

Mary Ann

September 15, 1994

Centerior Service Company
ATTN: Mr. R. A. Stratman
Vice President
Nuclear - Perry
P.O. Box 97, S 270
Perry, OH 44081

SUBJECT: REQUALIFICATION EXAMINATION REPORT

Dear Mr. Stratman:

On September 1, 1994, Mr. D. McNeil and others of this office administered requalification retake examinations to employees of your organization who operate and handle fuel at your Perry Nuclear Generating Station. The operators examined were members of a crew that failed the dynamic simulator scenario portion of their requalification examination given in January 1994. At the conclusion of the examination, any generic findings that evolved as a result of the examination were discussed with those members of your staff identified in the enclosed report.

One operating crew composed of two Reactor Operators (ROs) and three Senior Reactor Operators (SROs) was given a dynamic simulator scenario retake requalification examination. All operators passed the examination. The Perry Nuclear Generating Station requalification program status (satisfactory) is unaffected by this examination.

While conducting the examination a weakness was identified in the Shift Supervisor's (SS) implementation of the command and control function. This included performing control switch manipulations in lieu of directing the manipulations and directing Emergency Operating Procedure actions simultaneously with the Unit Supervisor. This same weakness was identified during the examination this crew originally failed. This weakness is being pointed out as a possible example of ineffective training for the individuals involved. This information is provided for evaluation by your System Approach to Training (SAT). No written response to this item is required.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosures will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

Should you have any questions concerning this examination, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Ring, Chief
Operations Branch

Docket No. 50-440

Docket No. 50-441

Enclosures: 1. Examination Report
No. 50-440/OL-94-02
2. Requalification Program
Evaluation Report
3. Simulation Facility
Fidelity Report

cc w/encls: R. W. Schrauder, Director, Nuclear
Services Department
J. D. Kloosterman, Manager
Regulatory Affairs
K. R. Pech, Director, Perry Nuclear
Assurance Department
N. L. Bonner, Director, Perry
Nuclear Engineering Department
H. Ray Caldwell, General Superintendent
Nuclear Operations
David P. Igyarto, Plant Manager
Terry L. Lodge, Esq.
State Liaison Officer, State of Ohio
Robert E. Owen, Ohio Department of Health
A. Grandjean, State of Ohio
Public Utilities Commission
M. L. Wesley, Training Department
M. Morgan, Pacific Northwest Laboratories
S. A. Richards, NRR/HOLB

Distribution:

Docket File w/encls	RI, Perry w/encls
PUBLIC IE-01 w/encls	H. J. Miller, RIII w/encls
OC/LFDCB w/encls	J. B. Hopkins, LPM, NRR w/encls
DRP w/encls	IPAS w/encls
PRR w/encls	R. D. Lanksbury, RIII w/encls

SEE ATTACHED CONCURRENCES

Document Name: P:Per.OL.02

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box "C" = Copy without attach/enc1 "E" = Copy with attach/enc1 "N" = No copy

OFFICE	RIII	RIII	RIII	RIII
NAME	McNeil:cg	Jordan	Greger	Ring <i>mm</i>
DATE	09/ /94	09/ /94	09/ /94	09/14/94

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Should you have any questions concerning this examination, please contact us.

Sincerely,

/s/ Michael J. Jordan (for)

Mark A. Ring, Chief
Operations Branch

Docket No. 50-440

Docket No. 50-441

- Enclosures: 1. Examination Report
No. 50-440/OL-94-02
2. Requalification Program
Evaluation Report
3. Simulation Facility
Fidelity Report

cc w/encls: R. W. Schrauder, Director, Nuclear
Services Department
J. D. Kloosterman, Manager
Regulatory Affairs
K. R. Pech, Director, Perry Nuclear
Assurance Department
N. L. Bonner, Director, Perry
Nuclear Engineering Department
H. Ray Caldwell, General Superintendent
Nuclear Operations
David P. Igyarto, Plant Manager
Terry L. Lodge, Esq.
State Liaison Officer, State of Ohio
Robert E. Owen, Ohio Department of Health
A. Grandjean, State of Ohio
Public Utilities Commission
M. L. Wesley, Training Department
M. Morgan, Pacific Northwest Laboratories

Distribution:

