

Enhancements to Emergency Preparedness Programs Hostile Action Related Events

May 2005

While the NRC has concluded that the regulatory bases of Emergency Preparedness remains acceptable, some enhancements have been identified with respect to implementing existing Emergency Response Programs when the initiating event is a hostile action based scenario. Significant actions, directed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or initiated voluntarily by the licensees have addressed these issues in an ongoing manner using a variety of mechanisms. The purpose of this White Paper is to:

- Identify enhancements to NPP emergency plans that have been identified as a result of analysis of the potential consequences of a hostile action directed at an NPP.
- Provide implementation guidance for those enhancements.
- Acquire NRC endorsement of the proposed actions and implementation guidance.

Changes to emergency plans and procedures made in accordance with this guidance have been assessed and are not considered a decrease in effectiveness and may be performed without prior NRC approval in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(q).

This paper provides enhancements in the following areas:

- A. Emergency Classification Schemes for Hostile Action Related Events
- B. Accelerated NRC Call
- C. Protective Measures for Onsite Personnel
- D. Emergency Response Organization Augmentation
- E. Integrated Emergency Preparedness/Security Drill Program

This paper does not address changes in offsite actions. Such changes, while contemplated, will be coordinated through an integrated review and interactions with the NRC, FEMA, licensees, and the Offsite Response Organizations (OROs). Additionally, impacts on offsite agencies as a result of the above enhancements will also be coordinated with the impacted agencies.

A. Emergency classification schemes for hostile action related events

Emergency plans should be revised to adopt modifications to the emergency classification schemes in two areas, the emergency classification level (ECL) definitions and the emergency action levels (EALs). If licensees adopt the changes as written, the following enhancements to emergency classification schemes are not a decrease in effectiveness and may be performed under 10 CFR 50.54(q) without prior approval by the NRC:

- The changes to the ECL definitions specifically incorporate the hostile action component and are spelled out in Attachment 1, “Emergency Classification Level Definitions.” Emergency plans and procedures should be modified to adopt the new ECL definitions.
- A revised definition for HOSTILE ACTION, required to consistently implement the new EALs irrespective of scheme is provided in Attachment 2.
- To ensure an appropriate level of response to the unlikely event of a hostile action directed at an NPP, new security EALs should be added and existing security EALs revised in emergency plans and procedures as appropriate. Attachment 3, “Enhanced Emergency Action Levels Implementation Guidance,” contains the EAL changes in a general summary and in three separate formats suitable for EAL sets based on NUREG-0654, NUMARC/NESP-007, and NEI 99-01.
- Licensees that currently have EAL submittals on the docket for NRC approval (i.e., conversion from one scheme to another) will continue the amendment process and should incorporate the enhanced EAL scheme under 10 CFR 50.54(q) into their currently in use EALs. After NRC approval of the EAL submittals, the enhanced EALs should be incorporated into the approved EALs in accordance with this white paper.
- Licensees that submit EAL scheme conversion requests to the NRC for approval after issuance of this white paper should incorporate the enhanced security EALs into the new EAL scheme prior to submittal.

B. Accelerated NRC Call

Existing Regulations in 10 CFR 73.71 require that the NRC be notified of security related events within one hour of the security event discovery. Additionally, 10 CFR 50.72 requires NRC notification “immediately after notification of the appropriate State or local agencies and not later than one hour after the time the licensee declares one of the Emergency Classes.” In the event of coordinated attacks on multiple sites, these notification time requirements may not give the NRC sufficient time to warn other NPP sites and notify other Federal agencies. Licensees are requested to change appropriate plans and procedures to ensure the NRC is called and notified of security related attacks as soon as possible upon discovery with a goal 15 minutes. This initial NRC call is to be brief and minimal. It is understood that

for declared emergencies many licensees currently await the arrival of augmenting staff to support NRC notification and reply to subsequent NRC information requests. The purpose of this accelerated call is to allow the NRC to warn other NPPs and initiate Federal response in accordance with the National Response Plan and does not replace the 10 CFR 50.72 NRC emergency classification notification that is required after declaration of the security related EAL event.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is pursuing formal rulemaking via 10 CFR 73.71 to codify this change.

Utilities are requested to make the following changes in the accelerated call process:

- A. The licensee should call the NRC using the emergency notification system (ENS) line as soon as possible after being informed by the station security staff of any security-related event(s) considered to be a credible imminent threat or Hostile Action. The priorities are: protection of the plant; protection of plant personnel, protection of the health and safety of the public, and protection of the national infrastructure.
- B. The accelerated call should be a verbal notification, with no hard copy, to the NRC with the following information:
 - Site name
 - Nature of the threat (if known, briefly described)
 - Type of attack (e.g., armed assault by land or water, aircraft, etc)
 - Attack status (i.e., imminent, in progress or repelled)

The call should not be delayed to continue development or assessment of the event progress. Upon completion of the NRC call, the event should be assessed for applicability of the site-specific emergency plan emergency action levels. If appropriate, the event should be classified and the emergency plan implemented. Appropriate emergency plan notifications to State and local emergency management authorities followed by the emergency plan notification to the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 50.72 should then be performed. The accelerated call is not intended to satisfy or replace the emergency plan notification requirements.

An example sequence of the accelerated call to meet the need to alert other critical infrastructure facilities is presented below:

Step	Action
1	A security related event considered to be an imminent threat to the security of the facility occurs or is discovered.
2	Security notifies the Control Room of the occurrence
3	The Control Room Shift Manager(SM) is informed of the occurrence.
4	The SM directs the Control Room staff to implement imminent security threat procedures.
5	The SM directs actions to use the ENS phone and contact the NRC Operations Center, making the accelerated call.
6	The SM directs actions to protect the plant.

