



LOUISIANA  
POWER & LIGHT

POM VOLUME 18

POM SECTION 3

EP-3-020

REVISION 4

EMERGENCY PLAN SUPPORTING PROCEDURE  
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILLS AND EXERCISE

PORC Meeting No. 85006

Reviewed W. Allen / 7-11-85  
PORC Chairman DATE

Approved W. Allen / 7-11-85  
Plant Manager-Nuclear DATE

Effective Date

# REVIEW COVER SHEET

REVIEW OF: \_\_\_\_\_

EP-3-020 - Emergency Preparedness Drills and Exercise (Rev. 4)

## PORC REVIEW

The PORC has reviewed this item and determined that a safety evaluation was performed (as applicable), that an unreviewed safety question does not exist (as applicable), that a change to the Technical Specifications is not required, and that nuclear safety is/was not adversely affected.

ORDER OF REVIEW	PORC MEMBER	PORC MEMBER SIGNATURE	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL		DATE
			YES	NO	
	Maintenance Superintendent	<i>W. Amish</i>	✓		7/11/85
	Operations Superintendent	<i>W. H. Berggren</i>	✓		7/11/85
	Radiation Protection Superintendent	<i>D. W. Kenning</i>	✓		7/11/85
	Plant Quality Manager	<i>J. J. Eddle</i>	✓		7/11/85
	Technical Support Superintendent	<i>H. Brown</i>	✓		7/11/85
	Assistant Plant Manager	<i>R. M. Gahan</i>	✓		7/11/85
	PORC Chairman	<i>S. A. Allen</i>	✓		7-11-85

PORC Meeting No. 65-12

Item No. 5

Date: 7/11/85

This item is recommended for approval? ☒ YES ☐ NO

This item requires SRC/NEC review prior to implementation? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, ensure documentation supporting review is attached.

This item requires QA review prior to PM-N approval? ☐ YES ☒ NO

## QA REVIEW

Reviewed by *[Signature]* DATE 7/11/85  
Corporate QA Manager

## PLANT MANAGER-NUCLEAR APPROVAL (REFER TO 5.4.12.1)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by *[Signature]* DATE 7/11/85  
Plant Manager-Nuclear

## WATERFORD 3 SES

## PLANT OPERATING MANUAL

Check Block Below

## CHANGE/REVISION/DELETION REQUEST

☒ POM ☐ PORC-S/CProcedure No. EP-3-020Title Emergency Preparedness Drills & Exercises

Effective Date \_\_\_\_\_

(if different from approval date)

Complete A, B, and C

A. Change No. \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Permanent ☐ Deviation Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_B. Revision No. 4C. Deletion ☐ YES ☒ NO

## DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE OR REVISION

Clarified responsibilities - provided more realistic interaction with Management and other departments - Brought Schedules into Agreement with regulatory Guidance - Made Evaluation Standards more usable

## REASON FOR CHANGE, REVISION, OR DELETION

To incorporate recommendations which resulted from review of the procedures against Guidance and Waterford 3 practice and use of the procedure in the development of drills and exercises

## REQUIRED SIGNATURES

ORIGINATOR J. P. ChappinDATE 6/25/85

## SAFETY REVIEW

Does this change, revision, or deletion:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Change the facility as described in the FSAR?        | YES _____ NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Change the procedures as described in the FSAR?      | YES _____ NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Conduct tests/experiments not described in the FSAR? | YES _____ NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Require a change to the Technical Specifications?    | YES _____ NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer to any of the above is yes, complete and attach a 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluation

SAFETY REVIEW J. P. ChappinDATE 6/25/85TECHNICAL REVIEW J. P. ChappinDATE 6-26-85GROUP HEAD REVIEW E. H. AppellDATE 6/26/85

TEMPORARY APPROVAL\* (SRO) \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

TEMPORARY APPROVAL\* \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

\*Temporary approval must be followed by Plant Manager/APM-N - Nuclear approval within 14 days.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 PURPOSE
- 2.0 REFERENCES
- 3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES
- 4.0 INITIATING CONDITIONS
- 5.0 PROCEDURE
  - 5.1 Drill/Exercise Scheduling Requirements
  - 5.2 Drill/Exercise Development
  - 5.3 Drill/Exercise
  - 5.4 Post Drill Activities
  - 5.5 Post Exercise Activities
  - 5.6 Records Retention
- 6.0 FINAL CONDITIONS
- 7.0 ATTACHMENTS
  - 7.1 Definitions (1 page)
  - 7.2 Drill/Exercise Scenario Objective Check Sheet (4 pages)
  - 7.3 Drill/Exercise Scenario Format
  - 7.4 W3SES Cue Card
  - 7.5 Drill Monitor/Observer Assignment Sheet
  - 7.6 Drill/Exercise Participant Attendance Report
  - 7.7 Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet
  - 7.8 Observer Evaluation Checklist
  - 7.9 Drill/Exercise Evaluation Report Sheet
  - 7.10 Milestones for Exercise Observation and Critiques

## LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

TITLE  
1-80

Revision 4  
Revision 4

1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to provide guidance for the preparation, scheduling, performance, and evaluation of emergency preparedness drills and exercises.

2.0 REFERENCES

- 2.1 Waterford 3 SES Emergency Plan
- 2.2 NUREG 0654/FEMA-REP-1
- 2.3 Waterford 3 SES Final Safety Analysis Report
- 2.4 Waterford 3 SES Emergency Medical Assistance Program (EMAP)
- 2.5 UNT-3-002, Training Records and Forms
- 2.6 EP-3-040, Emergency Equipment Inventory
- 2.7 EP-3-070, Emergency Communications Systems Routine Testing
- 2.8 NSP-451, Emergency Planning Action Item Tracking System

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1 The Emergency Planning Coordinator (EPC) is responsible for the coordination of all emergency preparedness drill and exercise activities.
- 3.2 The Plant Manager or his designee approves plant drill scenarios.
- 3.3 The Senior Vice President-Nuclear Operations or his designee approves joint exercise scenarios.
- 3.4 Individuals involved in drills/exercises as participants are responsible for the following precautions:
  - 3.4.1 Understanding Attachment 7.1, Definitions.
  - 3.4.2 Prefacing all communications and announcements that are part of the drill/exercise with the words "THIS IS A DRILL."
- 3.5 Individuals involved in the development of the drill/exercise ensure that plant safety is not compromised.

