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT GRATERFORD
ON BEHALF OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Q.1. Please state your full name and business address for the record.

A.1. Charles H. Zimmerman, Superintendent, State Correctional Institution at
Graterford, Box 244, Graterford, Pennsylvania, 19426.

Q.2. How long have you been the superintendent for Graterford?

A.2. I came to Graterford in August of 1983, as the Acting Superintendent pending
confirmation. I was confirmed as permanent superintendent in November of 1983.

Q.3. Have you remained superintendent from that time?

A.3. Yes.

Q.4. Superintendent Zimmerman, could you please describe your prior correctional
experience as well as your education and background?

A.4. This information is contained in a document entitled Resume - Charles H.
Zimmerman which is attached hereto.

8507090454 850705
PDR ADOCK 05000352
T PDR

Q.5. Could you please describe your responsibilities as the superintendent of the State Correctional Institution at Graterford?

A.5. I am the chief executive officer of the institution with administrative responsibility for the fiscal management and operation of the institution. It is my responsibility to maintain the security and maintenance operations aspect of the institution. Additionally, I oversee the provision for the health, safety and welfare of our inmates and to provide programs for their rehabilitation.

Q.6. Are you familiar with the Radiological Emergency Response Plan for Graterford in response to a nuclear incident at the Limerick Generating Plant?

A.6. Yes, I am familiar with the plan. I worked closely with our RERP Coordinator, Mr. Stephen Lucash, to determine what we would have to do to gather our inmates to implement an evacuation and to coordinate the process of bringing in the appropriate vehicles and embarking our inmates on those vehicles and getting them out according to the selected routes. This process was done in conjunction and cooperation with the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency, as well as the Central Office for the Department of Corrections, both of whom gave us support and suggestions. We also ran through an evacuation emergency exercise with these agencies for the Federal Emergency Management Agency on March 7, 1985.

Q.7. Have you been involved in developing an estimated time of evacuation for Graterford?

A.7. Yes. It is my understanding that Commissioner Jeffes gave an estimated time for evacuation for Graterford several months ago. We subsequently undertook an independent analysis of the components of and the time needed to complete an evacuation of Graterford. In doing so, we worked with staff at Graterford on site and developed an evacuation time estimate based upon past experiences as to how long it would take us to secure, prepare for evacuation and ultimately evacuate the institution.

After we developed the estimated time of evacuation at Graterford, I reviewed it with Commissioner Jeffes. We both used the same methodology in developing our estimated time of evacuation. In my opinion, in order to arrive at a reasonable estimated time of evacuation, the method we used is the only method. To more fully illustrate this methodology, we developed a flow chart, which is submitted with this testimony.

Q.8. Superintendent Zimmerman, turning to the flow chart, how was this developed?

A.8. We developed our estimates based upon previous experience with other emergencies and the day-to-day operation of the prison. We know, for example, that to lockdown the institution would take us approximately 30 minutes. We then would have to get a count of the inmates. We make counts routinely everyday, and they take approximately 30 minutes.

Q.9. Superintendent Zimmerman, do you expect it to take any longer to lockdown the institution during an evacuation situation than on a normal day?

A.9. Based on our past experience, when there are life threatening situations and the inmates know something is going on, for their own good, they cooperate with the staff. For example, we've had fire drills in the past, and inmates cooperate with those. So, during an evacuation due to a nuclear incident, we expect this to take thirty minutes.

Q.10. Superintendent Zimmerman, are there situations and circumstances for this evacuation where the inmates would not have to be locked down?

A.10. Yes. If this happened in the middle of the night or during one of our population counts, the institution population would already be locked down. We have the population locked down at 5 p.m. daily just before dinner for count. We

also have a majority of the prison population in its cells just before lunch, about 11:30 a.m. There are, therefore, several times during the day, as well as the entire night, that we would not have to undergo the lockdown process. For the purpose of estimating the time for evacuation, however, it was reasonable to include the time needed to effect a lockdown.

Q.11. What, if anything, will the inmates be told while the officers are walking the blocks taking the count?

A.11. While the officers are taking count, the inmates would be notified via our public address system, which is heard throughout the institution, that they should pack their personal effects in a pillowcase, that they would be permitted to take only that which would fit on that person and the pillowcase, and only those health and comfort items deemed necessary for their trip and for their relocation.