Following the accelerated call to the NRC, subsequent actions (Steps to meet

Emergency Plan Initiation and 10 CFR 50.72 Notification needs) may include the following example sequence of events:

Step	Action:
1	The SM assesses event for emergency declaration purposes.
2	The SM declares the emergency and initiates the emergency plan.
3	Notification to State and local authorities of event declaration.
4	Notification to NRC Operations Center is initiated, making the normal Emergency Plan notification
etc.	Other EP and Security related procedural actions are initiated as appropriate

The examples presented above are for illustrative purposes only. These examples are not intended to describe the exact or only sequence, rather they describe a preferred process of immediacy with regard to the “accelerated call” when addressing security-related events followed by implementation of the site’s emergency plan, if appropriate.

C. Protective Measures for Onsite Personnel

Changes in onsite protective measures related to Security Events have evolved since the September 11, 2001 attack. Utilities have initiated changes based on the early Threat Advisory’s, the February 2002 Interim Compensatory Measures Order, as well as recent NRC initiatives related to imminent threat of attack. The changes proposed in this section may have been completed in whole or in part in response to those previous activities. Utilities should evaluate the information provided here with respect to any additional enhancements to those changes.

An Alert or Site Area Emergency declaration is generally accompanied by site assembly, accountability measures, site evacuation, activation of emergency response facilities (ERFs), and other actions. While these actions are appropriate for some emergencies, they may be counterproductive during a hostile attack. Many licensees have already made protective measure changes through the modification of page announcements and emergency response organization (ERO) augmentation instructions. However, aircraft scenarios in particular may challenge these contingencies.

Although these enhancements are focused on the airborne attack, they may not be suitable for all circumstances. Utilities are requested to consider the following as part of a range of protection for site workers and apply them as appropriate for other Hostile Actions:

- Evacuation of personnel from target buildings (including security personnel)
- Site evacuation by any means (such as opening (while continuing to defend) security gates)
- Dispersal of licensed operators and/or key response personnel
- Onsite sheltering of personnel in structures away from potential site targets
- Arrangements for accounting for personnel after the attack

It is expected that site-specific arrangements, such as the location of workers with respect to potential targets, will dictate the appropriateness of sheltering versus evacuation. It should be noted that shelter within target buildings may not provide the intended personnel protection. Procedures should be modified to ensure plant page announcements accomplish the onsite protective actions deemed appropriate. Site-specific implementation of these actions would be considered sensitive information.

Utilities are requested to develop an onsite protective measure decision-making tool to support shift personnel. This tool is intended to aid the rapid decision for site evacuation via a normal exit, site evacuation via opening gates, or if little time is available, locations for sheltering and buildings to be evacuated. The goal of this effort is to develop a simple decision making tool such as a flowchart, for the shift manager to use in directing the site's protective measures (i.e., whether to evacuate the site or take shelter). In any case, it may be appropriate to evacuate target buildings, as quickly as possible. The tool should be developed estimating the time needed versus time available to take actions for the onsite population and consider:

- Type of Hostile Action
- Normal working hours
- Off normal hours/Weekends
- Outages
- Adverse weather

It is expected that the actions developed in response to this section may require modification as additional design work is conducted.

D. Emergency Response Organization Augmentation

The Order transmitting the Compensatory Measures of 2002 required that licensees staff emergency response facilities and identify alternative facilities to support emergency operations facility (EOF) activities. Implementation of this requirement is complete at all NPPs and has been inspected. However, some licensees have chosen to not activate elements of the ERO until the site is secured and fully rely on the EOF to support onsite response functions.

The possibility of severe damage resulting from hostile actions warrants the activation of all elements of the ERO including operations and engineering support, corrective action and repair functions, medical and first aid response, and health physics support and monitoring, to include assessments. It is also prudent to activate the onsite staffers of the ERO and deploy them to a staging area or readily available facility near the site. This is meant to include the technical support center (TSC) and operations support center (OSC) staff and any other ERO members assigned to onsite positions. The onsite ERO is expected to be staged in a manner that supports rapidly responding to mitigate site damage as soon as the site is secured.

Characteristics of these alternative facilities should include:

- Accessibility even if the site is not accessible
- Communication with the EOF, control room, and security

It may be beneficial to the ERO if the alternative facilities have general plant drawings and procedures, phones, and (ideally) computer links to the site. However, alternate facilities are not required to reproduce the full documentation present at the TSC. Training centers, emergency operations centers, assembly areas and the like are adequate alternative facilities.

Many sites use the EOF as the alternative facility for onsite ERO members. This is acceptable when the EOF is outside the owner controlled area yet not far from the site. It is appropriate to identify a staging area near the NPP if the EOF is more than about 30 miles away.

In the case of EOFs that are within the vehicle checkpoint, it is appropriate to develop an alternative facility for all the ERO functions should the EOF not be accessible.

E. Integrated Emergency Preparedness/Security Drill Program

The likelihood for hostile actions to cause damage at an NPP is low. However, emergency response organizations should be prepared to respond if such damage occurs. Current consequence assessments indicate that licensee measures are available to mitigate the effects of hostile acts. Consequently, such acts would not create an accident that causes a larger release or one that occurs more quickly than those already addressed by the emergency preparedness-planning basis. However, the condition of the plant after such an event is very different from the usual condition practiced in NPP drills and exercise programs. The ERO is the only organization that can effectively mitigate plant damage after a hostile action event. Some EROs may not be sufficiently practicing response to hostile action-based damage scenarios.

