



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUN 6 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Roger J. Mattson, Director
Lessons Learned Task Force

FROM: Harry E.P. Krug
Lessons Learned Task Force

SUBJECT: TMI LESSONS LEARNED

At the time I received John Olshinski's memo, on June 5th, proposing the safety monitor, I had just completed a short note concerning the role of the reactor operator. I have rewritten the note to reflect a little of John's memo. I thought my perception might be of some value because of my previous experience as a marine and naval engineer and as an instrument-rated commercial pilot.

The short of it is that I believe that we should carefully consider the advantages of having reactor operators more like airline pilots. The analogy is by no means superficial. It includes routine and emergency duties, health, training and readiness, corporate relationships, in-flight and "ground" relationships with the regulator (FAA) and other factors. Including the flight engineer, there are three pilots in the airliner cockpit with well defined duties and a clear chain of command. I believe it fair to say that the airline pilot staffing problem has been adequately solved. I believe that a similar approach can be used with reactor operators.

More specifically with respect to John Olshinski's memo, there is much evidence to support the perception that the best safety operator has a comprehensive understanding of the plant systems. Even the use of steam drain lines can be of great importance during an event.

I agree with the concept of a qualified safety monitor; although I would like to think that every licensed watch standing reactor operator could do the job if so assigned. Clearly, every person allowed to direct the operators on watch should be qualified for emergency duty. It is also reasonable to think that a supervisor, such as a shift supervisor, will naturally regard himself as a safety monitor. If a safety monitor can

556128

(2)

7907130269

P -

Roger J. Mattson

-2-

JUN 6 1975

command, he is no longer a monitor. If the safety monitor is not the shift supervisor or otherwise the "senior person present," the lines of authority and responsibility are unclear. If the safety monitor is truly a monitor, how is the function performed? Does it include checking the plant alignment, maintenance in progress or providing any approvals in advance?

I believe it fair to say that these problems are adequately solved in the cockpit of an airliner. Thus, I believe that the concept of making reactor operators more like airline pilots deserves careful attention.



Harry E.P. Krug
Lessons Learned Task Force

cc: Lessons Learned Task Force Members

556129