Q.12. Would the inmates have any other notice regarding the evacuation?

A.12. Yes. We plan to issue an addendum to the inmate handbook, which is given to every inmate. The addendum will tell the inmates what to do to help in the evacuation.

Q.13. Turning to the "Vehicle Arriving" portion of the flow chart, can you describe how you arrived at those figures?

A.13. Yes. We travel these routes regularly with our own buses and vans when moving from one facility to another, and we used what we considered to be the most reasonable figure. If we would have gradual entry into the emergency situation, we would already have the buses on site at Graterford. On the other hand, if we have a more rapidly developing incident, it may take between one to three hours for the bus companies to get their vehicles to the support facilities and then travel time to Graterford. The figure we used in developing the estimate was two to four hours. This

is a realistic travel time from the support institutions to Graterford and is based on the drivers having the busses at the support institutions.

Q.14. Turning your attention to the off-duty personnel figures on the flow chart, can you discuss how they were arrived at?

A.14. Yes, the chart indicates that off-duty personnel will arrive in one to two hours. We know this because we've had emergency situations where we've had to call in off-duty personnel. In addition, our institution emergency plan, which is tested at least twice a year, requires us to conduct a test of our call-in system. Our response in this instance is based upon those tests as well as those actual emergency situations that have happened over the past several years. Some of the personnel begin to arrive almost immediately, but to get the manpower for the loading teams will take one to two hours. All of the off-duty personnel would not be required to effect our evacuation plan; only the number indicated in the plan itself would be necessary to effect the movement of the inmates from their cells to the staging area.

Q.15. Turning your attention to the "Vehicle Loading Team" figure on the flow chart, can you discuss how that was arrived at and what it really means?

A.15. Basically, it means that we assigned designated personnel to be vehicle loading teams, that is, they would be at the staging areas. We have designated five of those areas in various places in the institution to which inmates would be funneled and boarded on the buses. Loading team personnel are required to see that the inmates get on the proper vehicle.

Q.16. Turning your attention to the information under the heading of "Evacuation" on the flow chart, could you explain the figures shown for the Class 3, 4 and 5 inmates?

A.16. Yes. Class 4 and 5 inmates are those inmates requiring the least amount of security that we have at our institution. In point of fact, many of these inmates live outside the walls of the institution and work outside the walls. Some of them go home on furloughs periodically. Class 3 inmates are those inmates designated as our general population. They are free to move about the inside of the institution depending on their work assignments, where they live, and in which program they are involved. All of our staff who would be involved in moving these inmates have been trained in the use of security equipment and use it on a regular basis. We have designated special teams that go on the blocks, the numbers determined by the size of the block and the amount of security needed. These teams would effectively remove the inmate from his cell, apply the appropriate security device and see him on his way to the appropriate staging area. The teams can move from cell to cell because we will have officers running a line from the block that is being evacuated onto the staging area. The inmate will be directed to go and follow that line of officers so that the inmates in effect would be walking to the staging areas for boarding the buses in a smooth, uninterrupted flow.

Q.17. Superintendent, the amount of time you have allocated for these Class 3, 4 and 5 inmates appears to indicate that more than one inmate at a time in each of these classes will be getting security restraints and being loaded, is that correct?

A.17. Yes. We have teams of officers doing this simultaneously on several blocks and moving right down the block on all of the ranges and tiers. Ranges and tiers are the different parts of the cellblock.

Q.18. In the flow chart you allocated more time for the Class 1 and 2 inmates. Could you describe what Class 1 and 2 inmates are and why you allowed more time to restrain and load these inmates?

A.18. Class 1 and 2 inmates are those requiring the highest degree of security that we have in the facility. These are inmates who are in our restricted housing units or in disciplinary lockup or administrative custody. The reason we have allowed more time to restrain and load them is because of additional security devices that may be used and the additional security required in moving them from their cells to the vehicles. Again, there are several teams working, depending upon the location and the physical plant, and the time estimate is based on the fact that the officers are familiar with using the restraints and moving the inmates.

Q.19. What effect would there be on the evacuation if one of the cellblocks refuses to lockdown or in some other way tries to impede the evacuation of the institution?