The industry has proposed that an integrated Emergency Preparedness/Security Drill Exercise initiative be developed and implemented. Attachment 4 contains a detailed outline of the drill and exercise program. Licensees are requested to make appropriate changes to the emergency plan to document these enhancements.

Attachments:

1. Emergency Classification Level Definitions
2. Definition for HOSTILE ACTION
3. Enhanced Emergency Action Levels Implementation Guidance
4. Integration and Demonstration of Emergency Response to Security Events, "Integrated Response Exercises"

Emergency Classification Levels (ECLs)

The following provides a revision to the description of the emergency classification levels (ECLs) to include a hostile action based perspective.

– Notification of Unusual Event

Events are in process or have occurred which indicate a potential degradation of the level of safety of the plant or indicate a security threat to facility protection has been initiated. No releases of radioactive material requiring offsite response or monitoring are expected unless further degradation of safety systems occurs.

– Alert

Events are in process or have occurred which involve an actual or potential substantial degradation of the level of safety of the plant or a security event that involves probable life threatening risk to site personnel or damage to site equipment because of intentional malicious dedicated efforts of hostile action. Any releases are expected to be limited to small fractions of the EPA Protective Action Guideline exposure levels.

– Site Area Emergency

Events are in process or have occurred which involve actual or likely major failures of plant functions needed for protection of the public or security events that result in intentional damage or malicious acts; (1) toward site personnel or equipment that could lead to the likely failure of or; (2) prevent effective access to, equipment needed for the protection of the public. Any releases are not expected to result in exposure levels that exceed EPA Protective Action Guideline exposure levels beyond the site boundary.

– General Emergency

Events are in process or have occurred which involve actual or imminent substantial core degradation or melting with potential for loss of containment integrity or security events that result in an actual loss of physical control of the facility. Release can be reasonably expected to exceed EPA Protective Action Guideline exposure levels offsite for more than the immediate site area.

These revisions are based on the threat posed by hostile action events rather than current plant conditions. Nuclear accident progression considers the unlikely occurrence of multiple failures and the defense-in-depth provided by plant design. The new ECL definitions incorporate the intentional harm and destruction of a hostile action that could lead to a radiological release. Consequently, these descriptors and the EALs that follow are intended to be more proactive and to initiate response measures not previously considered. This is considered appropriate because of the nature and indeterminate magnitude of the potential for harm during hostile action events.

Definitions:

The following is a new definition to be used consistently though out the security EAL schemes.

HOSTILE ACTION

Any combination of attributes that alone or together indicate a systematic use of violence, terror, deadly force, or intimidation to achieve an end. As used in this context HOSTILE ACTION includes; land based attacks, water borne attacks, air borne attacks explosive devices, BOMBS, incendiary devices or projectiles. Other acts that satisfy the overall intent may be included. HOSTILE ACTION does not include acts of CIVIL DISTURBANCE or STRIKE ACTION. These activities should be classified using non-violent based EALs.

NUREG-0654 Guidance

Modify the ECL definitions as provided above.

Add the definition for HOSTILE ACTION as provided above.

Delete any existing ISFSI Security EAL because it is replaced by either HOSTILE ACTION EAL or Site Attack EAL.

Replace existing NUREG-0654 General Emergency Example #3 (Loss of physical control of the facility) with NEI 99-01 HG1.

The following are the Security EALs for NUREG-0654 users. Verify that your EAL sets include the following Security related EALs:

The basis for these EALS is new guidance for attack events and Safeguards Advisory for Operating Power Reactors (SA 05 - 02). Training materials should be derived from the basis provided in the NEI 99-01, Rev. 4 guidance included in this enclosure.

UNUSUAL EVENT

1. Security threat or attempted entry or attempted sabotage. (NUREG-0654 UE Example #12)
2. A credible site-specific security threat notification. (2002 ICM Order)
3. A validated notification from NRC providing information of an aircraft threat greater than 30 minutes away. (2005 Security Advisory)

Add a note to your existing EAL sets to ensure that NUREG-0654, UE Example EAL# 14 remains applicable for other hazards being experienced or projected.

ALERT

1. Ongoing security compromise (NUREG-0654 ALERT Example #16)
2. A validated notification from NRC of an airliner attack threat less than 30 minutes away. (2005 Security Advisory).
3. A notification from the site security force of an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA.

Add a note to your existing EAL sets to ensure that NUREG-0654, Alert Example EAL# 18 remains applicable for other hazards being experienced or projected

SITE AREA

1. Imminent loss of physical control of the plant (NUREG-0654 Site Area Example #14)
2. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack,

airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the protected area.

Add a note to your existing EAL sets to ensure that NUREG-0654, Site Area Example EAL# 16 remains applicable for other hazards being experienced or projected with plant not in cold shutdown.

GENERAL EMERGENCY

1. A HOSTILE FORCE has taken control of plant equipment such that plant personnel are unable to operate equipment required to maintain safety functions.

