



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W., SUITE 2900  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323-0199

Report Nos.: 50-413/95-01 and 50-414/95-01

Licensee: Duke Power Company

Docket Nos.: 50-413 and 50-414

License Nos: NPF-35 and NPF-52

Facility Name: Catawba Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2

Inspection Conducted: January 23-27, 1995

Inspector:

*James H. Moorman, III*  
James H. Moorman, III

*2-6-95*

Date Signed

Approved by:

*Lawrence L. Lawyer*  
Lawrence L. Lawyer, Chief  
Operator Licensing Section  
Operations Branch  
Division of Reactor Safety

*2/10/95*

Date Signed

#### SUMMARY

##### Scope:

This was a routine, announced inspection of the Catawba Nuclear Plant to assess actions taken in response to findings documented in previous NRC Inspection Reports. The inspector evaluated the items with respect to status of completion, expediency, and effectiveness of completion using Inspection Procedure 92901, "Followup-Plant Operations." Activities reviewed included responses to Notices of Violation, corrective actions taken, and plans or programs to prevent recurrence.

##### Results:

The inspector identified one violation for the licensee's failure to determine that three licensed operators required a conditional license, VIO 50-413,414/95-01-01.

9503080061 950216  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
PDR

Enclosure 2

The inspector determined that corrective actions taken by the licensee were adequate to support closure of the following:

- IFI 50-413,414/94-301-01: Procedures that failed to provide adequate or correct information needed for operators to efficiently conduct procedure evolutions.
- IFI 50-413,414/94-20-01: Excessive JPM Test Item Overlap
- IFI 50-413,414/94-20-02: Failure To Properly Track Individual Control Manipulations
- VIO 50-413,414/94-20-03: Failure To Perform Operator Competency Evaluations
- URI 50-413,414/94-20-05: Anomalous Operator Eyesight Examination Results
- IFI 50-413,414/94-20-07: Lack of Site Specific Guidance for License Reactivation

## REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*G. Addis, Site Training Manager
- \*J. Cox, Manager, Engineering Support Division
- \*T. Crawford, Manager, Mechanical Systems Engineering
- \*J. Forbes, Site Engineering Manager
- \*S. Frye, Manager, Operations Training
- \*G. Grier, Manager, Engineering Support Division
- \*P. McNamara, Emergency Planning Manager
- \*W. Miller, Operation Superintendent
- \*G. Mitchell, Emergency Planning
- \*K. Nicholson, Compliance Specialist
- \*D. Rehn, Vice President - Catawba Nuclear Station
- \*Z. Taylor, Regulatory Compliance Manager

Other licensee employees contacted included instructors, operators, and office personnel.

#### NRC Personnel

- \*R. Freudenberger, Senior Resident Inspector
- \*M. Thomas, Inspector
- \*R. Moore, Inspector
- \*J. Kreh, Inspector
- \*J. Haller, Contractor

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Corrective Actions for Violations (92901)

The inspector reviewed the licensee's responses and the corrective actions taken for one violation of NRC requirements. The inspector concluded that the timeliness, completeness, and adequacy of the licensee's actions were satisfactory.

- a. (Closed) VIO 50-413,414/94-20-03. The inspector reviewed the licensee's response and corrective actions for Violation 50-413,414/94-20-03, "Failure To Perform Operator Competency Evaluations." This violation documented the licensee's failure to perform and document evaluations of individual operator's performance during their required annual operating examination. Training department activities, including those related to licensed operator requalification, are conducted in accordance with Operations Training Management Procedures (OTMP). Operations Training Management Procedure 6.0, Training Programs, provides an outline for conducting licensed operator requalification training. The specific guidelines for conducting and documenting individual operator evaluations are provided in OP-CN-SIM ADMIN, which is referenced by OTMP-6.0. This is the administrative guideline that provides working level details for

performing individual operator evaluations. In response to the violation, OP-CN-SIM ADMIN was changed to require individual operator evaluations and to ensure that the evaluations were properly documented. The inspector observed a simulator scenario during which licensed operators were evaluated. The evaluators documented the performance of the operators in accordance with the guidance in OP-CN-SIM ADMIN. The inspector determined that the above corrective actions were satisfactory.

Operations Management Procedure 1-7, "Emergency/Abnormal Procedure Implementation Guidelines," provides guidance to the licensed operators on implementing emergency and abnormal procedures. Item 1 in the "General Statements of Philosophy" section, directs the operators to properly position equipment that fails to automatically position, following a safety signal. This is typically done as part of the operator's initial response to plant changes caused by the initiation of safety signals. During one of the evaluated scenarios observed by the inspector, operators were required to respond to a small break loss of coolant accident. One of the equipment malfunctions in the scenario was a failure of both high head safety injection valves to open automatically on a safety injection signal. Also, the auxiliary feedwater pumps failed to start automatically on the safety injection signal. The operators, when performing their immediate actions, did not attempt to manually align the failed equipment. This indicates that the failures either went unnoticed or that the operators are unfamiliar with the guidance in OMP 1-7. This aspect of the operators' performance was not included in documentation of the evaluation or in the operator debrief following the scenario.