A.19. I believe minimal to none. My opinion is based upon the fact that we handle emergency situations on an almost regular basis, and the very nature of the fact that Graterford is a maximum security correctional facility. We have a team of trained personnel, our Emergency Response Team, which would be on hand and would be ready to respond to any type of situation like this. We can isolate areas inside the institution, and once isolated, we simply move the required personnel into that area, and they do whatever it is that they have to do to restore order.

Q.20. The other inmates could still be evacuated?

A.20. Absolutely.

Q.21. Turning your attention to the caption "Evacuation Begins" on the flow chart, how did you arrive at the numbers for the times of evacuation for the vans, ambulances and buses?

A.21. We arrived at these figures by evaluating the actions that would take place during the evacuation. Certain actions will take place at the same time. We can

begin lockdown, request the vehicles and call in off-duty personnel at the same time. As I discussed earlier, inmates will be restrained, loaded into vehicles and removed as the vehicles arrive on site. To arrive at the total of eight to ten hours, we reviewed the busses that would be coming at what time and how many inmates would be loaded at what times. We then added a short period of time for travel time out of the evacuation area. Although I am not at liberty to disclose evacuation routes, I can say that we will have the inmates go out of the evacuation area in a reasonably direct route. We will certainly not take them out past Limerick.

Q.22. Why do you have a range of numbers in this section?

A.22. Because we would load the busses as they arrive and send them out to the support institutions, and the busses are expected to come in at varying times since they are travelling different distances.

Q.23. In conclusion, Superintendent Zimmerman, do you believe the evacuation could take longer than the eight to ten hours you have compiled for the evacuation time estimate for Graterford?

A.23. In my opinion, it's highly unlikely. We developed the estimate using figures based on experience, including experience with emergency situations. The inmates will have been provided information with respect to an evacuation in the inmate handbook and will be kept abreast of developments during an incident. My staff and I are confident that the evacuation can be completed in the time indicated in the flow chart.

FLOW CHART
S.C.I.G.
R.E.R.P. EVACUATION

Evacuation Order: _____

Lockdown Order (30 Minutes): _____

Population Count (30 Minutes): _____

Vehicles Arriving (2 to 4 hours, adverse conditions 4 to 6 hours maximum)
58 Buses - 3 Ambulances
10 Vans

Off Duty Personnel Called
(1 to 2 hours, adverse conditions 2 to 3
hours maximum)

Vehicle Loading Teams Assigned
5 Loading Sites (1 hour)
A - B - C - D - E

Evacuation:

Evacuation:

200 Inmates Class 4 & 5 (1 Minute per 1 Man)
(25 Minutes Securing & Loading)

2125 Inmates Class 3 (1 Minute per 1 Man)
(5 Hours 10 Minutes Securing & Loading)

125 Inmates Class 1 & 2 (5 Minutes Per Man)
(2 Hours 6 Minutes Securing & Loading)

Evacuation Begins:

Evacuation Begins:

Vans Leaving Institution
(Within 3 Hours of Notice to Evacuate)

Ambulances Leaving Institution
(Within 3 Hours of Notice to Evacuate)

Buses Leaving Institution
(Within 3 to 8 Hours of Notice to Evacuate)

EVACUATION COMPLETED
Last group of buses
leaving within 8-10 hours

RESUME

CHARLES H. ZIMMERMAN

4603 Perkiomen Creek Road
Collegeville, Pennsylvania 19426
Telephone: 215-489-2184

Marital Status: Married
Two Children
Date of Birth: February 16, 1944

EDUCATION

B.A. Ohio State University, 1969
M.S. Xavier University, 1971

Major: Sociology
Major: Corrections

RECEIVED

JUL 01 1985

OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL

RECEIVED

CORRECTIONAL EXPERIENCE

August 1983 - Present

State Correctional Institution at Graterford
Post Office Box 244
Graterford, Pennsylvania 19426

Acting Superintendent - Three Months;
Appointed: November 14, 1983

DUTIES: Total administrative responsibility for treatment, custody, and fiscal operations of a maximum security state institution with a population of approximately 2400 adult felons. Directly responsible for day to day operation of the institution and providing for care, custody, control, and rehabilitative services of the inmates. Responsible to plan, organize and direct the program and operation, including a Diagnostic and Reception Center; classification and treatment programs, overall custody, farm, industrial and plant operations, fiscal operations, and personnel management. Responsible for formulating institutional policies and procedures under the umbrella of Bureau of Correction guidelines and directives. Presently working towards institution accreditation. Direct a staff of over six-hundred (600) employees and administer a budget in excess of \$32,000,000.

