

Northeast
Utilities System

107 Selden Street, Berlin, CT 06037

Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270
(203) 665-5000

June 10, 1994

Docket No. 50-423
B14876

Re: Examination Report
No. 50-423/94-08

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3
Response to Reactor Operator Examination Report No. 50-423/94-08

In a letter dated April 19, 1994,⁽¹⁾ the NRC Staff transmitted the results of an NRC administered initial reactor operator (RO) examination for five Millstone Unit No. 3 license candidates. Based upon the results of the examinations, all five of the RO candidates passed all portions of the examination and were granted licenses.

During the course of the examination process, the following generic concerns arose:

- The absence of facility management involvement during the preexam review process and also the few personnel involved in this process.
- Contradictions between procedures and management philosophy and between procedures themselves.
- Lack of depth and outdated training lesson plans.

In response to these concerns, we agreed to conduct an evaluation of the identified problems to determine corrective actions, and lessons learned. The Staff requested that Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) provide, within 30 days of the date of the report, the corrective actions and lessons learned from our evaluation. However, during a discussion between NNECO and the Region I Staff on May 6, 1994, it was agreed that this information would be provided on June 10, 1994. Accordingly, Attachment 1 to this letter provides the results of our evaluation including the recommended corrective actions.

(1) M. W. Hodges letter to J. F. Opeka, "Examination Report No. 50-423/94-08(OL)," dated April 19, 1994.

IFAD
11

U.S: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
B14876/Page 2
June 10, 1994

In summary, the results of our evaluation identified that supervisory or management involvement, and additional examination review resources, could have prevented much of the post examination effort expended by both the NRC and our staff. To correct this situation, the Nuclear Training Department will return to our past practice of having an appropriate number of reviewers, including supervision.


Additionally, during the course of the examination process, the Staff identified that a contradiction between procedures and management philosophy existed regarding whether reactor operators should obtain their supervisors' concurrence prior to manually tripping the reactor. To standardize the interpretation of existing procedural guidance, the Senior Vice President, Millstone Station, has issued a memo to all Reactor Operators, Senior Reactor Operators, and Senior Reactor Operator Certified Instructors providing interpretation and expectations associated with the guidance contained in the Millstone Conduct of Operations procedure. Attachment 2 to this letter is a copy of the memo which was distributed to reinforce existing procedural guidance on the responsibilities and expectations for manually tripping the reactor.

If you have any questions regarding the information contained herein, please contact Mr. T. B. Silko at (203) 665-5241.

Very truly yours,

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

FOR: J. F. Opeka
Executive Vice President

BY: 
E. A. DeBarba
Vice President

cc: T. T. Martin, Region Administrator
V. L. Rooney, NRC Project Manager, Millstone Unit No. 3
P. D. Swetland, Senior Resident Inspector, Millstone Unit
Nos. 1, 2, and 3

Docket No. 50-423
B14876

Attachment 1

Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3
Response to Reactor Operator Examination Report No. 50-423/94-08

Post NRC RO Examination Evaluation

June 1994