

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ORIGINAL

In the Matter of:

AFFIRMATION/DISCUSSION SESSION

AFFIRMATION SESSION 81-10

DATE: MARCH 12, 1981

PAGES: 1 thru 12

AT: Washington, D. C.

ALDERSON  REPORTING

400 Virginia Ave., S.W. Washington, D. C. 20024

Telephone: (202) 554-2345

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

* * * * *

AFFIRMATION/DISCUSSION SESSION

AFFIRMATION SESSION 81-10

* * * * *

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 1130
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, March 12, 1981

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at
11:26 a.m., JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman, presiding.

BEFORE:

- JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, Chairman
- VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner
- PETER A. BRADFORD, Commissioner
- JOHN F. AHEARNE, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

- LEONARD BICKWIT
- MARTIN MALSCH
- SAMUEL J. CHILK
- JOHN HOYLE
- E. W. MCGREGOR
- JIM MILHOAN

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on 3-17-81 in the Commission's offices at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected, or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determinations or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of or addressed to any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We turn now to what I trust
3 will be a speedy affirmation session, following which
4 everyone can get a quick lunch so we can come back at 1:00 p.m.
5 Vic is heading someplace and we want to get in an hour on
6 those adjudicatory matters before he gets out of town.

7 Would you please lead us in the reading of the
8 affirmations?

9 MR. CHILK: We have one paper for affirmation,
10 SECY-81-84, Proposed Rulemaking, "Qualification of Reactor
11 Operators."

12 There have been some changes on it this morning.
13 I would like to ask John to walk you through those and see if
14 we can affirm.

15 MR. HOYLE: Shortly before the meeting, there were
16 changes on Commissioner Bradford's vote sheet to which I have
17 some responses. I have not heard from Commissioner Gilinsky.
18 I understand he may be prepared to speak on his response.

19 MR. CHILK: I heard him say if Dr. Hendrie and
20 Mr. Bradford agree, he will agree.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: What happened?

22 MR. HOYLE: On Commissioner Bradford's notes, he
23 had four proposals, a change on page nine.

24 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: The third and fourth are
25 not pre-conditions.

1 MR. HOYLE: The third and fourth are before the
2 final rule.

3 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Yes.

4 MR. HOYLE: Page-nine.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I will buy page nine. I buy his
6 comment that he agrees with my comments, with a certain amount
7 of suspicion. Are you sure that was well founded, Peter?

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: On page nine, I just want
9 to put a footnote.

10 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I take it we are obviously
11 requesting comment on that point. I do not mean I am going
12 to insist we take it in the final rule.

13 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You are saying the
14 Commission realizes something. I do not think that is correct.
15 I just want to make sure it indicates I am not joining that
16 Commission view.

17 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Suppose we say some parts
18 of the military?

19 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I spent too many months
20 and a couple of years with that particular issue. I cannot
21 go on record as not understanding what I learned.

22 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I would suggest changing
23 it to some parts. I know there are some parts.

24 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My argument has never
25 been it is not accepted by some parts. The argument is they

1 have learned through many analyses and lots of hard years that
2 it is a threshold they would prefer not to have and when there
3 is any bonus or advantage that the military offers in return,
4 then they stick the other requirement on because the
5 performance is much higher.

6 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: For purposes of
7 accuracy, let me change it to say "parts of the military,"
8 and as to whether we should in fact go that route, I am
9 prepared to be talked out of it for purposes of the final rule.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would still like my
11 footnote.

12 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I reserve judgment on it.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Page nine with footnote.

14 MR. HOYLE: Commissioner Ahearne has agreed with
15 points three and four of Commissioner Bradford's response.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I do not have any problem with
17 those. There is still a difficulty in Peter's number two. He
18 agrees with me and I disagree with John so Peter disagrees
19 with John.

20 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Vic just said if the two
21 of you agree, he agrees.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Is that correct?

23 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You do not feel this creates a
25 certain momentum?

1 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: You testified to it.

2 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think it is pretty much
3 foolproof. I am not absolutely sure.

4 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Neither am I.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: With your agreement that would
6 put my comments which Peter agrees with in place, those
7 accepted in part and rejected in part, John's earlier remarks.

8 Is it clear to the Secretariat how the accounting
9 stands at the moment?

10 MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, it is.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: The fact that you are nodding
12 your head gives me comfort.

13 A new item.

14 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I was concerned that ship
15 supervisors need only be SROs, as I understand it, and they
16 could be individuals with a year and a half of experience,
17 operating experience.

18 I would be inclined to relax the requirement on
19 SROs having a B.S. degree. I would like to have a requirement
20 about ship supervisors having something more than is required
21 of the SROs.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The argument I was trying to
23 make or the context I saw this in is people come up through
24 the line from the operating crew and they should have a career
25 path and that career path ought to go up further into the

1 management system of the company. That is part of the idea
2 of putting a Bachelor's Degree on the SRO.

3 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You would impose that
4 requirement on existing ones?

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Future.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Anybody who is now an SRO and
7 hope to be a ship supervisor a year from now gets caught in that.

8 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Yes. Vic, what would you
9 put on the ship supervisor?

10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I would say he would have
11 to have a degree and more experience, perhaps three years'
12 experience. It seems to me that one and a half years of
13 experience for a ship supervisor is not enough.

14 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That sounds fine. I do not
15 know what the experience level is for a ship supervisor. That
16 sounds all right to me.

17 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Do you not think that is a
18 bit low, Joe, for someone who is the lead person in charge?

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Total as a licensed operator?

20 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I believe so. I may be
21 wrong.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: He has to put in a year as an RO
23 before he can go for the SRO.

24 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I was throwing in another
25 option for comment, that an SRO be a person with a degree and

1 more experience.

