

OROGO Emergency Response Exercise Report

Exercise Date and Contact Information

Date of exercise: 2024-05-23

Exercise contractor: Wotherspoon Environmental Inc.

Operator name: Utilities Group Facilities Inc.

Operator contact person: John Hogg

OA#:OA-2520-2620

Exercise Details

Name: 2024 Ikhil Emergency Response exercise

Type:

 Full scale (live) Table-top

Objectives:

1. Demonstrate and practice initial emergency response procedures including situation size up: (incident confirmation, hazard assessments, escalation potential, and resource needs)
2. Demonstrate and practice Incident Command activation.
3. Develop a public protection measures plan in a timely fashion.
4. Develop a Communication/Notification plan in a timely fashion

Location:

 On site (full scale or table-top exercise) at:
Inuvik Gate Station Virtual (table-top exercise only) Hybrid (table-top exercise only)

Summary of scenario: Response to a high consequence pipeline release inside Inuvik town limits. During the exercise the Emergency services (Police, Fire, Ambulance) were oriented to the IGL and UGFI operations. The IGL team engaged with then Inuvik Fire department on developing a plan for public protection and pipeline isolation.

Exercise scope includes control room initial actions? Yes No

Summary of Exercise Evaluation

Area of Evaluation	Results	See Section(s)
A. Exercise planning and design	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	All planning and design was conducted without inclusion of regulatory bodies and site staff and was contracted out to third party. The exercise focused on the tactical aspects of the incident but did not seem to engage the incident management aspects.
B. Exercise facilitation and control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	Initial briefing and oversight was maintained throughout the exercise.

C. During the exercise:		
1. Activating emergency response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	GM activated emergency response Approx. 1450h
2. Notifying and reporting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	GM assigned JH as Liaison Officer, CB as Operations Section Chief
3. Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	Adjacent buildings within the plume evacuated and traffic control put in place and coordinated by the fire department
4. Response management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
5. Use of communications technologies	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<p>Staff Primarily used cell phones for communication between IC and the field and third party support (FD and RCMP)</p> <p>It was unclear if the phones in use were intrinsically safe and caused some delays in information sharing as phones only allowed for 2 person communication.</p> <p>Use of intrinsically safe radios is recommended as it will keep all responders and IC more situationally aware.</p>
6. External communications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
7. Tactical and strategic response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
8. Public protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	FD erected and staffed traffic control and road blocks based on current information.
9. Environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
10. Post-emergency phase	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
D. Post-Exercise Debriefing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	Debrief with all participants took place following the exercise conclusion and provided opportunity for all participants to speak.

Exercise Participants (add rows as required)

Operator personnel

Name and title: John Hogg, TriSummit Ikhil Asset Manager

Attended in person

Attended virtually

Name and title: Robin Gaskell, General Manager	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Conrad Bourque, IGL Supervisor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Caitlin Weitzel, IGL Office Manager	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Jaymes Arey, IGL Operator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Billy Balaban, Ikhil Contract operator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Adrian Kagyat, IGL Operator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Tony Stefure, IGL Operator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually

Contractor personnel

Name and title: Adam Lazenby, FSX Facilitator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Thomas Spencer, FSX Facilitator	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title:	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually

Local community and Indigenous organization representatives

Name and title: Jesse Aubin, RCMP Detachment Commander	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: John Hicks, Deputy Fire Chief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Brian Larman, Fire Chief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Stephane Villeneuve, Fire Fighter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
Name and title: Kate King, Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually

Other participants

Name and title: Joanne Munroe, CER Emergency Management (Observer)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attended in person <input type="checkbox"/> Attended virtually
--	---

Name and title: Abul Kabir, CER Engineering (Observer)

 Attended in person Attended virtually

OROGO Evaluator(s)

Name and title: Michael Martin, Chief Safety/Conservation Officer (Observer)

 Attended in person Attended virtually

Name and title:

 Attended in person Attended virtually

Name and title:

 Attended in person Attended virtually

Name and title:

 Attended in person Attended virtually

A. Exercise Planning and Design

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Was an exercise participant package distributed prior to the exercise date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| 2. Was OROGO involved in the development of the exercise? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| 3. Are the exercise objectives attainable, measurable, and realistic? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: While the exercise was well designed, the use of an LNG tanker truck in the scenario does not seem realistic as LNG is not shipped in the Inuvialuit or Gwich'in regions at the time of the exercise. |
| 4. Were local responders and key stakeholders invited to participate in the planning process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Yes, Fire, paramedic and RCMP were involved in the exercise |
| 5. Which Indigenous governments / organizations were invited to observe the exercise? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Unknown |
| 6. Which, if any, Indigenous governments / organizations were invited to participate in the exercise? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Unknown |

Version: June 26, 2024

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 7. Were participating Indigenous governments / organizations involved in the development of the exercise? Did they identify specific issues or concerns that were incorporated into the exercise design? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Unknown |
| 8. Was appropriate mitigation established for environmental and socio-economic resources potential affected by conducting the exercise? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: traffic control and road blocks while stationed during the exercise were placed in an adjacent area as to not impeded movement of the public and vehicles not participating in the exercise. |

Other notes on exercise planning and design: The exercise was well planned and designed apart from item #3. It is expected that these exercises incorporate actual incidents and hazardous materials that may be encountered in the area of the exercise. As mentioned in Summary, the exercise focused more on the tactical aspects and not the incident management.

RECOMMENDATION

UGFI should conduct a follow up exercise that includes the use of their 'Incident Management Processes' to gather information, plan development, logistical/resource requirement identification, communications to affected parties, etc.

B. Exercise Facilitation and Control

For all exercises

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Did the facilitator go over the scenario, objectives, and results of play (including how to stop the exercise in the event of a real emergency)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| 2. Does the exercise scenario reflect the operator's authorized operations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: While it was an LNG truck collision, which is not currently part of the operations at the Gate station, collision with the pipeline riser by a vehicle is possible. See reported near miss from vehicle collision with gate station fence on October 22, 2023. |
| 3. Were injects appropriate? Did they adequately progress the scenario? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: The collision was escalated to a release and impacts to near by properties which were managed. As control of the situation was attained, source gas terminated from the pipeline, aspects were deescalated as appropriate. |
| 4. Were there enough operator personnel to simulate all the required aspects / agencies of the exercise? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

For full scale exercises only

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 5. Were site security, public safety, and the need for medical assistance appropriately planned to enable safe conduct of the exercise? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| 6. Did the facilitator conduct a safety briefing prior to beginning the exercise? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| 7. At the field location(s), did the facilitator conduct a safety meeting to review site specific hazards and controls for participant safety? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: OROGO evaluator was at the IC at the beginning of the exercise and not in the field initially to observe briefings. |

Other notes on exercise facilitation and control: OROGO was satisfied with the level of exercise control during the scenario.

C. During the Exercise

1. Activating emergency response

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| a) Did the operator activate an emergency response in accordance with the Contingency Plan (CP)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| b) Did the operator determine a level of emergency or severity of the incident according to its CP? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: The ERP at the IC was missing the page that defined the level of the emergency. This was clarified through the LO copy of the ERP. The GM flagged this in the debriefing and committed to updating the ERP at the UGFI office. |
| c) Did the operator establish a unified command as part of its response? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: While no formal UC as established, coordination with the RCMP, Fire Department and Paramedics was conducted. |
- If yes, list unified command participants:

Other notes on activating emergency response:

2. Notifying and reporting

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Were all potentially affected people, communities, and stakeholders identified? How were they identified? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Local emergency response authorities, impacted property owners and UGFI staff were notified. This ranged from phone calls to in person notification. |
|--|--|--|