#### 4.0 INITIATING CONDITIONS

This procedure is used to develop, conduct and document emergency preparedness drills/exercises.

#### 5.0 PROCEDURE

##### 5.1 DRILL/EXERCISE SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS

- 5.1.1 A major exercise simulating at least a Site Area Emergency is conducted annually. The scenario is varied to ensure that over a 5-year period all major components of Waterford 3 emergency preparedness are exercised. At least once every six (6) years there should be one drill initiated between 6 pm and midnight and another between midnight and 6 am. This exercise is evaluated by the Federal, State and LP&L drill observers/evaluators.
- 5.1.2 Communication drills.
  - 5.1.2.1 Monthly, a communication drill involving the state and local governments within the Plume Exposure Pathway/Emergency Planning Zone (10-mile EPZ) is conducted.
  - 5.1.2.2 Quarterly, a communication drill involving the Federal and State Emergency Response Organizations within the Ingestion Exposure Pathway Emergency Planning Zone (50-mile EPZ) is conducted.
  - 5.1.2.3 Annually, a communication drill between Waterford 3 and the State and local Emergency Operations Centers (EOC's) and the Field Assessment Teams is conducted. This drill may be held in conjunction with the annual exercise.
- 5.1.3 Fire drills are conducted as described in the Waterford 3 SES Training Manual.
- 5.1.4 Plant environmental and radiological monitoring drills (on-site and off-site) are conducted annually. This drill may be held in conjunction with the annual exercise.

- 5.1.5 Health Physics drills involving response to, and analysis of, simulated elevated airborne and liquid samples, and direct radiation measurements in the environment, are conducted semi-annually. One of these drills may be held in conjunction with the annual exercise.
- 5.1.6 Analysis of inplant liquid samples and use of the post-accident sampling system are included in health physics drills annually. This drill may be held in conjunction with the annual exercise.
- 5.1.7 Medical emergency drills are performed annually in accordance with section 7.0 of the EMAP and may be held in conjunction with the annual exercise.
- 5.1.8 A drill is performed semi-annually to assess the capability of Control Room personnel to don air-supplied respiratory equipment within two minutes. This drill may be held in conjunction with other drills or the annual exercise.
- 5.1.9 Additional drills, table-tops and walk-throughs are scheduled, developed and held as directed by the EPC in order to maintain emergency preparedness at an acceptable level.

## 5.2 DRILL/EXERCISE DEVELOPMENT

### NOTE

The Drill/Exercise Package and information related to the package is considered proprietary in nature. Individuals privy to the information contained within the package, or related to the package, are the package preparer(s) and authorized reviewers.

- 5.2.1 The EPC develops the Scope and Objectives of the drill/exercise. Attachment 7.2, Drill/Exercise Objective Check Sheet, is provided to assist in the development of the Scope and Objectives.

- 5.2.2 The drill preparer prepares the drill scenario based on the Scope and Objectives developed in 5.2.1 above. Attachment 7.3, Drill/Exercise Scenario Format is provided as guidance for use in the preparation of the scenario.
- 5.2.3 The EPC reviews and approves the drill/exercise scenario. The EPC ensures that the appropriate management approvals are obtained. If the exercise is the annual exercise, the submittals for the NRC and FEMA are in accordance with Attachment 7.10, Milestones for Exercise Observation and Critiques, or, other schedules developed in coordination with NRC, FEMA and LP&L.
- 5.2.4 The EPC, prior to the drill/exercise date, selects and ensures adequate preparation of the drill team.
- 5.2.5 Prior to any scheduled drill or exercise which involves events and/or evolutions which could be witnessed by the general public, the EPC informs the LP&L Director of Public Relations of the event.
- 5.2.6 The EPC notifies affected off-site agencies prior to any drill or exercise.
- 5.2.7 Prior to each major drill/exercise the EPC or his designee performs a walkdown of all Plant Emergency Facilities.

### 5.3 DRILL/EXERCISE

- 5.3.1 The Drill Team Leader ensures that each drill team member understands his duties and responsibilities in the development and conduct of the drill/exercise.
- 5.3.2 The Drill Team Leader conducts a pre-drill/exercise briefing with the drill team.
- 5.3.3 Those Drill Monitors required to provide information for participants' use shall be issued Cue Cards containing the information. See Attachment 7.3, Drill/Exercise Scenario Format.
- 5.3.4 The Drill Team Controller commences the drill/exercise and is responsible for control of the progress of the scenario.
- 5.3.5 During the drill/exercise, the Drill Monitors and observers record their observations and comments in chronological order.

#### 5.4 POST DRILL ACTIVITIES

- 5.4.1 Upon Termination of the Drill:
  - 5.4.1.1 The Drill Team Controllers meet with drill team members and drill participants and critique the drill.
  - 5.4.1.2 During this critique, highlights of the drill are discussed.
  - 5.4.1.3 Drill Controllers and Monitors collect all Logs, Records, and Forms generated by the drill participants during the drill.
  - 5.4.1.4 The EPC ensures that the Emergency Response Facilities are restored to pre-drill conditions.
- 5.4.2 Drill Evaluation Report
  - 5.4.2.1 Drill Team Members provide completed Attachments 7.7, 7.8, and 7.9 Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet, Evaluation Checklist, and Drill/Exercise Report, respectively, to the Drill Team Leader.
  - 5.4.2.2 Drill Team Members provide the documentation collected in 5.4.1.3, above, to the Drill Team Leader.
  - 5.4.2.3 Using the Logs, Records and documents generated by the participants during the drill, the Drill Team Leader constructs the Sequence of Response of the drill.
  - 5.4.2.4 The Drill Team Leader debriefs the drill team identifying any deficiencies which should be corrected prior to the next drill. Deficiencies noted are forwarded to the EPC.
  - 5.4.2.5 The Drill Team Leader, using the documentation collected from 5.4.2.1 and 5.4.2.2, develops the drill evaluation.
  - 5.4.2.6 Discrepancies identified are placed on the Emergency Planning Action Item Tracking System in accordance with Reference 2.8.
  - 5.4.2.7 The Drill Team Leader compiles the Evaluation, Sequence of Response, Action Item System Input Forms, and Drill Attendance Records in the Drill Evaluation Report.
  - 5.4.2.8 The Drill Evaluation Report is approved by the Emergency Planning Manager and forwarded to the Plant Manager-Nuclear and Nuclear Services Manager.
    - A. Identification of all drill requirements in Section 5.1 of this procedure that were satisfied by the drill is included in the evaluation report cover letter.