2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The ship supervisor.

3 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes. I would then be
4 prepared to relax the SRO requirement.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You are willing to have
6 non-college degree to SROs but if they were to progress up
7 to ship supervisor, you would like a degree and a little more
8 experience?

9 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It is a possible configuration
11 but I do not remember the sequence and the times well enough.
12 What worries me is even though it is just a proposed rule,
13 we have a pipeline problem. In part what you are looking at
14 or have to look at in terms of upgrading requirements like
15 this and the times at which they become effective and so
16 on is the capability of the system to begin to put people
17 of the right kind into early training stages so that by
18 the time the rule requires they have a year of reactor
19 operator experience, they can have had it reasonably over
20 most plants, so that you do not create a situation in which
21 after a bit you come to realize you have constructed a
22 proposition in which there is no way to appoint new ship
23 supervisors except for a few extraordinary individuals.

24 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Presumably that is one
25 of the things we will hear about in the comments, if you cannot

1 produce these people, someone will tell us about it.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If we contemplate something
3 like that in the proposed rule, we should get a fast evaluation
4 of what it means.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I do not find the ship
6 supervisor issue addressed in that.

7 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I do not think there is
8 a separate requirement. I think it has been loaded on the SRO
9 and he is then qualified to be a ship supervisor.

10 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: The rule itself --

11 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Deals with the SRO.

12 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: You would actually add an
13 additional section to the rule which would address requirements
14 for ship supervisors?

15 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I hate to hold all this up.
16 Maybe I can put this in a footnote. I am just uncomfortable
17 having someone with that amount of experience.

18 I expect utilities would be looking for people
19 with a good deal more experience and this is a minimum
20 requirement.

21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Where do we have that
22 minimum requirement?

23 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I cannot point it out to you.

24 MR. MILHOAN: I do not know the exact numbers.
25 Regulatory Guide 1.8, the ship supervisor is addressed

1 separately from the SRO. The ship supervisor does have to have
2 more experience than a regular SRO. It is in the proposed
3 revision of Regulatory Guide 1.8 that is out for public
4 comment at the present time.

5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: It is only in a reg guide?

6 MR. MILHOAN: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: In the rule here as we propose
8 it, is there a different thrust here that you know of?

9 MR. MILHOAN: In the rule, the thrust of this rule
10 is you would have SROs honestly being degree people which
11 would mean from a ship's staffing standpoint, you would have
12 a ship supervisor with a B.S. degree, depending on the control
13 room configuration, you would have an SRO in the control room
14 which would also be a degree person.

15 The rule itself just does not recognize the
16 difference in practice of an SRO being the additional person
17 of being a ship supervisor.

18 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Was I right in saying he
19 could have as little as one year and a half of experience?

20 MR. MILHOAN: I would have to look up the
21 information. I think he would have to have more than the
22 one and a half years. By the time you go through the
23 progression of a reactor operator, senior reactor operator,
24 control room senior reactor operator, then ship supervisor,
25 by the time you go through the training period and the

1 work experience requirements, you would have to have more than
2 that. I would have to look up the actual numbers.

3 The only position you might see in the lesser
4 experience requirements is if you took a college graduate
5 and you grandfathered or reduced under the exception the
6 experience requirement to make him an SRO immediately; you
7 might get in under the lower experience requirement.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Vic, it sounds to me like the
9 proposition you would like to include in what we would
10 publish for comment which I do not have any objection to as
11 I can see to having people comment on it, as an option or
12 whatever, but it does seem to me we do not have amongst the
13 four of us or even in the room quite the expertise we need
14 to understand what it means.

15 I think what I would like to do is ask you to
16 get ahold of Hanahuer's crowd and discuss it with them and
17 understand what it means.

18 It sounds to me as though it may be more than
19 a small change in the qualification. It may be a good idea.
20 If it is a substantial change, it would be useful to know that
21 and also they could help frame some language.

22 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think you are right that
23 you can be an SRO with a year and a half of experience. You
24 have to have two years of experience at a nuclear power plant
25 including six months at the facility; one year experience as

1 a nuclear power plant licensed operator, in order to be an
2 applicant or senior reactor operator.

3 The big change I think is the rule at the moment is
4 silent on ship supervisor. That was not an issue here.

5 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If you just added that the
6 ship supervisor should have at least three years of experience
7 as an SRO or something like that, it would have the same
8 effect, except there is the B.S. business.

9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would support additional
10 experience for a ship supervisor. I would not want to give
11 up on the B.S. for the SRO because I believe it is important
12 to have this career ladder for these people to go up into
13 the plant. I think your point is well taken, that you would
14 want the ship supervisor to have additional experience.

15 I do not know where or what we are requiring now.
16 I would support Joe to try to get Hanahuer to give you some of
17 that. I certainly support putting something in here on that
18 idea.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: We have agreement on everything
20 except this. Vic will talk to Hanahuer and either decide
21 it is already there in reg guides and it does not need any more
22 or some language to put in the rule for comment. If that
23 could come around to us, just that change, hopefully we would
24 be ready for affirmation next week.

25 I do not find any objection to the proposition.

1 MR. CHILK: Do you want to vote on it subject to
2 approval of a sentence or paragraph?

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I am perfectly willing to do that.
4 We will call for a vote in favor of that proposition.

5 (Chorus of ayes.)

6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It is unanimous. Thank you
7 very much.

8 (Whereupon, the affirmation session was concluded
9 at 11:45 a.m., and the Commission went onto other business.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of: Affirmation/Discussion Session

Date of Proceeding: March 12, 1981

Docket Number: _____

Place of Proceeding: Room 1130, 1717 H St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Commission.

Marilynn M. Nations

Official Reporter (Typed)

Marilynn M. Nations

Official Reporter (Signature)