

September 5, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: R. William Borchardt, Associate Director  
for Inspection and Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: */RA/ Cynthia Carpenter for*  
Bruce A. Boger, Director  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: CORRECTION TO THE SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL NRC/INPO  
COORDINATION MEETING ON TRAINING-RELATED ISSUES

By memorandum dated June 13, 2002, I forwarded to you a "Summary of the Annual NRC/INPO Coordination Meeting on Training-Related Issues," (Accession number ML021490522). That meeting was held on April 10, 2002. The purpose of this memorandum is to correct two inaccuracies that appeared on page three of the memorandum.

- (1) The minutes stated that INPO has eight accreditation teams. While there are eight accreditation team managers currently conducting team visits, there are more than eight accreditation team managers at INPO, and there is no fixed team composition.
- (2) The minutes stated that coupled accreditation team visits are performed four months after the plant evaluation. The correct number is 4-6 weeks.

I regret any inconvenience these errors may have caused.

September 5, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: R. William Borchardt, Associate Director  
for Inspection and Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: **/RA/ Cynthia Carpenter for**  
Bruce A. Boger, Director  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: CORRECTION TO THE MINUTES SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL  
NRC/INPO COORDINATION MEETING ON TRAINING-RELATED  
ISSUES

By memorandum dated June 13, 2002, I forwarded to you a "Summary of the Annual NRC/INPO Coordination Meeting on Training-Related Issues," (Accession number ML021490522). That meeting was held on April 10, 2002. The purpose of this memorandum is to correct two inaccuracies that appeared on page three of the memorandum.

- (3) The minutes stated that INPO has eight accreditation teams. While there are eight accreditation team managers currently conducting team visits, there are more than eight accreditation team managers at INPO, and there is no fixed team composition.
- (4) The minutes stated that coupled accreditation team visits are performed four months after the plant evaluation. The correct number is 4-6 weeks.

I regret any inconvenience these errors may have caused.

Accession Number: ML022260587 \*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	IEMB:DIPM	SC:IEHB:DIPM	BC:IEHB:DIPM	D:DIPM
NAME	GMUsova*	DCTrimble*	TRQuay*	BABoger
DATE	08 /27/02	08 /20/02	08 / 21/02	09/05/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

## BACKGROUND

From: Brooks, Charlie R (INPO)  
> Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 11:11 AM  
> To: Joe Shea (E-mail)  
> Subject: FW: NRC/INPO Annual Trg Coordination Meeting  
> Importance: High

> Joe,

> We have noted a few inaccuracies in the attached meeting minutes and would like to discuss with you how this type of input is typically addressed. The errors are:

> \* Page three indicates INPO has eight accreditation teams. While we have eight accreditation team managers currently conducting team visits, there are more than eight accreditation team managers at INPO, and we have no fixed team composition. It is suggested that the number be deleted.

> \* The minutes state that coupled accreditation team visits are performed four months after the plant evaluation. The correct number is 4-6 weeks.

> > As a side note and possible contributing factor, we noticed these meeting minutes seem to be much more detailed than in the past. We recall minutes more akin to the following statement in our INPO/NRC Memorandum of Understanding:

> \* Minutes of all coordination meetings will be placed in the NRC public document room. These need not be verbatim transcripts of coordination meetings, but should include a list of the meeting participants and agenda items discussed at meetings, with brief summaries of the discussions held by meeting participants.

> A high level of detail in minutes is unnecessary because, as is also stated in our MOA,

> \* Coordination meetings are for information exchange only. Meetings are not to be construed as requests or opportunities for (or used by the NRC for obtaining) the advice or recommendations of INPO or its personnel on policy or regulatory issues within the scope of the NRC's responsibilities. INPO advice or recommendations to the Commission on regulatory or policy matters, if any, are to be made through established procedures of the Commission and will be considered by the Commission in the same manner as other offers of advice or recommendations made through established Commission procedures.

> Perhaps a reminder of these clauses in the MOA in advance of future meetings would be worthwhile.

> Charlie

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Mainieri, Steve P (INPO)  
> Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:09 AM  
> To: Brooks, Charlie R (INPO)  
> Subject: NRC/INPO Annual Trg Coordination Meeting  
> Importance:High  
>  
> Charlie  
> Per your request I am enclosing the NRC file.  
>  
> Thanks  
> Steve  
>  
> << File: INPO.PDF >>

**DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain proprietary INPO or WANO information that is privileged, confidential, or protected by copyright belonging to INPO or WANO. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity for which it is intended. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is contrary to the rights of INPO or WANO and is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy or printout of this e-mail and any attachments.

Thank you.

June 13, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: R. William Borchardt, Associate Director  
for Inspection and Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Bruce A. Boger, Director */RA - William M. Dean for/*  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL NRC/INPO COORDINATION MEETING ON  
TRAINING-RELATED ISSUES

On April 10, 2002, a periodic NRC/Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) coordination meeting on training-related issues was held at NRC Headquarters, Rockville, Maryland. Such meetings are conducted in accordance with the NRC/INPO Memorandum of Agreement dated December 24, 1996. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss items of mutual interest concerning INPO's training program accreditation process as well as NRC issues on operator training. Participants included representatives of the NRC's Division of Inspection Program Management and INPO's Accreditation Division, a representative from the Professional Reactor Operator Society (PROS), who participated via telephone, and a representative from the McGraw Hill publishing company. The list of meeting attendees is provided as Attachment 1. The meeting agenda is provided as Attachment 2. Attachment 3 contains a compilation of revised INPO documents, as discussed below. Attachment 4 is a background white paper, sent to industry representatives, for agenda topic discussion purposes.

A summary of the discussions related to key agenda topics covered during the meeting follows.

### **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Introductions of the NRC/INPO personnel present were conducted. After the introductions were completed, organizational changes since the last coordination meeting, at both the NRC and INPO, were discussed.

### **Technical Specifications (TS)**

The NRC staff briefly reviewed the history of the operator license eligibility issue, including the National Academy's publication of "Guidelines for Initial Training and Qualification of Licensed Operators," the NRC's publication of Revision 3 of Regulatory Guide 1.8, "Qualification and Training of Personnel for Nuclear Power Plants," and the NRC's issuance of Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) 2001-01, "Eligibility of Operator License Applicants," which encouraged facility licensees to review and update their licensing basis documents. The staff noted that several facility licensees have responded to the RIS by submitting TS 5.3.1 amendment requests and that the staff has been deliberating how best to revise those specifications. The staff acknowledged that the Memorandum of Agreement with INPO discourages the codification of