Docket File w/encls RI, Perry w/encls
PUBLIC IE-01 w/encls H. J. Miller, RIII w/encls
OC/LFDCB w/encls J. B. Hopkins, LPM, NRR w/encls
DRP w/encls IPAS w/encls
PRR w/encls R. D. Lanksbury, RIII w/encls

Document Name: P:Per.OL.02

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box "C" - Copy without attach/enc1 "E" - Copy with attach/enc1 "N" - No copy

OFFICE	RIII	N	RIII	E	RIII	E	RIII	
NAME	McNeil:cg	Dr	Jordan	9/15/94	Greger	9/15/94	Ring	
DATE	09/15/94		09/15/94		09/15/94		09/ /94	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-440/OL-94-02

Docket No. 50-440

License No. NPF-58

Licensee: Centerior Service Company

Facility Name: Perry 1

Examination Administered At: Perry Nuclear Generating Station

Examination Conducted: September 1, 1994

RIII Examiners: M. Parrish, Pacific Northwest Laboratories

Chief Examiner:

D. R. McNeil

9/15/94
Date

Approved By:

M. J. Jordan, Chief
Operator Licensing Section 1

9/15/94
Date

Examination Summary

Examination administered September 1, 1994, (Report No. 50-440/OL-94-02).
A requalification retake examination (dynamic simulator portion only) was administered to 3 Senior Reactor Operators (SROs) and 2 Reactor Operators (ROs). The operators formed one operating crew.

Results:

The crew passed the examination. In accordance with the criteria of NUREG-1021, Revision 7, Operator Licensing Examiner Standards, Supplement 1, ES-601, E.2, paragraph 2, no valid program evaluation can be made due to the small sampling size involved with the examination. The Perry Requalification Training Program satisfactory rating is unaffected by this examination.

STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES:

Strengths:

Simulator scenarios were challenging (See section 3.c)

The Perry Station simulator (See section 3.c.1)

Weaknesses:

Both crew supervisors were simultaneously directing EOP actions (See section 3.c.2)

The shift supervisor was manipulating control switches vice directing their operation. (See section 3.c.2)

REPORT DETAILS

1. Examiners

*D. McNeil, Chief Examiner, NRC, Region III
M. Parrish, Pacific Northwest Laboratories

2. Persons Contacted

Facility

M. Wesley, Training Manager
D. Cobb, Ops. Manager
*C. Persson, OTU Supervisor
*N. Johnson, License Training Instructor
*A. Okorn, Shift Supervisor
*J. Messina, Supt, Plant Ops

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

*D. Kosloff, Senior Resident Inspector, Perry Station

* Indicates present at exit meeting on February 4, 1994.

3. Training Program Observations

The facility's trainers and operators were professional throughout the exam. The facility trainers appeared knowledgeable and were responsive to NRC questions.

The following information is provided for evaluation by the licensee via their SAT based training program. No response is required.

a. Written Examination

No written examination was required for this examination.

b. Job Performance Measures (JPMs)

No JPMs were required for this examination.

c. Dynamic Simulator Examination

The simulator scenarios were challenging and of adequate length. The crew demonstrated good use of procedures and teamwork in most cases. One operating crew was examined. Two simulator scenarios were required for the examination; both scenarios were completed on the same day. The following is a description of the scenarios:

1. Scenario OT-3070-002-PC5A required the operators to start up ESW Loop B for a radwaste discharge. The operators raised reactor power for a normal power ascension. They were required to respond to a failed APRM ("H"), including bypassing the APRM and resetting the half-scam. They responded to a loss of the Div 2 stub bus, which required them to enter various procedures to restore systems affected by the loss of power. They were required to respond to a failure (closed) of a scram discharge volume (SDV) drain valve. Leakage from a number of hydraulic control units caused the SDV to fill. An anticipated transient without scram (ATWS) occurred with a small leak in the SDV. The crew had to take action to shut down the reactor and control containment temperature and pressure.
2. Scenario OT-3070-002-RP4A required the operators to shift control room ventilation to emergency recirculation for a surveillance. The inner seal of reactor recirc pump "A" failed, followed by a partial failure of the outer seal. This resulted in a steam leak in the drywell. Power was reduced and the pump secured. The recirc pump discharge isolation valve failed to shut resulting in an unisolable leak from the reactor coolant system. A seismic event occurred causing multiple pump and valve failures. It also caused instrument lines in the drywell to be severed, resulting in a loss of level indication in the control room. The loss of level indication required Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) flood. Standby Liquid Control (SLC) train "B" failed to initiate.

