

50-322 0L-3

SC EP 71

I-SC-71
11/83



DOCKET NUMBER
PROD & UTIL. FAC. 50-322(0L-3)

NOVEMBER, 1983

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50-322-0L Official Exh. No. SC EP 71
 In the matter of Shoreham - Emergency Planning
 Staff _____ IDENTIFIED _____
 Applicant _____ RECEIVED _____
 Intervenor _____ REJECTED _____
 Cont'g Off'r _____
 Contractor _____ DATE 6/15/84
 Other _____ Witness _____
 Reporter R. Eyster

8408170242 840615
PDR ADOCK 05000322
G PDR

Area Evaluated

Monitors Rating

9. Were the correct private lines used and did non-emergency communications interfere with emergency transmissions? (No = 5, Yes = 1)

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. (5)

10. Were logs used effectively by personnel to review past events and to trend data?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O.

N.A.

11. Were appropriate communications techniques followed? (Phonetic alphabet, sign-on, sign-off, no abbreviations or acronyms)

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. (1)

poor radio technique in 1 case
Fair in the other
real need for radio training for communicators

C. Procedures

1. Were personnel generally familiar with the relevant procedures?

5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

2. Were procedures followed?

5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

3. Were personnel so overwhelmed with procedural requirements that they were distracted from the appropriate response?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O.

NO

4. Were the procedures appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O.

yes & No
They were some obvious shortcomings in the traffic procedures.

D. Direction and Control

1. Could the response be categorized as a team effort or a group of individual efforts? (Team = 5, Individuals = 1)

(5) 4 3 2 1 N.O.

2. Was there an effective mechanism for resolving differences of opinion regarding technical issues and actions to be taken?

5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

3. Was there excessive noise and loitering in the response facility? (No = 5, Yes = 1)

(5) 4 3 2 1 N.O.

E. Material and Equipment

1. Was all the required material and equipment available?

NO = 5

(5) 4 3 2 1 N.O.

NO Logbook/Record books
Dedicated Lines did not work
& other stuff

Area Evaluated

Monitors Rating

G. Access Control

- 1. Has an appropriate access control posture established? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
- 2. Was there an identifiable system implemented that effectively identified authorized personnel within the facility? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

H. Summary

- 1. Describe any problems noted by the area being evaluated. Provide a description of the problem, its outcome or effect and any recommended corrective courses of action to alleviate or correct the deficiency. Any of the previously listed areas that receive an evaluation grade of 2 or 1 require a written explanation on this page.

~~Group~~ Group was disorganized and unfamiliar with their procedures at the beginning of the drill causing confusion and little being accomplished. After I spoke to the Transportation Support Coord, about establishing order, ^{the situation} ~~things~~ improved. Again, a critique with the ~~entire~~ group is advisable.

B-2) Transportation Support Communicator unfamiliar with equipment.

B-5) periodic updates were not performed, Transportation Support Coord. apprehensive about taking charge.

B-11) Communicator unfamiliar with Radio jargon.

D-2) See B-5

 11/10/82
Evaluators Signature / Date

E-5) Status Board could be approved. Group had prepared own Status Board. Worked well

Area Evaluated

Monitors Rating

2. Did personnel check to ensure that all equipment was available and functional early in the activation process?

5 4 3 2 (1) N.O.
Yes = 1

3. If equipment was inoperable or failed in use, were appropriate actions taken to resolve the deficiency? (spares/backup equipment)

5 4 3 2 (1) N.O.

4. Were there any situations in which the lack of equipment, or a lack of ability to operate the equipment, prevented personnel from completing their tasks? (No = 5, Yes = 1) If so, please indicate details.

5 4 3 2 (1) N.O.
dedicated line problems necessitated the use of radios & communicators had varying degrees of expertise with radio.

5. Were there any situations in which additional equipment or materials, or different types of equipment could have made the activity more effective? (No = 5, Yes = 1) If so, please indicate details.

5 4 3 2 (1) N.O.
More & better dedicated lines
more & better maps
more & better radio training

6. Could the area support the personnel assigned to it?

5 4 3 2 (1) N.O.
Yes = 1

7. Were there sufficient resource materials readily available to support the conduct of the response? (maps, reference documents, copies of plans and procedures, data sheets, etc.)