Version: June 26, 2024

2. Were all notifications made in a realistic manner and in accordance with the CP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
3. Did the operator report the incident to OROGO following established incident reporting procedures? Was the report accurate and in line with the scenario?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: The incident was reported to the OROGO incident report line and relayed to the OROGO exercise observer within 17 minutes. The report accurately reflected the stage of the exercise when it was reported.
Other notes on notifying and reporting: Notifications were issued as per the ERP and OGOA. OROGO notification system worked as designed.		
3. Safety		
a) What type of product was released and were its specific hazards discussed and actioned?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: LNG truck collide with riser at gate station. Initial release of product unknown as origin could be from the truck or natural gas pipeline or both. Later determined to be the riser was ruptured releasing natural gas. Wind direction and concentration levels were regularly monitored. Adjacent properties were notified and evacuated as necessary. Fire department conducted traffic control to limit access to the impacted area. Operator closed gate valve upstream of the gate station to allow the damaged pipeline to depressurize.
b) Were product-specific characteristics / considerations and potential receptors considered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
c) Did the operator develop a safety plan for the response and conduct a safety briefing with responders and other field staff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: ERP was actioned, but the OROGO Observer was at the IC during the start of the incident so did not observe safety briefing in the field
d) Did the operator personnel have access to and use the required personal protective equipment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
e) Did the operator personnel have access to and use the required safety equipment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:

Other notes on safety: Safety of Operator, responders and public were adequately addressed

4. Response management

a) Did the operator respond in accordance with its CP and supporting documents?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
b) Did responders adapt to the changing conditions of the scenario as required?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
c) Did the operator have an incident management system (ICS or other) in place and demonstrate knowledge of / training in that system?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
d) Were the basic elements and principles of incident management followed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
e) Were roles assigned consistent with the operator's CP? Did personnel adhere to their assigned roles?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
f) Were meeting schedules established? Were meetings orderly, effective, and purposeful?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: The exercise only lasted approximately 90 minutes so regular situation reports were not needed. If yes, list meetings conducted:
g) Were incident objectives and response priorities established and appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: Source Control, public access limited, response personnel notified, regulatory authority notified.
h) Was an Operational Period established?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:

i) Were critical roles visibly identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: ICS roles not clearly visible but given the small number of participants, it was not necessary. UGFI, Fire Department, Paramedic and RCMP readily identifiable.
j) Were appropriate maps (or mapping) available, used, and up to date?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
k) Was the incident status board displayed and maintained?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: OROGO Observer was in the field once the incident was reported to the facility manager and did not observe if an incident status board was used.
l) Were field conditions monitored? How was field information relayed to the ICP/EOC?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: Wind direction and gas concentration in the atmosphere was regularly monitored and relayed in person to field staff and to the IC by phone.
m) Were the expected steps following throughout the exercise and in the lead up to the (possible) development of an IAP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: Appropriate steps were taken. IAP creation was not required.
n) Did an EOC provide active support to the response? What role did it play in supporting the response and was it effective?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: Notification to responders and regulators, tracked information as the incident developed.
o) Did the operator consider and facilitate interagency coordination at all levels and appropriately manage response functions outside of ICS?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:

Other notes on response management:

5. Use of communications technologies

a) Were the primary communication method and technology effective and efficient?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments: The primary method of communication was cellphones which raises concerns about those devices being intrinsically safe. The cellphones also limited the dissemination of information due to only two people at a time being on the phone. Use of two-way radios should be considered.
--	--	--

Version: June 26, 2024

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| b) Were the contingency communication method and technology effective and efficient? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| c) Did the operator effectively and efficiently integrate communications with other first responders or stakeholders involved in the response? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| d) If virtual meetings were used during the response, were they used effectively? Were issues with bandwidth or connectivity addressed? Did the operator adapt to technological limitations and constraints? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

Other notes on use of communications technologies:

6. External communications

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| a) Was an external communications strategy developed? Did it consider all potentially affected audiences, including Indigenous governments / organizations? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments:

If yes, list audiences provided with targeted communications: |
| b) What were the primary strategic and platforms used for external communications? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Cell phones |
| c) Were external communications coordinated among responding or supporting agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: The OROGO observer did not evaluate supporting agency communications.