NUMARC/NESP-007 (Revised)

Recognition Category H

Hazards and Other Conditions Affecting Plant Safety

INITIATING CONDITION MATRIX

NOUE	ALERT	SITE AREA EMERGENCY	GENERAL EMERGENCY
HU1 Natural and Related Destructive Phenomena Affecting the PROTECTED AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA1 Natural and Related Destructive Phenomena Affecting the Plant VITAL AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>		
HU2 FIRE Within PROTECTED AREA Boundary Not Extinguished Within 15 Minutes of Detection. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA2 FIRE or EXPLOSION Affecting the Operability of Plant Safety Systems Required to Establish or Maintain Safe Shutdown. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>		
HU3 Release of Toxic or Flammable Gases Deemed Detrimental to Safe Operation of the Plant. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA3 Release of Toxic or Flammable Gases Within a Facility Structure Which Jeopardizes Operation of Systems Required to Establish or Maintain Cold Shutdown. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>		
HU4 Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA4 Security Event in a Plant PROTECTED AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS1 Security Event in a Plant VITAL AREA <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HG1 Security Event Resulting in Loss of Physical Control of the Facility. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>
HU5 Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of a NOUE. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA6 Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of an Alert. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS3 Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of Site Area Emergency. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HG2 Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of General Emergency. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>
	HA5 Control Room Evacuation Has Been Initiated. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS2 Control Room Evacuation Has Been Initiated and Plant Control Cannot Be Established. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
	HA7 Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS4 Site Attack <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
	HA8 Notification of HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA <i>Op. Modes: All</i>		

NUMARC/NESP-007 Guidance

Modify the ECL definitions as provided above.

Add the definition for HOSTILE ACTION as provided above.

Delete existing EALS as follows:

- HU4 EAL1 (Bomb device discovered within plant Protected Area and outside the plant Vital Area) because it is replaced by the new HOSTILE ACTION EAL HA8
- HA4 EAL1 (Intrusion into the PROTECTED AREA by a HOSTILE FORCE) because it is replaced by the new HOSTILE ACTION EAL HS4
- Any existing ISFSI Security EAL because it is replaced by either HOSTILE ACTION EAL HA8 or Site Attack EAL HS4.

Delete existing HG1 and replace with NEI 99-01 HG1.

The following is a summary of the Security IC/EALs for NESP-007 users. Verify that your EAL sets include the following Security related EALs. Detailed bases for each IC/EAL follow this summary.

HU4 Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant.**EXAMPLE EALs:**(1 or 2 or 3)

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan. (Existing NESP-007 HU4 EAL2)
2. A credible site-specific security threat notification (2002 ICM Order).
3. A validated notification from NRC providing information of an aircraft threat greater than 30 minutes away (2005 Security Advisory)

HA4 Security Event in a Plant PROTECTED AREA

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan (Existing NESP-007 HA4 EAL2).

HA7 Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat

1. A validated notification from NRC of an airliner attack threat less than 30 minutes away. (2005 Security Advisory)

HA8 Notification of HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the OCA.

HS1 Security Event in a Plant Vital Area

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan. (Existing NESP-007 HS1 EAL2).

HS4 Site Attack

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the protected area.

HG1 - Security Event Resulting in Loss Of Physical Control of the Facility.

1. A HOSTILE FORCE has taken control of plant equipment such that plant personnel are unable to operate equipment required to maintain safety functions (Existing NEI 99-01 HG1 EAL1).

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****UNUSUAL EVENT****HU4 Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant.****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVELS:** (1 or 2 or 3)

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan.
2. A credible site-specific security threat notification.
3. A validated notification from NRC providing information of an aircraft threat greater than 30 minutes away

BASIS:

EAL 1 is based on the (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan. Security events which do not represent at least a potential degradation in the level of safety of the plant are reported under 10 CFR 73.71 or in some cases under 10 CFR 50.72.

The intent of EAL 2 is to ensure that appropriate notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Notification of an Unusual Event. The determination of "credible" is made through use of information found in the (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan or site procedures.

The intent of EAL 3 is to ensure that notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner and that Offsite Response Organizations and plant personnel are at a state of heightened awareness regarding the credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Notification of Unusual Event. This EAL is met when a plant receives information regarding an aircraft threat from the NRC and the aircraft is more than 30 minutes away from the plant. It is not the intent of this EAL to replace existing non-hostile related EALs involving aircraft.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****ALERT**

HA4 Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan.

OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY: All

EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL:

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan.

BASIS:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the Unusual Event.

Multi-unit stations with shared safety functions should further consider how this IC may affect more than one unit and how this may be a factor in escalating the emergency class.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****ALERT****HA7 Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat.****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL:**

1. A validated notification from NRC of an airliner attack threat less than 30 minutes away.

BASIS:

The intent of this EAL is to ensure that notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner and that Offsite Response Organizations and plant personnel are at a state of heightened awareness regarding the credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Alert. This EAL is met when a plant receives information regarding an airliner attack threat from NRC and the airliner is less than 30 minutes away from the plant.

This EAL is intended to address the contingency of a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from such an attack. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to activate (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717. The status of the plane is provided by NORAD through the NRC.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****ALERT****HA8 Notification of HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA.****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL:**

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the OCA.

BASIS:

This EAL is intended to address the potential for a very rapid progression of events due to an attack including:

- air attack (airliner impacting the OCA)
- land-based attack (HOSTILE FORCE progressing across licensee property or directing projectiles at the site)
- waterborne attack (HOSTILE FORCE on water attempting forced entry, or directing projectiles at the site)
- BOMBs

This EAL is not premised solely on adverse health effects caused by a radiological release. Rather the issue is the immediate need for assistance due to the nature of the event and the potential for significant and indeterminate damage. Although NPP security officers are well trained and prepared to protect against HOSTILE ACTION, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to begin activation (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions.

This EAL is intended to address the contingency for a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001 and the possibility for additional attacking aircraft. It is not intended to address accidental aircraft impact as that initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from additional attack elements. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and to activate in order to be better prepared to respond should protective actions become necessary. If not previously notified by NRC that the aircraft impact was intentional, then it would be expected, although not certain, that notification by an appropriate Federal agency would follow. In this case, appropriate federal agency is intended to be NORAD, FBI, FAA or NRC. However, the declaration should not be unduly delayed awaiting Federal notification. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717.

This IC/EAL addresses the immediacy of an expected threat arrival or impact on the site within a relatively short time. The fact that the site is an identified attack candidate with minimal time available for further preparation requires a heightened state of readiness and implementation of protective measures that can be effective (onsite evacuation, dispersal or sheltering) before arrival or impact.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****SITE AREA EMERGENCY****HS1 Security Event in a Plant Vital Area****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL:**

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan.

BASIS:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the Alert IC.

Multi-unit stations with shared safety functions should further consider how this IC may affect more than one unit and how this may be a factor in escalating the emergency class.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****SITE AREA EMERGENCY****HS4 Site Attack****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVEL:**

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the protected area.

BASIS:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the Alert IC in that a hostile force has progressed from the Owner Controlled Area to the Protected Area.

Although NPP security officers are well trained and prepared to protect against HOSTILE ACTION, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to begin preparations for public protective actions (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions.

This EAL is intended to address the potential for a very rapid progression of events due to a dedicated attack. It is not intended to address incidents that are accidental or acts of civil disobedience, such as hunters or physical disputes between employees within the OCA. That initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. HOSTILE ACTION identified above encompasses various acts including:

- air attack (airliner impacting the protected area)
- land-based attack (HOSTILE FORCE penetrating protected area)
- waterborne attack (HOSTILE FORCE on water penetrating protected area)
- BOMBs breaching the protected area

This EAL is intended to address the contingency for a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001 and the possibility for additional attacking aircraft. It is not intended to address accidental aircraft impact as that initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from additional attack elements. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and to activate in order to be better prepared to respond should protective actions become necessary. If not previously notified by NRC that the aircraft impact was intentional, then it would be expected, although not certain, that notification by an appropriate Federal agency would follow. In this case, appropriate federal agency is intended to

be NORAD, FBI, FAA or NRC. However, the declaration should not be unduly delayed awaiting Federal notification. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717.

This EAL addresses the immediacy of a threat to impact site vital areas within a relatively short time. The fact that the site is under serious attack with minimal time available for additional assistance to arrive requires ORO readiness and preparation for the implementation of protective measures.

Licenses should consider upgrading the classification to a General Emergency based on actual plant status after impact.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS**AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY****GENERAL EMERGENCY****HG1 Security Event Resulting in Loss Of Physical Control of the Facility.****OPERATING MODE APPLICABILITY:** All**EXAMPLE EMERGENCY ACTION LEVELS:**

1. A HOSTILE FORCE has taken control of plant equipment such that plant personnel are unable to operate equipment required to maintain safety functions.

BASIS:

This IC encompasses conditions under which a HOSTILE FORCE has taken physical control of VITAL AREAs (containing vital equipment or controls of vital equipment) required to maintain safety functions and control of that equipment cannot be transferred to and operated from another location. Typically, these safety functions are reactivity control (ability to shut down the reactor and keep it shutdown) reactor water level (ability to cool the core), and decay heat removal (ability to maintain a heat sink) for a BWR. The equivalent functions for a PWR are reactivity control, RCS inventory, and secondary heat removal. If control of the plant equipment necessary to maintain safety functions can be transferred to another location, then the above initiating condition is not met.

This EAL should also address loss of physical control of spent fuel pool cooling systems if imminent fuel damage is likely (e.g., freshly off-loaded reactor core in pool).

Loss of physical control of the control room or remote shutdown capability alone may not prevent the ability to maintain safety functions per se. Design of the remote shutdown capability and the location of the transfer switches should be taken into account.

NEI 99-01 (Revised)Recognition Category H

Hazards and Other Conditions Affecting Plant Safety

INITIATING CONDITION MATRIX

NOUE		ALERT	SITE AREA EMERGENCY	GENERAL EMERGENCY		
HU1	Natural and Related Destructive Phenomena Affecting the PROTECTED AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA1	Natural and Related Destructive Phenomena Affecting the Plant VITAL AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>			
HU2	FIRE Within PROTECTED AREA Boundary Not Extinguished Within 15 Minutes of Detection. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA2	FIRE or EXPLOSION Affecting the Operability of Plant Safety Systems Required to Establish or Maintain Safe Shutdown. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>			
HU3	Release of Toxic or Flammable Gases Deemed Detrimental to Safe Operation of the Plant. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA3	Release of Toxic or Flammable Gases Within or Contiguous to a VITAL AREA Which Jeopardizes Operation of Safety Systems Required to Establish or Maintain Safe Shutdown. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>			
HU4	Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA4	Confirmed Security Event in a Plant PROTECTED AREA. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS1	Confirmed Security Event in a Plant VITAL AREA <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
HU5	Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of a NOUE. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HA6	Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of an Alert. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS3	Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of Site Area Emergency. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
		HA5	Control Room Evacuation Has Been Initiated. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS2	Control Room Evacuation Has Been Initiated and Plant Control Cannot Be Established. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
		HA7	Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	HS4	Site Attack <i>Op. Modes: All</i>	
		HA8	Notification of HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA <i>Op. Modes: All</i>		HG1	Security Event Resulting in Loss Of Physical Control of the Facility. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>
					HG2	Other Conditions Existing Which in the Judgment of the Emergency Director Warrant Declaration of General Emergency. <i>Op. Modes: All</i>

NEI 99-01 Guidance

Modify the ECL definitions as provided above.

