

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report Nos. 50-206/87-16, 50-361/87-15 and 50-362/87-17

Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361 and 50-362

License Nos. DPR-13, NPF-10 and NPF-15

Licensee: Southern California Edison Company
P. O. Box 800
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

Facility Name: San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3

Inspection at: San Onofre Site, San Diego County, California

Inspection Conducted: June 10, 1987

Inspector: G. M. Good
G. M. Good, Emergency Preparedness Analyst

6/24/87
Date Signed

Approved by: R. F. Fish
R. F. Fish, Chief
Emergency Preparedness Section

6/24/87
Date Signed

Summary:

Inspection on June 10, 1987 (Report Nos. 50-206/87-16, 50-361/87-15 and 50-362/87-17)

Areas Inspected: Unannounced, special inspection of the annual medical emergency drill and associated critique. Inspection procedure 82301 was addressed.

Results: No deficiencies or violations of NRC requirements were identified.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

D. Bennette, Supervisor, Station Emergency Preparedness (SEP)
G. Buzzelli, Emergency Planning Coordinator
P. Dooley, Supervisor, Corporate Emergency Planning
J. Firoved, Emergency Planning Engineer
D. Peacor, Manager, SEP

2. Simulated Medical Emergency Drill Planning

The licensee's Nuclear Affairs and Emergency Planning (NA&EP) Department has the overall responsibility for developing, conducting and evaluating the annual medical emergency drill. A drill scenario was developed to provide for an assessment of the plant staff's ability to respond to a radiation medical emergency onsite and to assess pre-hospital and hospital emergency medical services to handle a contaminated injured patient. A number of drill objectives were established. Several drill controllers were utilized to provide necessary information such as contamination levels and vital signs. For training purposes, provisions to video tape the drill had been made. The drill was intended to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.47(b)(15), IV. F of Appendix E to 10 CFR 50, the guidance provided in NUREG-0654 and Section 8.1.3 of the licensee's Emergency Plan (EP).

3. Drill Scenario

The drill was conducted at the Multi Purpose Radwaste Handling Facility; however, all drill activities took place outside the fence so that work in-progress would not be disrupted. The scenario involved a Radwaste Handler who had been struck by a falling 55 gallon drum containing spent resins. The drum had been punctured by a fork lift. This resulted in the Radwaste Handler becoming contaminated and injured. For the purpose of the drill, the Radwaste Handler suffered facial abrasions and a compound fracture of the right femur, which had torn through his protective clothing (PCs). To provide realism for the medical team and health physics (HP) personnel, a nurse had applied make-up to the "victim" to illustrate these injuries. The scenario facilitated response by HP personnel, Security personnel and Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs). San Clemente General Hospital had been pre-selected as the facility that would receive the "victim", conduct decontamination and provide further medical attention. The "victim" was transported to the hospital via the Southern California Edison (SCE) ambulance. It should be noted that the drill had to be terminated early due to the level of activity at the emergency room.

4. Federal Evaluators

The drill was evaluated by the NRC and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). One NRC inspector evaluated the licensee's response and three FEMA representatives evaluated the response of the emergency room

staff at the hospital. FEMA, Region IX, personnel stated that a formal report, based on their observations, would not be issued.

5. NRC Observations

- A. The EMTs performed promptly, effectively and efficiently. Use of a "dirty" team and a "clean" team was particularly noteworthy.
- B. The extent to which make-up was used on the "victim" provided a high level of realism for the respondents.
- C. Participants in the drill, including the "victim", demonstrated a positive aggressive attitude toward the drill.
- D. There was good coordination between the HP Technicians, EMTs and hospital personnel.
- E. Although the HP Technicians attempted to explain the actions they would be taking, their performance could not be fully evaluated due to the extent of simulation. The following examples of excessive simulation/poor staging were observed:
 - (1) The HP Technicians had no dosimetry.
 - (2) PCs, including gloves, were not used.
 - (3) No area controls were established.
 - (4) Supplies such as absorbent materials were not utilized.
 - (5) Props such as 55 gallon drums and a substance to simulate the spent resin were not utilized.

6. Critique

Immediately following the drill, a critique was held at the hospital. The FEMA evaluators were present at this critique. A formal critique for the onsite portion of the drill was conducted on June 11, 1987. The NRC inspector did not attend this critique; however, during a telephone conversation on June 18, 1987, NA&EP personnel provided the inspector with a verbal summary of the issues covered at the critique. During this conversation, licensee personnel stated that the excessive simulation led to one objective not being met and one other only being minimally met. Additionally, the licensee has determined that as remedial action, a mini-drill would be conducted to test the HP aspects during a medical emergency. The licensee indicated that the problems that were experienced were associated with less than adequate preparation.

7. Exit Interview

The inspector held an exit interview with the licensee on June 10, 1987 to discuss the preliminary findings of the inspection. The attachment to this report identifies the licensee personnel who were present at the meeting. The observations described in Section 5 were mentioned. The

inspector, acknowledging the licensee's recognition of the problems and system for corrective actions, stated she would review the documentation and corrective actions during a subsequent inspection.

ATTACHMENTEXIT INTERVIEW ATTENDEES

- D. Bennette, Supervisor, SEP
- C. Couser, Compliance Engineer
- D. Dack, Quality Assurance Engineer
- J. Firoved, Emergency Planning Engineer
- P. Knapp, Manager, Health Physics
- D. Peacor, Manager, SEP