5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
NO = 5
yes = 1

F. Protective Measures

1. Were appropriate protective measures implemented for response personnel?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. NA

2. Did personnel properly wear protective clothing and dosimetry?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. NA

3. Were appropriate radiological practices observed?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. NA

4. Were field personnel kept apprised of radiological conditions?

5 4 3 2 1 (N.O.)

5. Were response activities conducted with regard for personnel safety, consistent with the need to complete the activity?

5 4 3 2 1 N.O. NA

JANUARY 24, 1984

Area Evaluated

Monitors Rating

G. Access Control

- 1. Was an appropriate access control posture established? 5 4 (3) 2 1 N.O.
- 2. Was there an identifiable system implemented that effectively identified authorized personnel within the facility? (5) 4 3 2 1 N.O.

H. Summary

- 1. Describe any problems noted by the area being evaluated. Provide a description of the problem, its outcome or effect and any recommended corrective courses of action to alleviate or correct the deficiency. Any of the previously listed areas that receive an evaluation grade of 2 or 1 require a written explanation on this page.

B1 & E5) Pt. Jefferson Direct line inoperable
 other communication was utilized.
 Situation handed over to equipment group.

B4 & B6) Communication messages were in disarray
 will improve with practice.

B5 & B2) Better control of ^{his} people by Senior
 Coordinator. This will be discussed
 to improve group organization.

B11) Communicators need to review Jargon.

Overall appraisal:

Good

Monitors Signature / Date

DRILL COMMENTS

Riverhead Staging Area

Communications:

1. Too many calls on direct line.
2. Background noise at EOC very bad over radio.
3. Traffic guides had problems with radios.
4. Suggested using a P.A. System throughout the building.
5. Use a standard Radio Log (Ex: transmitting or receiving, etc.).
6. Suggested using Radio Cards to understand terminology.
7. Road Crews and Route Spotters cannot talk to Brentwood on Channel 3 - then switch to Channel 10.

Bus Maps:

1. Spirals too small - maps coming apart.
2. Problem with Doctor's Path - icing (flood area).
3. Scaling on maps not accurate (map with Edwards Avenue).
4.
5. Eastport Sub. - Route 55 is Eastport Manor Road (it does not show that).

Route Alert Drivers:

1. Can they be used for something else after the sirens go off?
2. They would like more than 1 person in car.
3. 5 mph too slow; would like to average 12-15 mph. One driver said it took 76 minutes at 5 mph to cover whole trip.
4. Scale marking on map.
5. Route Alert Driver emphasized need to go up private driveways.
6. In farm areas do you still maintain speed?

Area Evaluated

Monitors Rating

- 9. Were the correct private lines used and did non-emergency communications interfere with emergency transmissions? (No = 5, Yes = 1) 5 4 (3) 2 1 N.O. DEDICATED LINE USED TOO MUCH. RADIO +
- 10. Were logs used effectively by personnel to review past events and to trend data? 5 4 3 2 1 (N.O.)
- 11. Were appropriate communications techniques followed? (Phonetic alphabet, sign-on, sign-off, no abbreviations or acronyms) 5 4 (3) 2 1 N.O. TRAFFIC GUIDER NEED MORE EXPOSURE.

C. Procedures

- 1. Were personnel generally familiar with the relevant procedures? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
- 2. Were procedures followed? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
- 3. Were personnel so overwhelmed with procedural requirements that they were distracted from the appropriate response? 5 4 3 (2) 1 N.O.
- 4. Were the procedures appropriate? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

D. Direction and Control

- 1. Could the response be categorized as a team effort or a group of individual efforts? (Team = 5, Individuals = 1) 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
- 2. Was there an effective mechanism for resolving differences of opinion regarding technical issues and actions to be taken? 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.
- 3. Was there excessive noise and loitering in the response facility? (No = 5, Yes = 1) 5 (4) 3 2 1 N.O.

E. Material and Equipment

- 1. Was all the required material and equipment available? 5 4 3 2 1 N.O. YES

B6. No communications logs were kept by the Staging Area coord.

B7. There was some questions by the Administrative Staff - Staging Area about where the information was to come from. In addition, only part of the Status board was used.

