



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

Report Nos.: 50-424/95-25 and 50-425/95-25

Licensee: Georgia Power Company  
 P. O. Box 1295  
 Birmingham, AL 35201

Docket Nos.: 50-424 and 50-425

License Nos.: NPF-68 and NPF-81

Facility Name: Alvin W. Vogtle Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2

Inspection Conducted: November 27-December 1, 1995

Inspector: Jonathan H. Bartley 12/18/95  
Date Signed

Accompanying Personnel: P. Steiner

Approved by: Thomas A. Peebles 12/18/95  
Date Signed  
 Thomas A. Peebles, Chief  
 Operator Licensing and Human Performance Branch  
 Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope:

The NRC conducted a routine, announced inspection of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant licensed operator requalification program during the period November 27-December 1, 1995. The purpose of this inspection was to verify that the licensee's requalification program for Reactor Operators (ROs) and Senior Reactor Operators (SROs) ensures safe power plant operation by evaluating how well the individual operators and crews had mastered training objectives. The inspectors reviewed and observed annual requalification examination conducted by the facility licensee and conducted inspection activities as specified in Inspection Procedure 71001. Activities reviewed included examination development, examination administration, and remedial training.

Results:

The inspectors concluded that the licensee's requalification program was adequate to ensure safe power plant operations.

The inspectors identified an inspector follow-up item regarding the failure to administer the walkthrough examinations in accordance with an approved examination outline (paragraph 2.c).

The inspectors identified a weakness in examination security regarding the physical control of operators (paragraph 2.d).

In the areas inspected, violations or deviations were not identified.

## REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

#### Licensee Employees

- \*J. Beasley, General Manager
- \*R. Dorman, Plant Training and Emergency Preparedness Manager
- \*W. Dunn, Unit Superintendent
- \*R. Odom, Assistant Performance Team Manager
- \*L. Ray, Operations Training Supervisor
- \*A. Rickman, Independent Safety Engineering Group

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

#### NRC Personnel

- M. Widmann, Resident Inspector
- \*C. Ogle, Senior Resident Inspector

\*Attended exit interview

### 2. Licensed Operator Requalification Program Evaluation (71001)

#### a. Summary

The NRC conducted a routine, announced inspection of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) licensed operator requalification program during the period November 27-December 1, 1995. The purpose of this inspection was to verify that the licensee's requalification program for Reactor Operators and Senior Reactor Operators ensures safe power plant operation by evaluating how well the individual operators and crews had mastered training objectives. The inspectors reviewed and observed annual requalification examinations conducted by the facility licensee and conducted inspection activities as specified in Inspection Procedure 71001. Activities reviewed included examination development, examination administration, and remedial training. The inspectors concluded that the licensee's requalification program was adequate to ensure safe power plant operations. The inspectors identified an Inspector Follow-up Item (IFI) concerning deviations from the approved examination outlines and a weakness concerning poor physical control of operators during the walkthrough examinations.

#### b. Examination Development

The inspectors reviewed the written, simulator, and walkthrough examinations and compared them to the requirements of VEGP Procedure 60007-C, "Licensed Operator Requalification Examination Guidelines," Revision 0, and 10 CFR 55. The inspectors concluded that the examinations were adequate.

Enclosure

No violations or deviations were identified.

c. Examination Administration

The inspectors observed the licensee's staff administer the simulator and walkthrough examinations and compared the observations to the requirements of VEGP Procedure 60007-C and 10 CFR 55. The inspectors observed the administration of four scenarios and seven walkthrough examinations. The inspectors identified an IFI concerning the failure to administer walkthrough examinations in accordance with the approved examination outlines.

The inspectors observed, on two separate occasions during the walkthrough examinations, that the pre-approved examination outline was not followed. During a third occasion, an inspector intervened in order to prevent an evaluator from deviating from the outline. The actions taken would have resulted in the retention of inaccurate requalification records.

- (1) The inspectors observed the performance of simulator Job Performance Measures (JPMs) on November 29, 1995. The inspectors observed that the JPM, "Isolate the RCS Following Loss of All AC," did not follow an alternate path as indicated on the "JPM Information" page. The inspectors reviewed the "Instructions to Examiner" page and found that the malfunction inserted to create the alternate path was listed as "OPTIONAL." The evaluator chose to omit the option. When questioned after the administration of the JPM, the evaluator stated that due to an illness of the normal simulator booth operator, he was not comfortable with the booth operator's ability to accomplish the alternate path malfunction. The stand-in booth operator was the simulator modifications supervisor. The JPM was scheduled to be run again later that morning by the same booth operator, but with a different evaluator. The inspector observed the simulator setup. After realizing that the alternate path malfunction was going to be omitted, the inspector questioned the evaluator on whether or not he intended to install the optional malfunction. The evaluator then told the booth operator, "you can install it if you want to." The booth operator installed the malfunction. The booth operator did not demonstrate any deficiencies operating the simulator during the JPM.

The record retained by the requalification program which indicated satisfactory completion of the JPMs was the "JPM Information" page. A review of these records would indicate that the operator was administered an alternate path JPM, when in fact he was not. By allowing the evaluators to select or not select the optional malfunction, the examination may not be administered

as approved by training management, and the records retained would give a false indication of the level of operator evaluation.

The inspectors questioned the training management on whether or not the examination was an adequate tool for evaluation. The training management decided to administer the operator an additional in-plant JPM.

The inspectors identified failure to administer walkthrough examinations in accordance with the approved examination outlines as JFI 50-424, 425/95-25-01.

No violations or deviations were identified.

d. Examination Security

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's control of the examination materials during the development and administration phases to determine if activities could compromise the examination integrity. The inspectors identified inadequate physical control of the operators during the administration of the walkthrough examinations as a weakness.

The licensee assigned one evaluator to administer walkthrough examinations to two operators in parallel. The in-plant JPMs were conducted by alternating between the two operators. One operator would perform a JPM while the other operator observed. During in-plant JPMs, the evaluator concentrated on observing the operator performing the JPM and would sometimes lose track of the other operator. The inspectors observed, (1) the operator not performing the JPM talking to a plant technician while waiting, (2) the evaluator leaving the operators uncontrolled while using the restroom, and (3) the evaluator leaving the operators uncontrolled in the training center while checking on the status of the simulator.

The simulator JPMs were conducted by alternating performance of the same JPM. While one operator was administered a JPM, the second operator would be waiting in the main hallway outside the simulator. The operator waiting in the hallway was not controlled for approximately 20 minutes.

The inspectors identified their concern to the training manager and prompt corrective actions were taken. The inspectors were unable to verify that examination security was actually compromised. However, the poor physical control of operators provided the opportunity and potential for a compromise to occur. The inspectors identified the inadequate physical control of operators during the administration of walkthrough examinations as a weakness.

No violations or deviations were identified.

e. Procedure Usage

The licensee procedure VEGP 19200-C, "F-0 Critical Safety Function Status Trees," Revision 12, allowed the operator performing the Shift Technical Advisor (STA) function to rely on the Plant Computer for monitoring the Critical Safety Function Status Trees (CSFST). The STA was allowed to depend solely on the Plant Computer, unless it indicated that invalid data was being received. The inspectors were concerned that this practice relied on a single source of data, using an unqualified system, to direct entry into the Emergency Operating Procedure Functional Recovery Guidelines. The NRC typically observes the Plant Computer being manually cross checked with the output of multiple qualified instruments.

3. 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>Type</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Description</u>
IFI	50-424,425/95-25-01	Open	Failure to administer walkthrough examinations in accordance with the approved examination outlines (paragraph 2.c).