3. The EPC notifies the Training Department under separate cover of any items to be included in the training program.

5.4.2.9 Table-tops and walk-throughs are documented as determined by the EPC.

#### 5.5 POST EXERCISE ACTIVITIES

5.5.1 Upon Termination of the Exercise:

5.5.1.1 The Drill Team Controllers meet with drill team members and exercise participants and critique the exercise.

5.5.1.2 During the critique, highlights of the exercise are discussed.

5.5.1.3 The Drill Controllers and monitors collect all Logs, Records, and Forms, generated by the exercise participants during the exercise.

5.5.1.4 The EPC ensures that the Emergency Response Facilities are restored to Pre-Exercise Conditions.

5.5.2 Exercise Evaluation Report

5.5.2.1 Drill team members provide completed Attachments 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, Drill Exercise Critique Sheet, Evaluation Checklist, and Drill/Exercise Report to the Drill Team Leader.

5.5.2.2 Drill Team Members provide the documentation collected in 5.5.1.3, above, to the Drill Team Leader.

5.5.2.3 The EPC meets with the members of the drill team to critique the Exercise. This Critique provides the discussion items for the Licensee/NRC Critique.

5.5.2.4 The EPC conducts the Licensee/NRC Critique.

5.5.2.5 Using the Logs, Records and documents generated by the participants during the Exercise, the Drill Team Leader constructs the Sequence of Response of the Exercise.

5.5.2.6 The Drill Team Leader debriefs the drill team as necessary to prepare the Exercise Evaluation.

5.5.2.7 The Drill Team Leader develops the Exercise Evaluation using the information collected from 5.5.2.1, 5.5.2.2, and 5.5.2.4, above.

5.5.2.8 Discrepancies identified during the development of the Exercise are placed on the Emergency Planning Action Item Tracking System in accordance with Reference 2.8.

- 5.5.2.9 The Drill Team Leader compiles the Exercise Evaluation, Sequence of Response, Action Item Input Forms and Exercise Attendance Records in the Exercise Evaluation Report.
- 5.5.2.10 The Exercise Evaluation Report is approved by the Emergency Planning Manager and forwarded to the Plant Manager - Nuclear, Nuclear Services Manager, and the Senior Vice President - Nuclear Operations.
  - A. Identification of all drill requirements in Section 5.1 of this procedure that were satisfied by the exercise is included in the evaluation report cover letter.
  - B. The EPC notifies the Training Department under separate cover of any items to be included in the training program.

#### 5.6 RECORDS RETENTION

- 5.6.1 The original Drill and Exercise Attendance Forms are forwarded with a copy of the Evaluation Report to the Training Manager.
- 5.6.2 The original of the Drill/Exercise Package, a copy of the Drill/Exercise Evaluation Report and all supporting documents are forwarded to Project Files.
  - 5.6.2.1 Copies of the Maintenance Tracking System Task Cards corresponding to the drill requirements in Section 5.1 that were satisfied by the documented activity are included in the package provided to Project Files.
- 5.6.3 The Records identified in 5.6.2 above are retained in Project Files for a period of at least 6 years.

#### 6.0 FINAL CONDITIONS

- 6.1 The Evaluation Report is forwarded to the designated management personnel including Training Department report for items to include in the Training Program, as appropriate.
- 6.2 All documents and records are completed and filed for retention in Project Files.
- 6.3 Restoration of the Emergency Response Facilities to Pre-Drill/Exercise conditions has been initiated.
- 6.4 Action Items are documented and tracked on the Emergency Planning Action Item Tracking System.

7.0 ATTACHMENTS

- 7.1 Definitions
- 7.2 Drill/Exercise Scenario Objective Check Sheet
- 7.3 Drill/Exercise Scenario Format
- 7.4 W3SES Emergency Preparedness Drill Cue Card
- 7.5 Drill Controller/Monitor/Observer Assignments
- 7.6 Drill/Exercise Participant Attendance Record
- 7.7 Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet
- 7.8 Observer Evaluation Checklist
- 7.9 Drill/Exercise Evaluation Report Sheet
- 7.10 Milestones for Exercise Observation and Critique

## DEFINITIONS

1. Drill - A supervised training instruction period conducted or simulated in a work environment for the purpose of developing and maintaining skills required to cope with abnormal or emergency plant conditions, including an evaluation of performance.
2. Exercise - A demonstration of the response to Simulated Emergency Conditions, including the demonstration of the ability to effectively evaluate the response.
3. Lead Controller - The Senior Drill Team Controller responsible for coordinating the control of the Drill/Exercise.
4. Controller - A member of the drill team assigned to Control and Evaluate the Drill/Exercise activities within a component of response through interaction with the monitors and participants.
5. Monitor - A member of the drill team responsible for the Control and Evaluation of a component of response under the direction of a Controller.
6. Observer - A member of the drill team who evaluates a component of response.
7. Drill Team Leader - The individual assigned the responsibility for the development of the Drill/Exercise Package. This person is usually the Lead Controller, also.
8. Drill Team - The cadre of personnel assigned to develop, control and evaluate the Drill/Exercise.
9. Drill Package - The document developed by the drill team which contains the administrative and control details of the scenario.
10. Exercise Package - See Drill Package.
11. Joint Drill - A Drill involving participation by both Waterford 3 and State or Local Agency Emergency Response Organizations.
12. Sequence of Response - A reconstruction of the response to the Simulated Emergency.
13. Table-Top - A supervised training instruction period which involves "talking through" responses and instructions, but no actual "activities" related to response. Evaluation of performance is usually not included.
14. Walk-Through - A supervised training instruction period which involves response activities, assistance from the drill team, but no evaluation of response.