The Status board was placed outside behind the Bus Dispatcher for everyone to see.

However, it is very unlikely that anyone besides the bus dispatcher and the Lead Traffic Guide knew what the information on that status board meant or what to do with it.

B8. NO. But there should be a line towards standardizing all communications between the EOC and the Staging Areas. In other words here forms like the Radiological Emergency Data Form. This will help both the EOC and the Staging Area

FEBRUARY 8, 1984

Summary

In your own words, describe and evaluate the demonstrated activities, capabilities and resources, or lack thereof, covered by this section. Put the facts recorded in the "yes/no" questions in perspective. Explain the deficiencies, and also note the exceptionally good performances.

Due to the simulation aspects - ~~some~~ some of the communication links were not demonstrated

15. High speed teletype very handy. It's location might be changed to be more readily visible or assign person to monitor the teletype and distribute messages. Several messages were typed on the machine undisturbed.

- The line to Port Jefferson only goes one way - can only receive on the coast pick up on the boat and send on Port Jeff
- Overhead the line run on Portchoyne set. (used to be one set.)
- Better radio protocol practices needed.
- Communications in the Red Health area is low
 maneuvered for related periods of time.

II COMMAND AND CONTROL

1. Person was in charge at all times
Insufficient @ Pathegoe good
2. - No general emergency briefings @ P.S. - ^{R.S. delayed - very} Patch - OK
- People in SA not familiar with general terminology - i.e. what is a release, class of emergency etc
- Communications to people ~~not~~ given but they do not listen.
3. No radiological information given to people given out to the field

III DOCUMENTATION & LOGS - CONSIDER

1. 15 not enough connections
 2. Records OK.
 3. Word for KI to the SA. - not taken in the SA. - no forms available for KI distribution.
7. Kuhlman finished in 45 min. Patch in 1 hour
Post JFH > 2 hours

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Radio given out at R.H. prior to the word coming from the C.O.C. Communications check was good at R.H.
2. Med by dispatching form for Lead Traffic Guide
3. General radio protocol training is needed
4. Post JFH line - cannot receive from FCC. - ^{not com.} hand in
5. Field survey team same freq as Patch ~~T.S.~~
6. Better use of regular dial phones

V. Communications

Yes No N/A N/O

1. For each of the following:

a. Indicate whether communication was demonstrated (Yes, No, etc.)

b. Name the communication system used on the dotted line (dedicated land line, two-way radio, commercial phone, etc.)

- Local EOC/primary	Dedicated line	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
/backup	Outside line.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
- Bus Drivers		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Traffic Guides	Radio	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
- Road Crews		_____	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Route Alert Drivers		_____	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Route Spotters		_____	_____	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Transfer Points	Radio	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____

2. Were radio communications easily understood, i.e., no static?

_____ _____

3. Was there too much communication traffic on the radio frequency?

_____ _____

4. In general, were communications good?

5. Were messages written down?

6. Were they retained for future reference?

7. Were any communications problems rectified?

2. Not EASILY. A lot of walk over some static. Poor Radio Etiquette.

3. A lot yes, but too much; I think not

TRAFFIC BLOCKAGE DRILL

TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AT POINT 35 CONSIDERED SITUATION AND DECIDED TO MOVE CONES TO AID EXISTING TRAFFIC FLOW. AFTER SOME HESITATION INFORMED BASE AND "AWAITING FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS." BASE DID NOT ACKNOWLEDGE AND NO FURTHER COMMUNICATIONS. AFTER 1/2 HOUR GOT PERMISSION TO COME IN.

AFTER I GOT IN, I WENT TO RADIO ROOM WHERE THEY WERE TRYING TO GET HOLD OF MY CAR TO GIVE INSTRUCTIONS ON WHAT TO DO ABOUT TRAFFIC STOPPAGE. INDICATES FOLLOWING PROBLEMS

- RADIO ROOM HAS NO WAY TO TRACK STATUS OF TRAFFIC POINTS
- INSUFFICIENT RELAY OF MESSAGES
(LEAD TRAFFIC CONTROLLER GOT MESSAGE ABOUT POINT 35, THOUGHT IT WAS SAME MESSAGE AS FROM POINT 63, AND DISREGARDED)
- IN ADDITION, RADIO OPERATION SAYS THAT NO UNIFORM LANGUAGE BEING USED
(CB, FIDELITY, LILCO STANDARD)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY and
LOCAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE ORGANIZATION
NUCLEAR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EXERCISE