1. Strengths:

The simulator was determined to be a strength in the training program. The simulator was able to simulate all conditions the scenarios required without halting or simulation failure.

Communications were generally good, however, there were several instances of crew members making important announcements without requiring crew supervision to acknowledge receiving the message. Crew members would frequently announce their availability to crew supervision.

The use of the Shift Technical Advisor (STA) is noted as a strength. The STA performed as a backup to the crew supervisors. The STA continually and independently reviewed the Emergency Operating Procedure (EOP) steps that had been executed to ensure they were completed.

2. Weaknesses:

The Shift Supervisor became involved in manipulating switches on the P-601 (ECCS) panel. It was recognized that the task he performed was simple and required little time, however, this is cited as a weakness because the shift supervisor may become accustomed to helping panel operators and become distracted from his supervisory role during an actual plant event.

During scenario OT-3070-002-PC5A, when the APRM failure was inserted, four members of the crew and the STA converged on the P-680 panel. Only the shift supervisor remained outside the confines of the P-680 panel. This left the other panels in an unmonitored condition.

In scenario OT-3070-002-RP4A, the P-680 operator and the P-601 operator were both in the P-680 area. The unit supervisor directed the P-601 operator to insert control rods instead of the P-680 operator. While this is acceptable in some cases, the P-601 operator in this instance was not given a turnover or otherwise prepared for the responsibility of inserting control rods.

The Unit Supervisor (US) and the Shift Supervisor (SS) were simultaneously directing EOP flowchart actions. At one point the US directed an operator to initiate High Pressure Core Spray (HPCS) when another operator had been directed to perform the task by the SS.

4. Operations, Security, Rad Protection, Other

Operations personnel contacted during the examination responded in a professional manner. No other organizations were contacted during this visit.

5. Simulator Observations:

No simulator discrepancies were identified during the course of the examination.

6. Exit Meeting

An exit meeting with the Perry Nuclear Generating Station management was held at the Perry Station training offices on September 1, 1994. Those attending the meetings are listed in Section 2 of this report. The following items were discussed during the exit meeting:

- Strengths and weaknesses noted in this report.

The personnel attending the exit verified that no proprietary information was disclosed and that no license commitments were made as a result of the NRC Requalification Examination.

ENCLOSURE 2

REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

Facility: Perry Nuclear Generating Station

Examiners: D. McNeil, Chief Examiner
M. Parrish, Pacific Northwest Laboratories

Dates of Evaluation: August 31, 1994

Areas Evaluated: Written Oral X Simulator

Examination Results:

	<u>RO</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>SRO</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Evaluation</u> <u>(S or U)</u>
Written Examination	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Operating Examination				
Oral	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Simulator	2/0	3/0	5/0	S

Evaluation of facility written examination grading: n/a

Crew Examination Results:

	<u>Crew 1</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Crew 2</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Crew 3</u> <u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Evaluation</u> <u>(S or U)</u>
<u>Operating Examination</u>	Pass	n/a	n/a	S

Overall Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is not required due to the small sampling size of this examination per ES-601 E.3, paragraph 2.

Submitted:

DM
D. McNeil
Examiner
09/15/94

Forwarded:

M. Jordan
M. Jordan
Section Chief
09/15/94

Approved:

M. Ring
M. Ring
Branch Chief
09/15/94

ENCLOSURE 3

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: Centerior Service Company

Facility Licensee Docket No.: 50-440

Operating Tests Administered: January 31 - February 4, 1994

This form is to be used only to report observations. These observations do not constitute audit or inspection findings and are not, without further verification and review, indicative of noncompliance with 10 CFR 55.45(b). These observations do not affect NRC certification or approval of the simulation facility other than to provide information that may be used in future evaluations. No licensee action is required in response to these observations.

While conducting the simulator portion of the operating tests, the following items were observed:

ITEM

DESCRIPTION

No discrepancies were noted during the examination.