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO OBJECTIVE CHECK SHEET

## 1. Time Frame

- a. Season (Circle one)  
winter    spring    summer    fall
- b. Period of the week (Circle one)  
weekday    weekend    holiday
- c. What shift shall the drill begin on-  
8 am - 5 pm    6 pm - midnight    midnight - 6 am
- d. Projected Drill/Exercise date      /      /
- e. Date of last similar drill/exercise      /      /
- f. Real time span of drill      hours,      days
- g. Drill/Exercise time frame      hours,      days

## 2. Maximum Level of Classification Emergency

- a. Classification during the drill/exercise (check one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Notification of Unusual Event
- \_\_\_\_\_ Alert
- \_\_\_\_\_ Site Area Emergency
- \_\_\_\_\_ General Emergency

### 3. Organization/Facility Involvement

- |    |                    |        |
|----|--------------------|--------|
| a. | On-Site            |        |
|    | Control Room Staff | yes/no |
|    | TSC                | yes/no |
|    | EOF                | yes/no |
|    | Site Security      | yes/no |
|    | Fire Brigade       | yes/no |
|    | OSC                | yes/no |
|    | B/U OSC            | yes/no |

# DRILL EXERCISE SCENARIO OBJECTIVE CHECK SHEET

B/U EOF	yes/no
PR Staff	yes/no
Off-Site Assembly Areas	yes/no

## b. Off-Site

EOC St. Charles Parish	yes/no
EOC St. John	yes/no
Sheriff's Department	yes/no
Fire Department	yes/no
EOC State Baton Rouge	yes/no
Regional NRC Office	yes/no
LOEP Office of Emerg	yes/no
Preparedness	
LNED Nuclear Emerg Division	yes/no
CCC	yes/no
GOIC	yes/no
Emergency Medical	yes/no
Ambulance	yes/no

## 4. Communication

- a. Do you desire to exercise the emergency backup phone system?  
yes/no
- b. Do you desire to use the emergency paging system? yes/no
- c. Should a news bulletin be prepared? yes/no
- d. Do you desire to activate the LP&L Public Information Center?  
yes/no
- e. Do you desire to exercise the Public Notification System?  
yes/no
- f. Is a medical problem to be involved? yes/no
  - If yes, 1) On-site response? yes/no
  - 2) Off-site response? yes/no

DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO OBJECTIVE CHECK SHEET

3) Victim(s) injury(ies) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4) Is the victim contaminated? yes/no

g. If yes is answered for f.2 above, describe involvement of  
off-site organization. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

h. Will the exercise involve a fire? yes/no

a) On-site response? yes/no

b) Off-site response? yes/no

c) Describe involvement of responder. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

i. Will the Security Force response be tested? yes/no

a) Sabotage/Bomb? yes/no

b) Intruder? yes/no

c) Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Radiological Release

a. Meteorological capabilities

1. Should real-time meteorology be used? yes/no

2. Should simulated meteorology be used? yes/no

3. Should weather forecasting capability be required? yes/no

DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO OBJECTIVE CHECK SHEET

b. Dose Assessment

1. Will dose projection be backed up by field monitoring?  
yes/no
2. Will long-term dose projections be calculated?  
yes/no
3. Source of radioactive release \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. Postaccident Sampling

1. Should postaccident sampling capabilities be exercised?  
yes/no
2. If yes, to what extent? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO FORMAT

1. The following format shall be used by the Drill Preparer to ensure a standardization of the drill and exercise packages.
2. The first page of the drill/exercise package shall be a Title Page with the following information centered on it.

W3SES

Emergency Preparedness

Drill/Exercise

(Title)

(Date)

3. Page number two (2) of the package shall be a "Table of Contents" similar in design to the following outline.

### Sections:

- I Introduction
- II Objectives
- III Guidelines
  - A. General
  - B. Safety Precautions
- IV Narrative Summary
- V Sequence of Events
  - A. Initial Conditions
    - 1. Plant Status
    - 2. Meteorological Conditions
  - B. Scenario Timetable
- VI Cue Cards
  - Part I Participant Message
  - Part II Monitor Guide

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO FORMAT

### VII Charts, Graphs and Tables

- A. Plant Data
- B. HP Plant Data
- C. Chemistry Data
- D. Meteorological Data
- E. Offsite Field Data
- F. Onsite Data

### VIII Controller/Monitor/Observer Instructions

#### IX Controller/Monitor/Observer Assignments

#### X References

- 4. Introduction - This section should contain a brief narrative description of goals that the drill or exercise is designed to accomplish.
- 5. Objectives - This section clearly states, in detail, the objectives that the drill/exercise package was designed to evaluate.
- 6. Guidelines - Includes those items that provide guidance to the participants, Drill Monitors and observers throughout the performance of the drill. This section is broken down into several subsections.
  - a. General Guidelines - Those general guidelines that are to be followed by all participants throughout the drill or exercise period.
  - b. Safety Precautions - General and detailed precautions necessary to prevent jeopardizing plant and personnel safety.

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO FORMAT

7. Narrative Summary - A brief narrative description of the drill/exercise sequence of events.
8. Sequence of Events - An outline of the sequence of drill events.
  - a. Initial Conditions - Those parameters and plant conditions necessary to be established to set the stage to commence the drill or exercise.
  - b. Meteorological Conditions - Those meteorological parameters necessary to establish the initial conditions for the drill or exercise radiation release.
  - c. Detailed Scenario Timetable - A three-column format that provides a sequence of events that includes a drill time, event summary and the cue card number used to initiate the drill or exercise event. Some indication of the anticipated response of the drill/exercise players may be included in this section.
9. Cue Cards - A two-page document used to transmit parameters and plant conditions to the participants of the drill/exercise.
  - a. The information on page 1 is given to the participant. The time block is the drill time or condition under which the cue card should be issued. The message contains, in chronological sequence, the events, changes in parameters, indications or actions that the participant will observe, hear, smell, feel or experience and then respond to.
  - b. Page 2 is retained by the Drill Controller/Monitor to provide him/her with guidance control or to evaluate the participant's response to page 1 of cue cards. Page 2 of the cue card has three subsections:
    - 1) Anticipated Response - is an outline of the order of actions that is expected to be observed as the participant responds to the cue card message. This section includes reference to procedures that are to be used and the expected interpretation of the message parameters.
    - 2) Comments - This section is a blank section to allow the Drill Monitor to make comments while referring to the Anticipated Response section. These comments should be transferred to the Drill Critique Sheet at a later time.