OBSERVER CONTROLLER LOG SHEET

Name: [REDACTED]

Date: 2-8-84

Location: Port Jeff

TIME

OBSERVATION/COMMENT

1:00 PM	MESSAGE IN TO LD TRAF GUIDE TO DISPATCH A ROW CREW TO ZONE 2
1:09	DEDICATED PHONE TO EDC OUT OF ORDER - SOMETIMES WORKS (INTERMITTENT)
1:25	1 ST RADIO CHECK CAME IN
1:37	CALL TO [REDACTED] (TAKEN BY [REDACTED]) THE FEEDBACK TO ROW INDICATES THAT THE BUS DISPATCHER OR PERSON ANSWERING PHONE FOR DISPATCHER DOES NOT HAVE THE EDC/PT JEFF STG AREA DISPATCHING FORMS. (ROW DROPPED THEM OFF YESTERDAY) DIFFERENT PARTS OF MESSAGE FORMS ARE BEING GIVEN OUT - SHOULD BE CONSISTENT.
2:03	2 MINUTE TIME SPAN OF FE UNIDENTIFIABLE COMMUNICATIONS VIA RADIOS. POSSIBLE HORSEPLAY BY TRAFFIC GUIDES OR MULTIPLE CALLERS "STEPPING" ON EACH OTHER. PORT JEFF BASE STATION MONITOR ^(TUNY) ASKED ALL CALLERS IN THAT TIME SPAN TO REPEAT THEIR MESSAGES ONE AT A TIME.
2:10	ONE PHONE ANSWERED AND LEFT HANGING TILL PARTY HUNG UP. (BRENTWOOD PHONE)

(2)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY and
LOCAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE ORGANIZATION
NUCLEAR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EXERCISE

OBSERVER CONTROLLER LOG SHEET

Name: [REDACTED]

Date: 02/09/84

Location: PAT. S.A.

TIME

OBSERVATION/COMMENT

2.

IT WAS OBSERVED THAT TRAFFIC GUIDES DO NOT USE "LILCO" CALL-#'S AND EXPRESSIONS WHEN CALLING INTO THE PATCHOGUE STAGING AREA BASE-RADIO. TRAINING IS REQUIRED.

3.

TRANSFER POINT COORDINATORS NEED COLD-WEATHER CLOTHING TO ALLOW COMFORT WHEN STANDING OUT-OF-HIS-VEHICLE FOR LONG PERIODS

- Port Jeff line - can only receive on the EOC
- Radio systems and RCI's were sent out with regular Traffic Guide radios from SA and could not be communicated with via the normal means

- Two new communicators on EOC who training
- TCR #35 - Traffic guide from Patchogue & Road Crew from Port Jefferson
- Used new message forms from 3a
- Procedure for messages needs system for numbering
- Admin staff to act as runner for getting messages delivered.
- ~~Get into to ability the radio call~~

General Services & Rel Ctr.

- Ambulance list
- Hospital list
- Well ambulances to who be sent out for drills
- 1245 - Home conductor called people at home before the PDR were made.
- 1345 - Ambulance dispatched to SA.
- 1345 - Ambulance dispatched from SA.
- check on Swan Hill school - does it exist.
- check on messages n.e. private vs public schools
- Not all 3a procedures in all the books

Rad Health

- DOE observer created a lot of confusion in EOC. Took away from E.K.'s time and placed doubt in the mind of some of the people as to how DOE/LAP would function.
- ⇒ - Communications in Rad Health are very bad. No one picked up the telephone when I was ringing, no messages taken. [GENERAL COMMENT ON COMMUNICATIONS IN EOC]
- ⇒ - RHC should tell communicators of he is going out of the room.

General

- Used framing in "showman ship".