June 1980-August 1983

State Correctional Institution at Huntingdon
Drawer R
Huntingdon, Pennsylvania 16652

Superintendent

DUTIES: Total responsibility for treatment, custody, and fiscal operations of a maximum security State Correctional Institution with a population of over 1550 adult felons. Duties same as above. During my tenure as Superintendent, the institution population increased from approximately 1000, for a gain of over

50%. Staff increased as well to approximately 365 full time employees, and the annual budget went from approximately \$10,000,000 to approximately \$13,500,000. Accepted and met the challenge to enable the institution to assimilate this large increase in population with a minimum of difficulty and no major problems by innovative programming, developing alternative scheduling for routine functions such as showers, feeding, recreation, etc., double celling, and the development of dormitory and outside modular housing units. Also brought the institution to within final readiness stages for the Commission of Accreditation audit.

June 1978-June 1980

State Regional Correctional Facility at Mercer
R.D. #2, P.O. Box 10
Mercer, Pennsylvania 16137
(Regional Correctional Institution)

Superintendent

DUTIES: Total responsibility in directing the treatment, custody, and supportive programs of a 180 man minimum security, regional correctional facility. Began by recruiting, hiring and training a total staff of 101 personnel involved in all areas of institution operations including maintenance, dietary, medical, clerical, security, personnel, and business management. Directly responsible for the subsequent day-to-day operations of the institution in providing for the care, custody, control and rehabilitative services for inmates. Formulated and implemented institutional operating philosophy and directed program development to provide for academic and vocational opportunities for inmates committed to the institution. Also direct development and implementation of group and individual counseling, educational release programs, work release programs and a full spectrum of leisure time recreational activities. Responsible to oversee and direct an overall operating budget of \$2.3 million.

March 1973-May 1978

State Correctional Institution
Post Office Box 99901
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15233
(Maximum Security Correctional Institution)

Deputy Superintendent for Inmate Services

DUTIES: Total administrative responsibility for the treatment area of a one thousand inmate, adult, maximum security correctional facility. This included the direct supervision of department supervisors in the following areas: medical services, counseling (including psychiatric and psychological), diagnostic and classification center, activities, chaplains, data

services (including records, clerical and receiving), vocational placement, and education (academic and vocational). Developed volunteer resources and community services involving over fifty (50) separate agencies and over two-hundred (200) individual participants rendering services to inmates. Involved with labor issues, including grievance hearings, regular meet and discuss meetings and negotiations regarding local issues. Responsible for review and approval of budgets for all treatment areas. Review all disciplinary procedures and individual inmate lock-ups. Review monthly sanitation, health and safety standards of entire institution including dietary and living quarters. Administrator in charge of the institution on a regular basis as rotating "Duty Officer" and Acting Superintendent during his absence.

July 1972-March 1973

Lebanon Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 56
Lebanon, Ohio
(Medium Security Correctional Institution)

Assistant Associate Superintendent

DUTIES: Served as Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent and both associate superintendents. Performed administrative, coordinating, and supervisory duties in all areas of the institution including security, treatment, and community programs and relations. Acted as legal advisor to institution disciplinary boards and performed public relations activities for the institution, which included news interviews, television appearances, and public speeches. Conducted in-service training classes for all institution personnel. Also acted as direct liaison between inmates and line personnel and the Superintendent, thereby insuring a cooperative acceptance and implementation of new departmental policies and procedures. Directed and coordinated all inmate programs including religious, community services and Jaycees. On assigned weekends, and holidays, acted as administrator in charge of the institution.

