



1.0 Executive Summary

A sitewide tabletop drill, 01-TT-01, was conducted on January 16, 2001. The purpose of the drill was to validate the Emergency Management Organization's (EMO) ability to implement the graded approach for responding to an Operational Emergency involving two concurrent events: a hazardous material spill and security incident. The drill was designed to provide a cognitive learning environment in a workshop-type format for those personnel who serve as Alternates in EMO response positions. Personnel were invited to fill 56 different EMO positions. Of those invited, 53 were in attendance. There were 9 Observers representing various organizations including Kaiser-Hill senior management, DOE – Rocky Flats Field Office, DOE – Chicago Operations Office, North Region Incident Management Group, and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE).

Based on the feedback from Kaiser-Hill senior management, responders, and observers, the drill format resulted in a very positive learning experience for the attendees. In addition, the graded approach for responding to operational emergencies was proven to be an effective component of the overall emergency response process at RFETS.

2.0 Introduction

The drill was designed primarily to provide training to the Crisis Support Staff (CSS) in responding to an operational emergency at the Alert level. The technical basis for the initiating event was derived from the Building 891 Emergency Preparedness Hazards Assessment, Scenario 5 – Spill of 400 Gallons of Hydrogen Peroxide. The drill was divided into two sessions. Training activities in the Morning Session included validating the processes for reviewing/validating the Operational Emergency classification, completing consequence assessment activities, making onsite and offsite notifications within the required timeframes, establishing and maintaining communications between facility personnel and the Emergency Operations Center, and disseminating accurate and timely information to the Site populous, the offsite public, and the media. A security incident was introduced just prior to the end of the Morning Session, which involved a credible bomb threat inside Portal 2. The technical basis for the security event was based on the Scenario 3 of the Sitewide Emergency Action Levels for Security and Safeguards. The security incident provided an opportunity to initiate dialogue with Protective Force (Pro Force) personnel related to their response capabilities following the reconfiguration of the Protected Area and associated Pro Force personnel reductions.

The tabletop reconvened in the afternoon beginning with a turnover briefing from the Emergency Director to the CMT. The Afternoon Session focused on validating the integration of the response efforts between the various EMO functional areas. Each functional area was tasked with determining their



priorities and appropriate response actions. This included identifying the necessary resources, identifying the major groups needed to communicate/coordinate with to achieve priorities, and identifying potential stumbling blocks and potential solutions to achieving priorities in the most efficient manner.

3.0 Performance Objectives and Criteria

Terminal Objective:

Given an Operational Emergency, demonstrate the Emergency Management Organization's ability to implement the graded approach to staffing the Emergency Operations Center and respond to two concurrent events of different classifications.

Enabling Objectives:

1. Demonstrate the Site's ability to activate and operate the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) at the Alert level with the CSS Only reporting.
2. Demonstrate the CSS's ability to recognize and prioritize emergency conditions and take the appropriate response actions.
3. Demonstrate the CSS's ability to conduct a briefing and accurately communicate the status of response activities to the Crisis Management Team (CMT).
4. Demonstrate the Incident Command Organization's (ICO) ability to recognize and prioritize the response actions for two separate events.
5. Demonstrate the CSS's ability to track the status of response activities for two separate events.
6. Demonstrate the Public Information Team's ability to accurately communicate the facts to the workers and the public as they pertain to two separate events.
7. Demonstrate the ability of the Protective Force to prioritize emergency conditions and effectively maintain physical control of all locations relevant to the events, including access to and from the event scene.
8. Demonstrate the CMT's ability to identify and verbalize the criteria for selecting a Recovery Manager for each event.