- b. (Closed) Unresolved Item 50-413,414/94-20-05, "Anomalous Operator Eyesight Examination Results." This item documented that one operator's medical records of an eye examination indicated that the operator did not need eyeglasses even though he wore eyeglasses at the time. The results of the eye examination, given on April 21, 1994, indicated that the operator's eyesight satisfied the requirements of ANSI 3.4-1983 for operating with uncorrected vision. The operator's use of eyeglasses at the time of the examination indicated the need for further investigation. When NRC inspectors presented this information to the licensee, the operator was given another eye examination. This examination was conducted on September 29, 1994. The results did not satisfy ANSI 3.4-1983 requirements for operating without corrective lenses, and a conditional license was requested. Additionally, the documentation from this examination indicated that the operator had a private eye examination in July 1994 at which time the operator was given an updated prescription for eyeglasses. A doctor under contract to the NRC reviewed the above information. She stated that when results of a test appear to be contradictory, a practical examination is warranted. In this operator's case, a practical examination would have indicated the need for a conditional license. The evaluation from the NRC doctor that a practical examination should have been conducted closes Unresolved Item 50-413,414/94-20-05 and is one example of violation 95-01-01.

In a letter dated January 12, 1995, license renewal applications were submitted for three operators. The accompanying medical certification, NRC Form 396, indicated that two operators required a license condition for eyeglasses. The medical certification submitted with the previous license renewal application in 1988 for these two operators did not contain a license condition for eyeglasses. Based on this information, their licenses were renewed with no conditions. All licenses issued prior to 1988 for both of these operators were conditioned to require eyeglasses. A review of records for the medical examination done to support license renewal in 1988 indicated that the operators required eyeglasses. 10 CFR 55.21, Medical examination, requires that a physician determine if a licensed operator meets the requirements of 55.33(a)(1). 10 CFR 55.33(a)(1) states that a licensed operator's medical condition and general health will not adversely affect the performance of assigned operator job duties or cause operational errors endangering public health and safety. ANSI/ANS 3.4-1983, "Medical certification and monitoring of personnel requiring operator licenses for nuclear power plants," provides medical standards appropriate to the licensed operator position. As stated above, the failure to determine that three licensed operators required a conditional license based on medical examination results is identified as Violation 50-413,414/95-01-01.

3. Open Item Follow-up (92901)

- a. (Closed) IFI 50-413,414/94-301-01, "Procedures that failed to provide adequate or correct information needed for operators to efficiently conduct procedure evolutions." This item documented five areas in which procedure guidance was less than optimal or where the lack of staged equipment would complicate the completion of a procedural evolution.

The inspector concluded that the licensee's actions in response to the deficiencies noted in this item were satisfactory.

- b. (Closed) IFI 50-413,414/94-20-01, "Excessive JPM Test Item Overlap." This item documented that during a five week examination period, an excessive number of JPMs were repeated between examinations. Thus, the total number of JPMs used was less than optimal for ensuring absolute examination security. The inspector determined that this was not a common practice, but was the result of not having enough JPMs that were revised to reflect recently revised plant procedures. As a result, OTMP-3.0, "Design and Development," was revised to incorporate criteria to prevent excessive overlap of examination material between different weeks of an examination. The training department is currently revising all of the JPMs and considerable progress has been made toward this goal. The training department is also in the process of refining the list of tasks that are best trained on through the use of JPMs.

The inspector concluded that the licensee's actions in response to the deficiencies noted in this item were satisfactory.

- c. Closed) IFI 50-413,414/94-20-02, "Failure To Properly Track Individual Control Manipulations." A part of the Systems Approach to Training (SAT) is to identify tasks that are best trained on by performing the task on the simulator or otherwise simulating performance of the tasks. The list of tasks identified at Catawba is similar to the list of tasks in 10 CFR 55.59(c)(3). This list of tasks includes those tasks that are accomplished by a crew of operators and those that need to be performed individually by an operator. The IFI identified that all members of a crew were receiving credit for performance of tasks requiring individual performance even though the task was performed by only one operator on the crew. To correct this, OTMP 3.0, "Design and Development," was changed to address the need to individually perform certain tasks. The list of tasks has been annotated to note the difference between those that are designated for individual performance and those that are designated for crew performance.

The inspector concluded that the licensee's actions in response to the deficiencies noted in this item were satisfactory.

- d. (Closed) IFI 50-413,414/94-20-07, "Lack of Site Specific Guidance for License Reactivation." The requirements for re-activation of an inactive operator's license and for maintaining a license active are contained in 10 CFR 55.53(e) and (f). Catawba personnel used the guidelines in a corporate level procedure for complying with these requirements. The guidelines in the corporate level procedure were not specific to prevent violations in the future. To provide site specific guidance, Operations Management Procedure 1-3, "NRC License Maintenance/Activation," was written to provide guidance for complying with 10 CFR 55.53(e) and (f).

The inspector concluded that the licensee's actions in response to the deficiencies noted in this item were satisfactory.

#### 4. Surveillance Observation (61726)

The inspector observed the performance of the turbine stop valve and combined intermediate valve stroke test surveillance performed by licensed operators in the control room. No deficiencies were noted.

#### 5. Exit Interview

At the conclusion of the site visit, the inspectors met with representatives of the plant staff listed in paragraph 1 to discuss the results of the inspection. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any material provided to, or reviewed by the inspectors. The inspectors further discussed in detail the inspection findings listed below. Dissenting comments were not received from the licensee.

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Description and Reference</u>
IFI 50-413,414/94-301-01	Closed	Procedures that failed to provide adequate or correct information needed for operators to efficiently conduct procedure evolutions
IFI 50-413,414/94-20-01	Closed	Excessive JPM Test Item Overlap
IFI 50-413,414/94-20-02	Closed	Failure To Properly Track Individual Control Manipulations
VIO 50-413,414/94-20-03	Closed	Failure To Perform Operator Competency Evaluations
URI 50-413,414/94-20-05	Closed	Anomalous Operator Eyesight Examination Results
IFI 50-413,414/94-20-07	Closed	Lack of Site Specific Guidance for License Reactivation
VIO 50-413,414/95-01-01	Open	Failure to determine that three licensed operators required a conditional license