Add the definition for HOSTILE ACTION.

Delete existing EALS as follows:

- HA4 EAL1 (Intrusion into the PROTECTED AREA by a HOSTILE FORCE) because it is replaced by the new HOSTILE ACTION EAL HA8
- HS1 EAL1 (INTRUSION into the plant VITAL AREA by a HOSTILE FORCE.) because it is replaced by the new HOSTILE ACTION EAL HS4
- E-HU2 (Confirmed security event with potential loss of level of safety of the ISFSI) because it is replaced by either HOSTILE ACTION EAL HA8 or Site Attack EAL HS4.

The following are the Security IC/EALs for NEI 99-01 users. Verify that your EAL sets include the following Security related EAL: Detailed bases for each IC/EAL follow this summary.

HU4 Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant.

Example EAL: (1 or 2 or 3)

1. Security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision (Existing NEI 99-01 HU4 EAL1).
2. A credible site specific security threat notification (2002 ICM Order).
3. A validated notification from NRC providing information of an aircraft threat greater than 30 minutes away (2005 Security Advisory).

HA4 Confirmed Security Event in a Plant PROTECTED AREA

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision. (Existing NEI 99-01 HA4 EAL2).

HA7 Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat

1. A validated notification from NRC of an airliner attack threat less than 30 minutes away. (2005 Security Advisory)

HA8 Notification of HOSTILE ACTION within the OCA

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the OCA.

HS1 Confirmed Security Event in a Plant VITAL AREA

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision (Existing NEI 99-01 HS1 EAL2).

HS4 Site Attack

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the protected area.

HG1 - Security Event Resulting in Loss Of Physical Control of the Facility

1. A HOSTILE FORCE has taken control of plant equipment such that plant personnel are unable to operate equipment required to maintain safety functions (Existing NEI 99-01 HG1 EAL1).

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONSAFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HU4

Initiating Condition – NOTIFICATION OF UNUSUAL EVENT

Confirmed Security Event Which Indicates a Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant.

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Levels: (1 or 2 or 3)

1. Security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision.
2. A credible site-specific security threat notification.
3. A validated notification from NRC providing information of an aircraft threat greater than 30 minutes away.

Basis:

Reference is made to (site-specific) security shift supervision because these individuals are the designated personnel on-site qualified and trained to confirm that a security event is occurring or has occurred. Training on security event classification confirmation is closely controlled due to the strict secrecy controls placed on the plant Safeguards Contingency Plan.

This EAL 1 is based on (site-specific) Site Security Plans. Security events which do not represent a potential degradation in the level of safety of the plant are reported under 10 CFR 73.71 or in some cases under 10 CFR 50.72. Examples of security events that indicate Potential Degradation in the Level of Safety of the Plant are provided below for consideration.

Consideration should be given to the following types of events when evaluating an event against the criteria of the site specific Security Contingency Plan: CIVIL DISTURBANCE, and STRIKE ACTION.

The intent of EAL 2 is to ensure that appropriate notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner. This includes information of a credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Notification of an Unusual Event.

The intent of EAL 3 is to ensure that notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner and that Offsite Response Organizations and plant personnel are at a state of heightened awareness regarding the credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Notification of Unusual Event. This EAL is met when a plant receives information regarding an aircraft threat from NRC and the aircraft is more than 30 minutes away

from the plant. It is not the intent of this EAL to replace existing non-hostile related EALs involving aircraft.

The determination of “credible” is made through use of information found in the (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan or site procedures.

A higher initial classification could be made based upon the nature and timing of the threat and potential consequences. The licensee shall consider upgrading the emergency response status and emergency classification in accordance with the [site security specific] Safeguards Contingency Plan and Emergency Plans.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONSAFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HA4

Initiating Condition -- ALERT

Confirmed Security Event in a Plant PROTECTED AREA.

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Level:

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision.

Basis:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the NOUE.

The Safeguards Contingency Plan identifies numerous events/conditions that constitute a threat/compromise to a Station's security. Only those events that involve Actual or Potential Substantial degradation to the level of safety of the plant need to be considered. The following events would not normally meet this requirement; (e.g., Failure by a Member of the Security Force to carry out an assigned/required duty, internal disturbances, loss/compromise of safeguards materials or strike actions).

The intent of EAL 3 is to ensure that notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner and that Offsite Response Organizations and plant personnel are at a state of heightened awareness regarding the credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Alert. This EAL is met when a plant receives information regarding an airliner attack threat from NRC and the airliner is less than 30 minutes away from the plant.

EAL 3 is intended to address the contingency of a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from such an attack. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to activate (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717. The status of the plane is provided by NORAD through the NRC.

The determination of "credible" is made through use of information found in the (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan or site procedures.

Reference is made to (site-specific) security shift supervision because these individuals are the designated personnel on-site qualified and trained to confirm that a security event is occurring or has occurred. Training on security event classification confirmation is closely controlled due to the strict secrecy controls placed on the plant Security Plan.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONSAFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HA7

Initiating Condition -- ALERT

Notification of an Airborne Attack Threat.