October 1969-July 1972

Lebanon Correctional Institution
Post Office Box 56
Lebanon, Ohio
(Medium Security Correctional Institution)

Social Worker

DUTIES: Supervised the Social Services Department in the absence of the regular supervisor. Had a caseload of up to 450 inmates. Acted as a voting member of various institution committees. Conducted a narcotics education program within the institution and gave presentation on drug abuse to interested citizens' groups and educational facilities. Conducted

individual, group, and family counseling. Wrote social histories and special reports for the Parole Board.

June 1969-October 1969

Ohio State Penitentiary
Post Office Box 511
Columbus, Ohio
(Maximum Security Penitentiary)

Social Worker

DUTIES: Duties included counseling, participation in orientation programs, research and writing social histories

TEACHING AND CONSULTING

August 1984

Commission on Accreditation for Corrections
Certified Commission consultant for adult Correctional Institutions.

June-July 1984

New Jersey Civil Service Examiner
Trenton, New Jersey
Correctional Administration Examiner

January 1980-1981

Certified Instructor for Municipal Police Officers
Education and Training

September 1979-May 1980

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, Pennsylvania
Instructor - Criminology - Extension Program

June 1974

Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio
Consultant - Training Program for County Corrections Officers

September 1972-June 1973

Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio
Graduate Instructor - Corrections

October 1972-December 1972

Hocking Technical College
Nelsonville, Ohio
Undergraduate Instructor - Corrections

MILITARY

May 1966-March 1968

U. S. Marine Corps

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Correctional Association - Member
North American Association of Wardens and Superintendents - Member
Pennsylvania Prison Wardens' Association - Member

PLAN OF INSTRUCTION
NUMBER SEVEN

DOSIMETRY AND DECONTAMINATION SEMINAR
FOR EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

Office of Training and Education
Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency
January, 1985

PLAN OF INSTRUCTION
NUMBER SEVEN

DOSIMETRY AND DECONTAMINATION SEMINAR
FOR EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

Rationale

Despite the extraordinary precautions and safeguards in effect, there remains the possibility of unplanned radiological releases from the nuclear-powered generating plants located within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In minimizing the risk to emergency response personnel who may be required to function in a potentially hazardous environment, there is a need for such personnel to know how to monitor their personal exposure to radiation, monitor exposure of other persons, and conduct proper decontamination monitoring procedures.

Purpose

This seminar is designed to provide emergency personnel with the knowledge and skills that will permit them to monitor their personal exposure to radiation and to conduct decontamination monitoring procedures that will be employed in appropriate locales in proximity to nuclear-powered generating plants.

Objectives

Upon completion of this seminar, participants should be able to do the following:

1. Develop an understanding of the government response to disasters.
2. Demonstrate an ability to properly utilize the designated dosimetry.
3. Know the acceptable levels of radiation during an incident at a fixed nuclear facility.

4. Demonstrate an understanding of maintaining appropriate records.
5. Understand reception centers, mass care centers, and where decontamination monitoring procedures are utilized.
6. Demonstrate the proper use of a survey meter.

Qualifications for Attendance

All county emergency management coordinators, members of the county emergency management organizations, municipal emergency management coordinators as recommended by their county coordinators, and any other person approved by the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency are eligible to attend this seminar.

Summary of Subject Areas

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Hours</u>
1. Introduction and Overview	0.1
2. Government Response to Disasters	0.5
3. Dosimetry	0.9
4. Decontamination	0.9
5. Summary and Conclusion	<u>0.1</u>
Total	2.5

Units of Instruction

1. Introduction and Overview 0.1 hours

The instructor will introduce all those persons who should be made known to the students. Then, through a brief lecture, the instructor will explain the purpose of this seminar and briefly review the subjects that will be discussed.

2. Government Response to Disasters

0.5 hours

- Reference:
- a. Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, P.L. 81-920.
 - b. Pennsylvania Emergency Management Services Act of 1978, P.L. 1332.
 - c. "The Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency," a brochure.

Presentation: The instructor will lecture on the development of civil defense in the United States with an emphasis on Pennsylvania. The evolvement into emergency management will be explained and its present mission described. The involvement of emergency management in planning for incidents at fixed nuclear facilities will be described. The PEMA brochure will be utilized as a hand-out.

3. Dosimetry

0.9 hours

- Reference: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Disaster Operations Plan, Annex E ("Fixed Nuclear Facility Incidents"); November, 1981; Appendix 16 ("Radiological Exposure Control").