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO FORMAT

- 3) Instruction - Special instruction that the monitor should be aware of during the response to the cue card message.
10. Charts, Graphs and Tables - This section includes all supportive charts, graphs and tables referenced by the cue cards or by the Drill/Exercise Package.
11. Controller/Monitor/Observer Instructions - Those information items that the drill team members need to be aware of in order to perform their functions.
  - a) Evaluation Standards
    - 1) Satisfactory - Personnel and Equipment performed according to expectations. The area was able to carry out its functions.
    - 2) Unsatisfactory - Personnel and Equipment generally performed below expectations. The area's ability to carry out its function was diminished.
    - 3) Not Applicable/Not Observed - Not a part of the drill or exercise.
  - b. Categories for Evaluation - See Attachment 7.8.
  - c. Drill Team Documentation - Drill controllers/monitors/observers use three (3) documents to generate their evaluation of the participants and equipment performance observed:
    - a. Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet (Attachment 7.7)
    - b. Observer Checklist (Attachment 7.8)
    - c. Drill/Exercise Evaluation Sheet (Attachment 7.9)The Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet is a narrative summary of significant observed events. The Observer Checklist is an outline of expected key events that should be performed by each segment of the emergency organization. The key events are coupled with an evaluation scale. The Drill Controller/Monitor/Observer, on completion of the evaluation, shall complete the Drill/Exercise Evaluation Sheet based on his/her comments made in the Drill/Exercise Critique Sheet and evaluation made in the Observer Checklist.

## DRILL/EXERCISE SCENARIO FORMAT

---

### NOTE

The Observer Checklist is not weighted, nor are items equal in value; therefore, a quantitative evaluation of this document is not considered reasonable. An "Unsatisfactory" in one area can significantly impact the overall rating of that section.

---

12. Controller/Monitor/Observer Assignments - This section lists the positions which require Drill Controllers/Monitors and/or Drill Observers. The Drill Team Leader ensures that each position is filled with an individual that is qualified to evaluate and safely monitor the assigned responsibility.
13. References - All referenced documents and procedures, including Action Item Tracking System Drill Items, used to prepare and/or support the design and uses of the Drill/Exercise Package.

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO.

CUE CARD NO. \_\_\_\_\_

TO:

TIME:

FROM:

\*\*\*\*\*

THIS IS A DRILL

DO NOT initiate actions affecting normal plant operations.

\*\*\*\*\*

INFORMATION:

\*\*\*\*\*

THIS IS A DRILL

\*\*\*\*\*

W3 SES EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DRILL CUE CARD

DRILL TYPE/NO.

CUE CARD NO. \_\_\_\_\_

TO:

TIME:

FROM:

ANTICIPATED RESPONSE

COMMENTS:

INSTRUCTIONS:

# DRILL CONTROLLER/MONITOR/OBSERVER ASSIGNMENTS

Drill/Exercise Title \_\_\_\_\_ Page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_ :

	Controller/Monitor/Observer Name	Area of Responsibility
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____
13.	_____	_____
14.	_____	_____
15.	_____	_____
16.	_____	_____
17.	_____	_____
18.	_____	_____
19.	_____	_____
20.	_____	_____
21.	_____	_____
22.	_____	_____
23.	_____	_____
24.	_____	_____
25.	_____	_____
26.	_____	_____
26.	_____	_____
27.	_____	_____
28.	_____	_____
29.	_____	_____
30.	_____	_____

ATTENDANCE RECORD

COURSE TITLE		COURSE NUMBER	
INSTRUCTOR		START DATE	END DATE
NAME		SSAN	DEPARTMENT
LAST	FIRST MI.	SIGNATURE	COMPANY
		GRADE	
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			

## DRILL/EXERCISE CRITIQUE SHEET

Drill Observer Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date    /    /   

Drill/Exercise Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned area to monitor \_\_\_\_\_

1. Drill controllers, monitors and observers use this sheet to record important events and comments during the drill.
2. The notes on this sheet should be used when completing the Observer Evaluation Checklist (Attachment 7.8).

Time	Event	Comment	Page ____ of ____
------	-------	---------	-------------------

This image shows a full page of white paper with horizontal black ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page, typical of notebook or legal stationery. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or printed text on the page.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: CONTROL ROOM DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating Column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\*If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE</u>		
Control Room (CR) personnel rapidly and correctly interpreted the problem.		
CR personnel knew when to refer to the Emergency Operating procedures, Emergency Plan and which Emergency Implementing procedures to use.		
Plant process information was available when required.		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
CR personnel obtained timely meteorological data.		
CR personnel got timely release information from radiological and effluent monitor systems.		
CR personnel responded quickly to personal injury incident.		
CR personnel responded properly to simulated operational events.		
HP assistance was requested as needed.		
Event classifications were timely accurate and clear.		
The SS took action to determine what other conditions might exist which would verify the accuracy of the initial indication.		
CR personnel took appropriate actions to mitigate the effects of the accident.		
Technical advice was requested and/or received from the proper people.		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
The emergency was upgraded or downgraded when appropriate.		
The SS made the correct response to implement on-site and off-site assessment and protective measures.		
II. <u>COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION</u>		
Notifications were timely and properly completed.		
Communications flow was adequate to ensure that information was timely, effective, and efficient.		
Phone listings were available, complete and up-to-date.		
General status announcements were made and updated periodically throughout the drill.		
Proper data flow was maintained between TSC and CR.		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Logs were maintained.

The ambient noise level in the CR was not a problem

Transfer of information within the CR was clearly and completely understood.

### III. PROCEDURES

Emergency Operating Procedures and Emergency Plan Implementing Procedures were clearly marked and readily available in the CR.

Procedures used were current and controlled.

### IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL

The SS promptly assumed control and authority.

Action was taken to initiate activation of the Emergency Response Centers when plant conditions and procedures indicated they should be activated.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
The proper management chain of command in the CR was followed when making decisions		
Emergency control and authority was properly transferred to the designated Emergency Coordinator.		
The transfer of control and authority was announced and logged.		
V. <u>MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
Plant Monitoring system functioned correctly.		
Radiation Monitoring System functioned correctly.		
CEPADAS functioned correctly		
Met. Data available independent of CEPADAS.		
Public Address System functioned correctly.		
Paging/Callout System functioned correctly.		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Message recorders functioned correctly.		
PABX and dedicated hotlines functioned correctly.		
Station Alarm/Fire Alarm Systems functioned correctly.		
Radios functioned correctly		
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
Personnel in the CR were adequately protected from radiological and chemical hazards.		
Supplies such as respirators, protective clothing and KI for CR personnel were available.		
HP personnel were available as needed.		
VII. <u>ACCESS CONTROL</u>		
Access to CR was limited to personnel operating the plant, or participating in the drill/exercise.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: DOSE ASSESSMENT - CR      DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS:      Indicate the rating for each criteria in the  
rating Column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

The need to perform dose  
measurements was promptly  
identified.

The correct procedures were  
used for making dose calculations

The individual(s) assigned to  
perform dose calculations were  
familiar with the procedures.

Dose calculations were performed  
efficiently and accurately.