FEBRUARY 15, 1984

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY and
LOCAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE ORGANIZATION
NUCLEAR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EXERCISE

OBSERVER CONTROLLER LOG SHEET

Name: [redacted]

Date: 2-15-84

Location: Port Jeff Comm

TIME

OBSERVATION/COMMENT

*

NEED PREPRINTED FORM ~~BY~~ BY RADIO NUMBERS IN NUMERICAL ORDER (WITH COLS FOR ~~CONTROL~~ CONTROL PT, INITIAL RADIO CTE, ARRIVAL @ CNTRPT, DEPARTURE FOR BASE, ARRIVAL @ BASE) TO FACILITATE RADIO COMMUNICATIONS.

2:10

TOO MANY ^{TRAFFIC GUIDES} ~~WERE~~ WERE CALLING 'THE BASE' IN RAPID SUCCESSION WITHOUT WAITING FOR THE BASE TO RESPOND TO THE FIRST CALLER. THIS IS EITHER LACK OF COURTESY ON THE AIR (OR TOOLING AROUND BY THE DRIVERS) OR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE USE OF THE AIRWAYS. PERHAPS BETTER TRAINING IN THE USE OF RADIOS IS REQ'D.

2:15

ONE ROUTE DRIVER WAS LOST

RADIO OPERATORS ^{ARE} BEING ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT DRIVING X-ROUTES TO WHICH THEY HAD NO IDEA WHAT WAS BEING ASKED OF THEM. BETTER BRIEFING OF OPERATORS AS TO THE NATURE OF THE REQUESTS EXPECTED, ~~IS NECESSARY~~ ^{AND} WHO TO DIRECT THE REQUEST FOR RESPONSE TO, IS NECESSARY. OPERATORS ^{REQUEST} ~~NEED~~ A LIST OF ^{WHAT IS CALLED US} ~~WHAT IS CALLED US~~ SUPPOSED TO BE DOING.

*

SUGGEST 2 PEOPLE WORK RADIO WITH HEADSETS AND SPLIT LIST OF RADIOS IN TWO. TOO MANY TRANSMISSIONS IN ^{AN EXTENDED} ~~THE SAME~~ TIME FOR ONE OPERATOR TO HANDLE / NEVER GETS A CHANCE TO ^{RECOVER} ~~RECOVER~~

V Communications

- Poor Radio Etiquette by field personnel who have had no specific training on radio usage.
- Lack of Drill status in most messages.

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY and
LOCAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE ORGANIZATION
NUCLEAR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS EXERCISE

OBSERVER CONTROLLER LOG SHEET

Name: _____

Date: _____

Location: _____

TIME

OBSERVATION/COMMENT

Met JEFFERSON

Rad. Controls

- PJ got the word on KI
- Started to run out it documents - Got extra and had them passed

Conversations

- Poor radio protocol and etiquette - holding mike up to ear radios. Joking and laughing around.

~~lack of good communication~~

V. Communications

	Yes	No	N/A	N/O
1. For each of the following:				
a. Indicate whether communication was demonstrated (Yes, No, etc.)	✓			
b. Name the communication system used on the dotted line (dedicated land line, two-way radio, commercial phone, etc.)				
- Local EOC/primary ^{DED +} _{Comm. PHONE} /backup	✓			
- Bus Drivers _{Comm. PHONE}	✓			✓
- Traffic Guides _{RADIO}	✓			
- Road Crews				✓
- Route Alert Drivers				✓
- Route Spotters				✓
- Transfer Points _{RADIO}	✓			
2. Were radio communications easily understood, i.e., no static?	✓			
3. Was there too much communication traffic on the radio frequency?	✓			
4. In general, were communications good?		✓		
5. Were messages written down?	✓			
6. Were they retained for future reference?	✓			
7. Were any communications problems rectified?		✓		

VI. Scenario

Summary

Comment on the adequacy of the scenario. Did it provide enough activity? Was it realistic? Did it test areas of earlier deficiency?

THE LATE G.E. CAUSED A HELTIC AFTERNOON SCHEDULE. RADIO PERSONNEL NEED MORE TRAINING IN HANDLING QUESTIONS ASKED OF THEM (AND WHO TO DIRECT QUESTIONS ~~TO~~.)

MESSAGES TO EDC CANNOT BE ^{DIRECTED TO BE} GIVEN BY RADIO OPERATORS AS THEY ARE TOO BUSY.