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Level:

1. A validated notification from NRC of an airliner attack threat less than 30 minutes away.

Basis:

The intent of this EAL is to ensure that notifications for the security threat are made in a timely manner and that Offsite Response Organizations and plant personnel are at a state of heightened awareness regarding the credible threat. Only the plant to which the specific threat is made need declare the Alert. This EAL is met when a plant receives information regarding an airliner attack threat from NRC and the airliner is less than 30 minutes away from the plant.

This EAL is intended to address the contingency of a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from such an attack. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to activate (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717. The status of the plane is provided by NORAD through the NRC.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONSAFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HA8

Initiating Condition -- ALERT

Notification or HOSTILE FORCE within the OCA

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Level:

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the OCA.

Basis:

This EAL is intended to address the potential for a very rapid progression of events due to a hostile attack including:

- air attack (airliner impacting the OCA)
- land-based attack (hostile force progressing across licensee property or directing projectiles at the site)
- waterborne attack (hostile force on water attempting forced entry, or directing projectiles at the site)
- BOMBS

This EAL is not intended to address incidents that are accidental or acts of civil disobedience, such as hunters or physical disputes between employees within the OCA or PA. That initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs.

This EAL is not premised solely on adverse health effects caused by a radiological release. Rather the issue is the immediate need for assistance due to the nature of the event and the potential for significant and indeterminate damage. Although NPP security officers are well trained and prepared to protect against HOSTILE ACTION, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to begin activation (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions.

This EAL is intended to address the contingency for a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001 and the possibility for additional attacking aircraft. It is not intended to address accidental aircraft impact as that initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from additional attack elements. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response

Organizations to be notified and to activate in order to be better prepared to respond should protective actions become necessary. If not previously notified by NRC that the aircraft impact was intentional, then it would be expected, although not certain, that notification by an appropriate Federal agency would follow. In this case, appropriate federal agency is intended to be NORAD, FBI, FAA or NRC. However, the declaration should not be unduly delayed awaiting Federal notification. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717.

This IC/EAL addresses the immediacy of an expected threat arrival or impact on the site within a relatively short time. The fact that the site is an identified attack candidate with minimal time available for further preparation requires a heightened state of readiness and implementation of protective measures that can be effective (onsite evacuation, dispersal or sheltering) before arrival or impact.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS
AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HS1

Initiating Condition – SITE AREA EMERGENCY

Confirmed Security Event in a Plant VITAL AREA

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Level:

1. Other security events as determined from (site-specific) Safeguards Contingency Plan and reported by the (site-specific) security shift supervision.

Basis:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the Alert IC.

The Safeguards Contingency Plan identifies numerous events/conditions that constitute a threat/compromise to a Station's security. Only those events that involve Actual or Likely Major failures of plant functions needed for protection of the public need to be considered. The following events would not normally meet this requirement; (e.g., Failure by a Member of the Security Force to carry out an assigned/required duty, internal disturbances, loss/compromise of safeguards materials or strike actions).

Reference is made to (site-specific) security shift supervision because these individuals are the designated personnel on-site qualified and trained to confirm that a security event is occurring or has occurred. Training on security event classification confirmation is closely controlled due to the strict secrecy controls placed on the plant Security Plan.

Loss of Plant Control would escalate this event to a GENERAL EMERGENCY.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONS
AFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HS4**Initiating Condition – SITE AREA EMERGENCY**

Site Attack

Operating Mode Applicability: All**Example Emergency Action Level:**

1. A notification from the site security force that an armed attack, explosive attack, airliner impact, or other HOSTILE ACTION is occurring or has occurred within the PROTECTED AREA.

Basis:

This class of security events represents an escalated threat to plant safety above that contained in the Alert IC in that a hostile force has progressed from the Owner Controlled Area to the Protected Area.

Although NPP security officers are well trained and prepared to protect against HOSTILE ACTION, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and encouraged to begin preparations for public protective actions (if they do not normally) to be better prepared should it be necessary to consider further actions.

This EAL is intended to address the potential for a very rapid progression of events due to a dedicated attack. It is not intended to address incidents that are accidental or acts of civil disobedience, such as hunters or physical disputes between employees within the OCA or PA. That initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. HOSTILE ACTION identified above encompasses various acts including:

- air attack (airliner impacting the protected area)
- land-based attack (hostile force penetrating protected area)
- waterborne attack (hostile force on water penetrating protected area)
- BOMBs breaching the protected area

This EAL is intended to address the contingency for a very rapid progression of events due to an airborne hostile attack such as that experienced on September 11, 2001 and the possibility for additional attacking aircraft. It is not intended to address accidental aircraft impact as that initiating condition is adequately addressed by other EALs. This EAL is not premised solely on the potential for a radiological release. Rather the issue includes the need for assistance due to the possibility for significant and indeterminate damage from additional attack elements. Although vulnerability analyses show NPPs to be robust, it is appropriate for Offsite Response Organizations to be notified and to activate in order to be better prepared to respond should protective actions become necessary. If not previously notified by NRC that the aircraft impact was intentional, then it would be expected, although not certain, that notification by an appropriate Federal agency would follow. In this case, appropriate federal agency is intended to

be NORAD, FBI, FAA or NRC. However, the declaration should not be unduly delayed awaiting Federal notification. Airliner is meant to be interpreted as aircraft as large as or larger than an 737, DC9, MD80, MD90, or 717.

This EAL addresses the immediacy of a threat to impact site vital areas within a relatively short time. The fact that the site is under serious attack with minimal time available for additional assistance to arrive requires ORO readiness and preparation for the implementation of protective measures.