4.0 Functional Areas

The following organizations participated in the tabletop drill:

- Incident Command Organization
 - Building 891 Operations Manager
 - Building 371/374 Emergency Preparedness Coordinator
 - Shift Superintendent
 - ICO Communicator
 - Battalion Chief



- LIMA-1
- Industrial Hygiene/Safety and Health Representative
- Crisis Support Staff
- Hazards Assessment Center, including the Dose Assessment Cell
- Crisis Management Team, including DOE/RFFO and CDPHE Representatives
- Public Information Team
- Joint Information Center (RFETS contingent)
- Tactical Operations Center

5.0 Drill Results

5.1 Observations

One of the key questions on the Customer Feedback Survey form was “*Did this course make an improvement in your work performance?*” The possible responses to choose from were as follows:

- No improvement. Not worth training time. **(0 responses)**
- Slight improvement. Not worth training time. **(1 response)**
- Some improvement. Not sure training was worth time away from job. **(3 responses)**
- Improvement. Time in training was worth time away from job. **(29 responses)**
- Significant improvement. Training was well worth time away from job. **(3 responses)**

The actual responses received from participants are noted in parentheses. Four survey forms were returned without any feedback in this area. A numeric summary of all of the responses provided by participants is included in Section 6.0 – Appendices/Attachments. The numeric rankings are defined as follows:

- 1 = Needs Major Improvement
- 2 = Needs Some Improvement
- 3 = Needs No Improvement
- 4 = Was Handled Well
- 5 = Was Handled Very Well

In addition, the following written comments were recorded by participants on the survey forms:

“We have had a couple of scenarios (today’s included) in which Site communications was, or could possible be crippled. Yet no real good solutions have been developed. As a Site, I feel we need more dialogue on how we will deal with these types of situations – what do we have currently that will do in a pinch and what do we really need that we don’t currently have.”



“Much better format than auditorium event.”

“Need to look at EAL’s/pre-planned response for bomb, particularly truck or car bomb threat.”

“Tabletop exercise method is a very good approach to teach all aspects of our emergency response organization.”

“I thought the tabletop was very good. Gave us a practical exercise and had team interaction from one group to another. Very good!”

“This type of exercise allowed open discussion and provided how other support teams serve the CMT.”

“I liked this format a lot better than in the auditorium. It was interesting to see the difference between the groups. Interaction was good.”

“Good interaction between groups.”

“JIC need info ASAP and sooner to respond to media and telephones.”

“This type of exercise made it difficult to communicate to my support groups FWC and IC.”

“Overall general approach of having all parts of process together and hearing what they do was very helpful. However, instruction about the situation vs. training was unclear.”

“Good experience.”

“Excellent format. Don’t have personal experience with other formats – but this was handled well.”

“Current maps not consistent with drill.”

“EOC Spokesperson book is out of date in the EOC.”

“How will security deal with JIC emergency responders leaving the Site?”

“When the DOE Spokesperson reports at Alert needs to be clarified. B115? B060?”

“Is the risk of keeping personnel on site for security reasons worth the risk?”

“Because this was intended to be a training exercise, a clear overview of the Site Emergency Management Organization would have been appropriate. How are the parts supposed to function? CSS vs HAC, etc.”



Participants were also given the opportunity to rank the following topics in order of importance as they experience them in their work environment:

- Procedural Compliance
- Schedule
- Safety
- Work you perform

Twenty-eight (28) participants responded to the question. Twenty-one (21) of those responding identified “safety” as the most important. A compilation of all responses is provided in Section 6, Customer Survey Feedback – Numeric Results.

5.2 Improvement Items

Two improvement items were noted by the Excalibur Drill and Exercise Team.

Identify the pre-determined planning assumptions in the drill design package in order to better communicate initial conditions during delivery of scenario information. For example, “assume” reconfiguration of the Protected Area, “assume” the vehicle is a laundry truck.

The Site Emergency Plan will be revised to reflect the Radiological Engineering position as responsible for reporting at the Alert level.

6.0 Appendices/Attachments

- Drill Package Summary
- Building 060 Floorplan
- Customer Feedback Survey results
- EPLAN-99, Section 2, Emergency Response Organization