Some means were available to  
verify that the dose calculations  
were correct.

## OBSERVER CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: TECHNICAL SUPPORT CENTER DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

The TSC was manned in a timely manner at the Alert Action Level.

Command and control authority was transferred from the Control Room (CR) according to procedure.

The transfer of command and control was formal, was announced, and was logged.

Follow-up activities to manage injured persons.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Follow-up activities to manage fire.		
Field monitoring teams dispatched if appropriate.		
II. <u>COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION</u>		
Plant status and/or radiation parameters needed to determine the existing conditions were available in the TSC including portable radiological monitoring, chemistry and meteorological data.		
Communications with State, parish, and NRC officials were quickly established.		
Initial (if appropriate) and Follow-up Notifications were made in timely (usually 15 min) fashion.		
Major changes in plant or radiation release status was made known to all parties quickly.		
Off-site protective action recommendations were made quickly and clearly.		

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
All responsible persons in the the TSC kept abreast of current conditions.		
Communications between TSC and CR, EOF, OSC and CCC were established and used.		
Communications with field monitoring teams were adequate.		
Discussions were held concerning trends, prognosis, courses of action.		
III. <u>PROCEDURES</u>		
Current and controlled copies of the Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were available.		
Personnel using procedures were trained and familiar with them.		
Communications with off-site groups were made in accordance with procedures.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL</u>		
Transfer of command from the CR was clear and understood by all persons in TSC.		
Transfer of command from TSC to EOF was clear and understood by all persons in TSC.		
Appropriate TSC personnel made prompt recommendations.		
Logs were kept.		
Recommendations were passed on to Emergency Coordinator for decisions.		
Proper classification upgrading and downgrading was done.		
<u>V. MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
SPDS was operational.		
CEPADAS was operational.		
Blueprints as-built drawings maps, etc. were available.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
PABX, sound-powered phones and dedicated hotlines functioned correctly.		
Public Address System functioned correctly.		
Radios functioned correctly.		
Fascimile machine functioned correctly.		
Status boards in place and used.		
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
HP coverage available in TSC (air sampling, dose rate instruments).		
Protective equipment and supplies for TSC personnel.		
Plant evacuation decisions logical and clear.		
Plant evacuation directives included travel routes, special precautions, etc.		
Continuing accountability information given to Security.		

OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

In-plant radiological monitoring  
reported to TSC.

VII. ACCESS CONTROL

Only those people with assigned  
responsibilities were in TSC.

Sign-in system was employed

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DOSE ASSESSMENT - TSC DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Initial and subsequent dose  
dose calculations were  
performed in a timely manner.

Computerized equipment was  
properly utilized. (CEPADAS)

Plume was defined and tracked

Teams were contacted, briefed, and  
dispatched expeditiously (through  
OSC).

Communications were maintained  
with all teams.

Personnel were efficiently  
utilized.

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Health Physics Coordinator initiated and provided periodic updates to the Emergency Coordinator.		
Status was maintained on team exposure levels.		
Comparisons were made between projected and actual field measurements.		
Off-site monitoring teams were provided with adequate information to perform their duties.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: EMERG OPERATIONS FACILITY DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows.

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\*If not observed, so note in Comment column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

EOF Director maintained open communication link with TSC while enroute.

EOF was activated within two hours after request by Emergency Coordinator.

EOF Director received complete briefing from Emergency Coordinator prior to assuming command and control.

EOF personnel informed of assumption of specific responsibilities.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Sign-in system used to assume full staffing.		
II. <u>COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION</u> <u>OF INFORMATION</u>		
Communications were quickly established with TSC, EOF, CCC and off-site groups.		
All parties notified of assumption of command and control by EOF.		
Needed data was available from TSC and CR.		
EOF received prompt information on radiological status, both on- and off-site.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Pertinent information quickly (15 minutes) transmitted to off-site groups.		
Up-to-date meteorological data was available.		
Plant status information was promptly available.		
Communications with off-site monitoring teams were adequate.		
General status announcements and updates were made to EOF personnel throughout exercise.		
EOF coordinated the supply of information to news media, or to Corporate Command Center.		
Status boards used and kept current.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>III. PROCEDURES</u>		
Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were available in current and controlled copies.		
EOF participants were familiar with procedures.		
Correct procedures were used		
<u>IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL</u>		
The organizational structure and chain of command in EOF was clear.		
Appropriate people made prompt decisions and recommendations.		
EOF Director took necessary follow-up actions to care for injured personnel, if any.		
Status boards kept current.		
Plume pathway tracked and visible		
Emergency classifications and action level notifications transmitted to proper authorities as required.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Protective action recommendations were made clearly and timely.		
Continuous accountability performed.		
V. <u>MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
SPDS was available.		
CEPADAS was available.		
PABX, sound-powered phones, and dedicated hotlines available and working.		
Facsimile machine functioned.		
Status boards available.		
Reference materials, procedures, prints, etc., available.		
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
Radiological monitoring performed at EOF.		
Protective supplies available.		
Personal dosimetry available and used.		

OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Security control established.

VII. ACCESS CONTROL

Only assigned EOF people were present.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: DOSE ASSESSMENT - EOF DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Initial and subsequent dose calculations were performed in a timely manner.

Computerized equipment was properly utilized.

Plume was defined and tracked

Teams were contacted, briefed, and dispatched expeditiously.

Communications were maintained with all teams.

Personnel were efficiently utilized.

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<p>Radiological Assessment</p> <p>Coordinator initiated and provided periodic updates to the EOF Director.</p> <p>Status was maintained on team exposure levels.</p> <p>Off-site monitoring data were coordinated with State.</p> <p>Comparisons were made between projected and actual field measurements.</p> <p>Dose assessment off-site teams were provided with adequate information to perform their duties.</p>		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: OPERATIONAL SUPPORT CENTER DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

The OSC was activated in a timely manner.

All support personnel listed in the Emergency Plan were available in the OSC.

The personnel stationed in the OSC understood their emergency response functions.