SCENARIO WAS REALISTIC ~~FOR~~ ^{FOR} SHOWING ^{ING} SHORTCOMINGS OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS AS DESCRIBED EARLIER AND ON OBSERV/COMMENT SITS.

THERE WERE NO MAJOR CHANGES MADE TO OVERCOME EARLIER DEFICIENCIES - THEREFORE THEY ~~W~~ STILL EXISTED.

V. Communications

	Yes	No	N/A	N/O
1. For each of the following:				
a. Indicate whether communication was demonstrated (Yes, No, etc.)	✓			
b. Name the communication system used on the dotted line (dedicated land line, two-way radio, commercial phone, etc.)				
- Local EOC/primary	_____	_____	_____	_____
/backup	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Bus Drivers	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Traffic Guides	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Road Crews	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Route Alert Drivers	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Route Spotters	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Transfer Points	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Were radio communications easily understood, i.e., no static?	_____	_____	_____	✓
3. Was there too much communication traffic on the radio frequency?	_____	_____	_____	✓
4. In general, were communications good?	_____	✓	_____	_____
5. Were messages written down?	✓	_____	_____	_____
6. Were they retained for future reference?	✓	_____	_____	_____
7. Were any communications problems rectified?	_____	_____	_____	✓

Not directly involved with observation/control of communications. However, from the traffic control standpoint, it seems that communications from EOC is slow and a possible weak link. Controller did have to give contingency message no. IV-52. Message for traffic guide dispatch had only 32 of 50 - 9 - TCP's with no indication of the number of traffic guides to send to each TCP.

Summary

In your own words, describe and evaluate the demonstrated activities, capabilities and resources, or lack thereof, covered by this section. Put the facts recorded in the "yes/no" questions in perspective. Explain the deficiencies, and also note the exceptionally good performance.

→ Item ④:

There were a number of no-shows as indicated in comment/observation sheets, specifically

- a. 8-traffic guides fail to come and 2 extremely late & 2 went home sick; also 3 have real-life medical problems that would prohibit them from taking the KI tablets; thus they cannot be used in a real emergency.
- b. ~~3 Road spotters~~, 1 Rte spotter & 2 Rte alert drivers no-show.

Item ②:

Lead traffic guides performed well in response to the messages received. However, without knowing the background information, it appears from the traffic control standpoint that communications from the EOC is not good.

The lead traffic guides were prompt in notifying coordinator of actions taken.

Item ③: Lead traffic ~~control~~ guides were responsive and well-prepared. A review of OPIP 3-6-3 (by them) is suggested.

Summary

In your own words, describe and evaluate the demonstrated activities, capabilities and resources, or lack thereof, covered by this section. Put the facts recorded in the "yes/no" questions in perspective. Explain the deficiencies, and also note the exceptionally good performance.

PHONE COMMUNICATIONS WERE GOOD EXCEPT WHEN RADIO COMMUNICATIONS MADE IT DIFFICULT TO HEAR OVER THE PHONE.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS WERE EXCESSIVE FOR ONE OPERATOR AND TOO LOUD FOR THE ROOM. HEADPHONES WOULD HELP - SEE OBSERVATION COMMENT SHEETS.

PHONE MESSAGES WERE HANDLED WELL WITH BUT ONE OPERATOR WROTE ALL MESSAGES TWICE (1ST TIME WAS ON SCRATCH PAPER)

THERE WAS A MISCOMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE RADIO OPERATOR AND THE BUS DISPATCHER. A VEHICLE STUCK IN THE MUD WAS INITIALLY THOUGHT TO BE A DRILL BUT WAS THE REAL THING. ~~3~~ EDC WASN'T NOTIFIED UNTIL 3:40 (POSS 2 HRS AFTER INITIAL CALL) AS BUS DISPATCHER THOUGHT RADIO OPERATOR CALLED IT IN TO EDC BUT OPERATOR WAS OVERWHELMED WITH RADIO CALLS AND DIDN'T DO IT. OPERATOR ALSO DIDN'T REALIZE THE BUS DISPATCHER WANTED HER TO CALL IT IN TO EDC.

RADIO CALLS BECAME OVERWHELMING AND NOT LOGGED IN COMPLETELY/CORRECTLY.