- Presentation:
- a. Through lecture and discussion, the instructor will demonstrate the proper use of the three dosimeters and the charger.
 - (1) CD V-730 (or DCA 622)
 - (2) CD V-742
 - (3) TLD (thermoluminescent dosimeter badge)
 - (4) CD V-750
 - b. Through lecture and discussion, the instructor will explain the following acceptable levels of radiation concerning fixed nuclear facility incidents:
 - (1) 25 R
 - (2) 15-20 R
 - (3) 5 R

- c. Through lecture and discussion, the instructor will explain the proper record forms and how they should be maintained.

4. Decontamination

0.9 hours

Reference: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Disaster Operations Plan, Annex E ("Fixed Nuclear Facility Incidents"); November, 1981; Appendix 16 ("Radiological Exposure Control").

Presentation: The instructor, through lecture and discussion, will examine reception centers and mass care centers. Then, decontamination monitoring procedures will be identified and demonstrated. The proper use of a CD V-700 will be explained and demonstrated. The following will then be discussed and explained:

- a. Background radiation (usually .03 mr).
- b. Radiation above background of .05 mr or more will be referred to a physician.
- c. Thyroid must not exceed .1 mr.
- d. Appropriate record keeping.

5. Summary and Conclusion

0.1 hours

The instructor will briefly summarize the content of this seminar and then bring it to a conclusion.

Evaluation

All participants will be requested to complete the evaluation form that is marked "Attachment A."

Deployment

This seminar will be presented in each county within the Commonwealth that is involved with nuclear-powered generating plants.

PENNSYLVANIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
OFFICE OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Course Evaluation
for
Dosimetry and Decontamination Seminar

I. General - Check space preceding most appropriate answer

1. My reaction to this seminar can best be described as:
 - () a. The seminar met my needs far beyond my expectations.
 - () b. The seminar met my needs in an adequate manner.
 - () c. The seminar did not meet all my needs.
 - () d. The seminar did not meet my needs at all.
2. My estimate of the instructor's capabilities can best be described as:
 - () a. The instructor was excellent.
 - () b. The instructor was good.
 - () c. The instructor met most of my needs, but some needs were not addressed.
 - () d. The instructor failed to meet my needs.
3. The room in which the instruction was conducted can best be described as:
 - () a. The room was excellent.
 - () b. The room was good.
 - () c. The room was not quite adequate.
 - () d. The room was totally inadequate.

II. Meeting Objectives

1. My understanding of the government response to disasters can best be described as:
 - () a. I fully understand the government response to disasters.
 - () b. I understand generally the government response to disasters.
 - () c. I do not understand the government response to disasters.

2. My knowledge of the proper use of dosimetry can be described as:
- () a. I fully understand the proper use of dosimetry.
 - () b. I understand generally the proper use of dosimetry.
 - () c. I do not understand the proper use of dosimetry.
3. My knowledge of the acceptable levels of radiation during an incident at a fixed nuclear facility can best be described as:
- () a. I fully understand the acceptable levels of radiation.
 - () b. I understand generally the acceptable levels of radiation.
 - () c. I do not understand the acceptable levels of radiation.
4. My understanding of the proper maintenance of appropriate records can best be described as:
- () a. I understand completely the appropriate records and how they are to be maintained.
 - () b. I understand generally the appropriate records and how they are to be maintained.
 - () c. I do not understand the appropriate records or how they are to be maintained.
5. My knowledge of reception centers, mass care centers, and where decontamination monitoring procedures are to be utilized can best be described as:
- () a. I fully understand reception centers, mass care centers, and where decontamination monitoring procedures are to be utilized.
 - () b. I generally understand reception centers, mass care centers, and where decontamination monitoring procedures are to be utilized.
 - () c. I do not understand reception centers, mass care centers, or where decontamination monitoring procedures are to be utilized.
6. My knowledge and understanding of the effective use of a survey meter can best be described as:
- () a. I understand completely the use of a survey meter.
 - () b. I understand the proper use of a survey meter, but have some questions about such use.
 - () c. I do not understand how to use a survey meter.

III. Recommendations

In the space below, please submit any recommendations you may have regarding this seminar.