There were enough specialists available to fill all demands for HP, Fire Brigades, Search and Rescue teams, Repair teams, and Field Monitoring teams.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>II. COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION</u> <u>OF INFORMATION</u>		
Communications with the CR and TSC were adequate.		
Communications with -4 control point were adequate.		
Communications with +7 Health Physics area were adequate.		
Communications with specialty teams were adequate.		
There was adequate information flow from the TSC concerning plant conditions and hazardous areas.		
There was adequate information flow from the OSC to specialty teams.		
<u>III. PROCEDURES</u>		
The Emergency Plan and implementing Procedures were available and current and controlled copies.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Appropriate procedures were available, as needed, for the specialty teams.		
IV. <u>DIRECTION AND CONTROL</u>		
The OSC was supervised (coordinated) adequately.		
A chain of command was established.		
Team formation and briefing were done quickly and accurately.		
Information for continuing accountability was supplied to Security.		
V. <u>MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
The office and communications equipment necessary to activate the OSC were available.		
All necessary vehicles were immediately available.		
Specialized tools were obtainable		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

## VI. PROTECTIVE MEASURES

Protective equipment, clothing and decontamination facilities were available.

The OSC was monitored for radiation.

## VII. ACCESS CONTROL

Only OSC assigned personnel were in the prescribed areas.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: FIRST AID TEAM DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
First Aid Team assembly was timely following notification.		
First Aid Team assembled with the proper first aid equipment.		
Accident/Injury assessment made by the First Aid Team.		
First Aid assistance was rendered in a timely manner.		
Appropriate decontamination measures were taken.		
Maintained communications linkage with Control Room.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
The HP escort reacted properly to the simulated event.		
The request for and notification of ambulance was in accordance to procedures.		
Patient was made ready for transport by the First Aid Team		
Dosimeter was left with the patient.		
Adequate HP coverage was provided at the hospital.		
Patient's radiation doses are monitored by HP personnel.		
HP performed radiation survey of ambulance at hospital before vehicle was released.		
Consideration/measures were taken to prevent spread of contamination.		
Periodic status reports are provided to the Shift Supervisor as to the injured individual's status.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: FIRE TEAM

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Reaction time between fire alarm and fire team activation is timely		
Fire fighting personnel response time to the scene of the fire was timely.		
Fire team members report to scene of fire with appropriate fire fighting gear and equipment.		
Initial assessment of fire situation is adequately performed.		
Standard fire fighting procedures were followed.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
When it is apparent W3 team cannot control the fire, off-site support is requested and obtained in a timely manner.		
Communications were maintained between the fire team leader and the OSC.		
Adequate information is provided by the fire team to the OSC for their assessment.		
Smooth transition and coordination is made between plant fire team and local fire department.		
Arrival of local fire department to fire scene is timely.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: SEARCH AND RESCUE TEAM

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory  
U - Unsatisfactory  
O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

OSC Supervisor selected three or more volunteers to serve as team.

If radiological hazards are involved, one team member is a HP Technician.

Team members briefed in accordance with procedure EP-2-130.

At least one team member has required formal access permit to area being entered.

Radio check performed.

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Safety equipment and first aid assistance available as requested.		
Communications maintained with OSC during search and rescue.		
Log of activities kept.		
Debriefing conducted, records and logs collected.		
Personal dosimetry used, if needed.		
TSC informed of results of search and rescue.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: OFFSITE MONITORING TEAMS DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Initial team briefings were held

Team assembled with field kits, vehicles and communications equipment in a timely manner.

Field Monitoring Kits were checked for contents before leaving site.

Instruments checked for proper operability and current calibration.

Teams received explicit instructions of where to go and what to sample.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Procedures for conducting off-site monitoring were consulted and followed.		
Vehicles were readily available		
Vehicles checked for contamination after mission completed.		
Sampling locations were readily located.		
Samples were properly packaged, identified and labeled.		
Pocket dosimeters were periodically checked.		
Pocket dosimeter readings were logged in upon return to W3.		
Communications were maintained with the TSC and/or EOF throughout sampling activity.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: CORPORATE COMMAND CENTER DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

The Corporate Command Center (CCC) was fully staffed in a timely fashion.

The Emergency Director was clearly in command.

Information was received quickly from EOF.

II. COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Statements prepared by EOF Off-Site Technical Advisor reviewed by Emergency News Director.

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Emergency News Director coordinated news releases in a timely manner with Louisiana Nuclear Energy Division, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and local officials.		
Spokespersons were clearly identified.		
Emergency News Director acted as moderator at all briefings.		
Rumor control methods were used.		
III. <u>PROCEDURES</u>		
Controlled and current copies of the Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were available.		
IV. <u>DIRECTION AND CONTROL</u>		
Emergency Director was clearly in control of the CCC.		
Major decisions were made by Emergency Director in consultation with his staff.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
News releases were reviewed and issued smoothly and quickly.		
Off-site power transmission and distribution restoration was handled smoothly and quickly.		
Security assistance was provided to the plant Security Superintendent as requested.		
Liason with off-site law enforcement was provided, as appropriate.		
Spokespersons were knowledgeable about technical aspects of plant problems.		
V. <u>MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
Space for staff was adequate.		
Space for news media representatives was adequate.		
Adequate telephones to handle traffic were available.		
Fascimile machine operable.		
Enough vehicles available		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u> (Not Applicable)		
VII. <u>ACCESS CONTROL</u> Only persons with assigned emergency responsibilities were present. (News media representatives excepted.)		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: HEALTH PHYSICS

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Adequate trained personnel were available to furnish HP coverage to the -4 Control Point, First Aid Teams, Chemistry, Search and Rescue Teams, Fire Teams, Repair Teams, EOF, OSC and evacuees.		
On-site monitoring equipment was easily accessible and properly distributed.		
Equipment was checked for proper operability prior to its use.		
Standard HP practices were employed for entry into actual or potential radiation areas.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Proper survey records, dosimetry, stay times, etc. were maintained during entry.		
Survey results were reported to the appropriate personnel.		
Follow-up actions were taken on survey reports.		
Pocket dosimeters were frequently checked and properly logged.		
The TSC and EOF's habitability were frequently monitored.		
Team members had adequate understanding of proper utilization of equipment (survey instruments, radios, SCBA's, etc.)		
The Radiological Controls Coordinator received adequate information from the OSC to perform his function		
Survey results were systematically collected by the Radiological Controls Coordinator.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

The correct procedure was used  
to establish emergency dose  
limits, if needed.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: EMERGENCY CHEMISTRY DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE</u>		
The Chemistry Engineer reported promptly to the Technical Assessment area of the TSC.		
The Chemistry Supervisor reported promptly to the RAB Laboratory.		
An adequate number of technicians were available or were called in.		
Analytical results were available within the specified times.		

OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

II. COMMUNICATIONS/DISSEMINATION  
OF INFORMATION

Communications with the Control Room (CR) and/or TSC were adequate.

Directions given to technicians were clear.

Plant status information was available and followed:  
CE-3-900, CE-3-901, CE-3-902  
CE-3-903, CE-3-904, EP-2-091 and EP-2-031.

IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL

Samples were collected and analyzed as requested by CR or TSC.

Chemistry Supervisor (or alternate) was clearly in command.

Analytical results were verified

Logs of actions were kept.

OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
<u>V. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
Analytical equipment functioned properly.		
Sample points were accessible and open (valves correctly aligned by CR and/or technicians).		
<u>VI. PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
Health Physics coverage was requested as needed.		
Protective equipment was available to lab personnel.		
<u>VII. ACCESS CONTROL</u>		
Only personnel with emergency responsibilities were present during exercise.		
Access to PASS, etc., was made according to procedure.		

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: EVACUATION/ASSEMBLY AREA DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

Announcement to evacuate is clearly understandable and is heard by all personnel.

Announcement was preceded by station alarm.

Evacuees quickly assembled in correct area.

Person in charge was clearly identifiable.

II. COMMUNICATION/DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Adequate instructions were given to evacuees by Emergency Coordinator.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

### CRITERIA

### RATING

### COMMENTS

Assembly Area Supervisor established and maintained communication with OSC.

Assembly Area Supervisor notified OSC when all persons were accounted for at off-site assembly area.

### III. PROCEDURES

Evacuees passed through proper control points.

Personnel badges and TLD's were left at the primary access point.

Muster sheets were completed as requested.

### IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL

The Assembly Area Supervisor was easily identified and clearly in charge.

Evacuation was performed in smooth and controlled manner.

Accountability (muster sheets) were used correctly at off-site assembly area.

OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Evacuees followed directions given over PA System and given by Assembly Area Supervisor.		
V. <u>MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
Assembly Area Supervisor was equipped with voice amplifier.		
Adequate vehicles were available		
Adequate radiation instrumentation and decontamination equipment was available.		
Radios functioned correctly.		
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
Portal monitors were effectively used to monitor evacuees.		
First aid equipment was available or obtainable.		
Decontamination equipment was available or obtainable.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

Health Physics coverage was available at off-site assembly area.

## VII. ACCESS CONTROL

Off-site assembly area was fully accessible.

There were no major problems in moving evacuees through control points or the Principal Access Point.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

WATERFORD 3 SES

OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION/GROUP OBSERVED: ACCOUNTABILITY/SECURITY DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: Indicate the rating for each criteria in the rating column. The rating scale is defined as follows:

S - Satisfactory

U - Unsatisfactory

O - Not Observed/Not Applicable

\* If not observed, so note in Comments column.

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
----------	--------	----------

I. ACTIVATION AND RESPONSE

Security personnel were in place quickly following evacuation announcement.

Means were established for performing rapid initial accountability for persons leaving protected areas.

Means were established for quickly establishing location of personnel remaining in protected area and performing evacuation verification outside the protected area.

II. COMMUNICATION/DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Initial notifications to Security Supervisor were clear and complete.

## OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Communications internal to the Security organization were adequate.		
Status reports from Security Supervisor to the Emergency Director were timely and complete.		
Continuing accountability reports were quickly furnished to Security by CR, TSC, and OSC.		
<u>III. PROCEDURES</u>		
Appropriate Security procedures were readily available.		
Controlled and current copies of the Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were readily available.		
Appropriate procedures were used during exercise.		
<u>IV. DIRECTION AND CONTROL</u>		
Accountability of all personnel was achieved within 30 minutes.		

# OBSERVER EVALUATION CHECKLIST

CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
Accountability of people entering or leaving assembly areas was accomplished.		
Security personnel were trained and familiar with their responsibilities.		
Security personnel requested or required by procedure were promptly dispatched.		
V. <u>MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT</u>		
Security computer in place and operable.		
Communications equipment properly functional.		
VI. <u>PROTECTIVE MEASURES</u>		
Health Physics coverage available as requested.		
Security personnel kept advised of plant status.		
VII. <u>ACCESS CONTROL</u>		
Facility access controlled during exercise.		
Special access controls, if any, put in place as requested.		

## DRILL/EXERCISE EVALUATION REPORT SHEET

Drill Observer Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Drill/Exercise Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Assigned Area to Monitor: \_\_\_\_\_

### Categories

Rating\*

1. Activation and Response
2. Communications/Dissemination of Information
3. Procedures
4. Direction and Control
5. Material and Equipment
6. Protective Measures
7. Access Control

### Report

1

\* S = Satisfactory, U = Unsatisfactory, N/A = Not Applicable,  
N/O = Not Observed

## MILESTONES FOR EXERCISE OBSERVATION AND CRITIQUES

<u>NR - DAYS</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
- 75 days	State and licensee jointly submit exercise objectives to FEMA and NRC Regional Offices.
- 60 days	FEMA and NRC Regional Offices discuss and meet with licensee/state as necessary and prepare response.
- 45 days	State and license scenario developers submit exercise scenario to FEMA and NRC Regions for review.
- 35 days	FEMA and NRC Regions notify State and licensee of scenario acceptability.
- 30 days	FEMA and NRC Regions develop specific postexercise critique schedule with the State and advise FEMA and NRC Headquarters.
- 15 days	RAC Chairman and NRC Region will meet to develop observer action plan (where stationed, how many from each organization, what to look for).
- 1 day	Meeting, in the exercise area, of all Federal observers both on-site and off-site to finalize assignments, give instructions.
E day	Exercise
E day	RAC observers caucus to collate observations. NRC observers also caucus to collate observations.
E day	RAC Chairman and NRC Region meet as soon after their respective caucuses as practical to coordinate Federal participation in critique.
E to + 1 day	Joint RAC/NRC critique General Agenda A. State, locals and licensee present their views.

## MILESTONES FOR EXERCISE OBSERVATION AND CRITIQUES

### NR - DAYS

### DESCRIPTION

- B. Critique of off-site actions, by RAC Chairman
- C. Critique of on-site action, by NRC
- D. Critique of Federal response (if applicable) by RAC Chairman
- E. Opportunity for clarification questions or comments by licensee, State and locals (press and public questions will not be entertained during the critique).

+ 15 days

Written critiques by FEMA Region to State with copies to FEMA Headquarters and NRC, and by NRC Region to licensee with copies to NRC Headquarters and FEMA.