Licenses should consider upgrading the classification to a General Emergency based on actual plant status after impact.

HAZARDS AND OTHER CONDITIONSAFFECTING PLANT SAFETY

HG1

Initiating Condition – GENERAL EMERGENCY

Security Event Resulting in Loss of Physical Control of the Facility.

Operating Mode Applicability: All

Example Emergency Action Level:

1. A HOSTILE FORCE has taken control of plant equipment such that plant personnel are unable to operate equipment required to maintain safety functions.

Basis:

This IC encompasses conditions under which a HOSTILE FORCE has taken physical control of VITAL AREAs (containing vital equipment or controls of vital equipment) required to maintain safety functions and control of that equipment cannot be transferred to and operated from another location. Typically, these safety functions are reactivity control (ability to shut down the reactor and keep it shutdown) reactor water level (ability to cool the core), and decay heat removal (ability to maintain a heat sink) for a BWR. The equivalent functions for a PWR are reactivity control, RCS inventory, and secondary heat removal. If control of the plant equipment necessary to maintain safety functions can be transferred to another location, then the above initiating condition is not met.

This EAL should also address loss of physical control of spent fuel pool cooling systems if imminent fuel damage is likely (e.g., freshly off-loaded reactor core in pool).

Loss of physical control of the control room or remote shutdown capability alone may not prevent the ability to maintain safety functions per se. Design of the remote shutdown capability and the location of the transfer switches should be taken into account.

Integration and Demonstration of Emergency Response to Security Events

Integrated Response Exercise Program Summary

Emergency Preparedness and Security Working Group proposal to establish guidelines for integration and demonstration of emergency responses to security events, including preparation and conduct of integrated drills exercising Emergency Response Organizations', Operation's, and Security's response to a range of security events. The NEI task force's target date for developing draft guidelines is the 1st quarter, 2005, followed by 4 industry tabletop drills and 2 pilot drill demonstrations with 9-12 months. Lessons learned from these drills will be used to improve guidelines for industry use, and for internal site reviews, training, and future drills. Over the following 3 years it is expected that each site will initiate an integrated drill during the off year. Long-term expectations are that each site will demonstrate an emergency response to security event one time during the 6-year exercise cycle.

Phase I

- Formulate NEI EP Security Task Force
 - Develop industry guidelines
 - Develop scenario abstracts
 - Identify industry peer review team
 - Develop Tabletop protocol
- Coordinate a pilot program (2005-2006) Tabletops
- Validate guidelines
- Consider FEMA evaluation criteria
- Develop lessons learn

Phase II

- Conduct 2 Pilot Integrated Drills using Industry Guidance
- Obtain NRC Endorsement of Industry Guidance
- Conduct joint NRC/NEI Workshop

Phase III

- Complete drills at all sites within 3 years of completion of pilot
- NRC participation in 1-2 biennial exercises/year

Phase IV

- Once all sites have completed initial integrated drills; incorporate into 6 year exercise plan

Conduct Of Activities

Table tops

- Involve stakeholders such as licensees, State & local emergency management / law enforcement, medical & fire response. Should last approximately a year, facilitated by the licensee.

Drills

- Drills - Agreement of 2 onsite drills with limited participation.
- Offsite roles / response can be provided by control cell based on knowledge gained in tabletops.
- NRC will observe without regulatory oversight (no enforcement), licensee will determine if standard post drill critique requirements would be followed.
- Drills to be conducted in the off year for the pilot.
- Pilot plants should have selection consideration based in part on “risk-informed” criteria.
- A series of scenarios should be developed to exercise various aspects of threats as the threat may require different consequence management actions.

Full Implementation - After Pilot

- All plants conduct hostile action-based scenarios over 3 (or more) years.
- Following the NRC inspected plant demonstration; the licensee will include hostile action-based scenarios in the Drill and exercise program for exercise selection on a six-year frequency.
- Full implementation needs to include engagement of Offsite responders and FEMA.

Scenarios - EP Response Focus

- The scenario should address EP response actions early in the event that include such aspects as initial classification, notification, PARs if appropriate, and protective measures onsite. Use “time-jump” or other techniques to pass through the security event, then pick up EP response actions based on a postulated damage state of the site / facility.
- Various scenarios should be developed to address response to different threat modes, various initiators or response capabilities such as onsite facilities available / not available or alternative accountability processes.
- The differences in response actions (delta’s) need to be thought through for security events vs non-security events.

Project Timeline

Phase 1 – Develop Materials and Conduct Pilot Tabletops

- Initial draft of guidance documents02/16/05 [Done]
- EP Security Event Drill task force meeting.....03/15/05 [Done]
- NEI task force pre-meeting03/30/05 [Done]
- Presentation to NRC/FEMA (supplant EP demonstration in FOF)03/31/05 [Done]
- National FEMA REP Presentation04/13/05 [Done]
- National Nuclear Security Conference 06/06/05
- NEI EP Forum Presentation..... 06/14/05
- Conduct 4 site tabletops (one in each region)..... June '05 - December '05

Phase 2 – Test Baseline Drills

- Revise guideline based on Phase 1 resultsJanuary '06
- Conduct 2 site drills..... February – March '06

Phase 3 – Conduct Baseline Drills (industry wide)

- Finalize guideline based on Phase 2 results April '06
- NRC endorsementMay '06
- Joint Industry/NRC Workshop.....June '06
- Utilities conduct baseline Security Event Drills July '06 – December '08

Phase 4 – Implement Security Event as Evaluated Exercises