If yes, list agencies:

<input type="checkbox"/> Joint Information Centre established |

Other notes on external communications:

7. Tactical and strategic response

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| a) Were the roles and responsibilities of the operator vs. emergency services and other responders documented and understood? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| b) As the operator able to effectively coordinate with internal and external stakeholders to develop and execute appropriate strategies and tactics? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| c) Did the operator conduct a tactical and strategic response according to its CP and supporting documents? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| d) Did the operator demonstrate ongoing situational awareness that resulted in reassessing and updating strategies and tactics? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

Other notes on tactical and strategic response:

8. Public protection

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| a) Were potential impacts to the public anticipated and planned for? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| b) Were affected people provided with personal protection instructions? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: it was stated that people at adjacent properties were notified and evacuated where necessary, but this was not actioned as it was not crucial for the implementation of the exercise |
| c) How was the evacuation process managed? Was there a documented plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| d) Were operator staff present at reception centers to keep evacuees informed? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: Operator staff were available at the UGFI office. Additionally, field staff maintain the permitter were able to provide guidance. |

Version: June 26, 2024

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| e) Was a plan developed to address communications and other public protection impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| f) Were potential energy disruption impacts / consequences managed? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| g) Were the territorial public health authorities engaged? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

Other notes on public protection:

9. Environment

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| a) Did the operator organize the environmental stakeholders? Was consideration given to local stakeholders and those with traditional and local area knowledge? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: The length and scale of the exercise did not require this. |
| b) Did the operator identify environmentally sensitive areas for protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| c) Did the operator have pre-determined mitigation measures and resources to manage wildlife? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

Other notes on environment:

The length and scale of the exercise did not require this.

10. Post-emergency phase

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| a) Did the operator downgrade the emergency / deactivate the emergency response in accordance with its CP? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |
| b) Was a demobilization plan considered? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Comments: |

Other notes on the post-emergency phase:

D. Post-Exercise Debriefing

1. Were all participants and observers involved in the debrief meeting / hotwash?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
2. Did the operator describe how it will address participant feedback, lessons learned, and the preparation of an after action report?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
3. Did the operator identify the need to conduct external stakeholder after action reviews?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
4. Was an action list developed, including identification of leads?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
5. Were all documents collected after the exercise?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:
6. Did the operator discuss / evaluate whether the exercise objectives were met?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Comments:

Other notes on the post-exercise debriefing:

Additional Comments / Observations

Exercise objectives were met? Yes No

After action report was submitted to OROGO? Yes No - June 27, 2024

Overall, the exercise was well designed and executed. As mentioned above, a few items that need to be considered for future exercises.

1. Evaluation of the use of intrinsically safe 2-way radios vs. cellphone for dissemination of information to all participants
2. Ensure realistic incident scenario that would be plausible based on current operation is developed. While the use of a LNG truck collision is not representative of current operations, it did allow for the objectives of the scenario to be met.

Version: June 26, 2024

DELIVERABLES:

1. UGFI to provide confirmation that the missing page(s) of the ERP were updated by August 30, 2024.

RECOMMENDATION

1. UGFI should conduct a follow up exercise that includes the use of their 'Incident Management Processes' to gather information, plan development, logistical/resource requirement identification, communications to affected parties, etc.

OROGO appreciates the invitation to this exercise and looks forward to working with UGFI on future response initiatives.

This emergency response exercise report was completed by:

Name: Michael Martin

Designation: Chief Safety Officer/Chief
Conservation Officer

ID number: S-004/C-004

Date: 2024-08-16

Signature:



Name:

Designation:

ID number:

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Signature: