



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

May 29, 1984

Report No.: 50-413/84-45

Licensee: Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

Docket No.: 50-413

License No.: CPPR-116

Facility Name: Catawba 1

Inspection at Catawba site near Rock Hill, South Carolina

Inspector: B. T. Debs

B. T. Debs

5/11/84
Date Signed

Approved by: H. Krug

H. Krug, (Acting) Section Chief
Operations Program Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

5/16/84
Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on April 10-12, 1984

Areas Inspected

This routine, unannounced inspection involved 20 inspector-hours on site in the areas of licensee submitted NRC Form-398(s).

Results

Of the area inspected, one violation and one deviation was identified.

8409240157 840823
PDR ADDCK 05000413
Q PDR

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. Hampton, Plant Manager
- *S. Frye, Director of Operator Training
- *C. W. Graves, Superintendent of Operations
- *G. Barrett, Training Supervisor
- L. E. Schmid, Systems Production Engineer

Other licensee employees contacted included six operator candidates, and three office personnel.

Other Organization

Oconee Nuclear Station Training Center

NRC Resident Inspectors

- *P. A. Skinner, Senior Resident Inspector (Operations)
- P. K. VanDoorn, Senior Resident Inspector (Construction)

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on April 12, 1984, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. Additionally, licensee management was informed that the inspection findings would probably be discussed at a Duke-NRC management meeting scheduled for April 16, 1984, at the NRC Region II Office in Atlanta, Georgia.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

(URI 50-413/84-39-01) Apparent inaccuracies on NRC Form 398(s). As a follow up to this item, the inspector reviewed additional training records for candidates who were certified by the licensee as cold license eligible. The inspector observed that the plant and control room sections of the Cold License Certification Observation Task List for docket numbers 20280 and 20256, had been signed by a single individual and dated as being performed in a single day.

As a result of interviews with licensee management, operator candidates, and training personnel; it was concluded that these two task lists had been completed at Duke's Oconee Nuclear Station in March 1980. The two trainees in question represented individuals from an original training group of six.

The trainees had been assigned to a member of the Oconee training staff. This individual provided the trainees with a plant and program orientation during their first day on site. The trainer then assigned the trainees to a shift. During their tour on shift, the trainees were to complete their task lists. The trainees indicated to the inspector that they had performed some action on each line item on the list. These actions consisted of either a procedure review, simulation, discussion, actual observation or performance, or a combination of these actions. One trainee specifically recalls not having observed certain control room operations as indicated on the task list, however, he did remember performing either a procedure review and/or simulation. Furthermore, the trainees indicated that the performance of these observation task lists during March 1980 were unsupervised. At the end of this observation period, the trainees discussed the items of the task list with the Oconee training representative who then signed and dated the task lists. Licensee management stated that the aforementioned method of completing this phase of training was acceptable and the convention at that time although no established plant procedure specifically allowed alternate methods of task completion.

The inspector expressed concern that apparently not all of the task list items were completed on the date indicated or in the manner indicated on the lists and that the performance of the task list items were unsupervised.

The licensee was unable to produce established plant procedures governing the licensee's Cold Licensee Certification Observation training, however, a broad program description does exist in the Duke Power Corporate Training Manual.

Section 13.2.2.2(K) of the Catawba Nuclear Station Final Safety Analysis Report states, in part, that the Cold Certification Observation Check List provides structured guidance for required observation tasks. The Cold Licensee Certification Program, File No. GS-943/OPS-NRC, which was presented to the NRC Operator Licensing Branch in October 1977, and accepted by a letter from Mr. Paul F. Collins, Chief, Operator Licensing Branch to Mr. William O. Parker, Duke Power Company Vice President of Steam Production states, in part, that Cold Licensee Certification Observation Task date should be the date the task is signed off as being observed. The licensee was telephonically informed that for docket numbers 20280 and 20256 the Cold Licensee Certification Observation Task lists were incorrectly documented as complete, and; therefore, represents a deviation from commitments to the NRC (Deviation 50-413/84-45-01).

10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion V states, in part, that activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions or procedures of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions or procedures.

The licensee's lack of an approved on-site instruction or procedure governing the Cold Licensee Certification Observation Training represents a violation of the aforementioned Federal Regulation (VIO 50-413/84-45-02).

Regarding the two clerical errors which were identified on the NRC Form 398(s) for Docket Numbers 20270 and 20256 and identified as part of the aforementioned unresolved item, evaluation of the correct information by the NRC determined that had the NRC known the correct information at the time of the submittals, the license eligibility of the individual applicants would not have been affected. The inspector, however, expressed concern that although the licensee had performed a detailed audit of submitted NRC Form 398(s), some errors remain. The inspector informed licensee management that these clerical errors are considered two additional examples of the violation of 10CFR55.10(a)(6) and (d) as cited in NRC Inspection Report Nos. 50-413/84-25 and 50-414/84-10 dated April 18, 1984.

4. Management Meeting

A meeting was held at the mutual request of the licensee and the NRC, on April 16, 1984, in the NRC Region II Office in Atlanta, GA, to discuss, in part, NRC concerns regarding the finding of this inspection.

Meeting attendance was as follows:

- H. B. Tucker, Vice President, Nuclear Production
- R. W. Bostain, Vice President, Production Support
- R. M. Kohler, Manager, Production Training Services
- S. Frye, Director of Operator Training
- C. W. Graves, Superintendent of Operations, Catawba
- W. H. Barron, Training Supervisor, Catawba

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II

- James P. O'Reilly, Regional Administrator
- R. C. Lewis, Director, Division of Reactor Projects
- A. F. Gibson, Chief, Operations Branch
- J. M. Puckett, Director, Enforcement (Acting)
- H. C. Dance, Chief, Project Branch 2
- V. L. Brownlee, Chief, Project Section 2A
- B. Wilson, Chief, Operator Licensing Section
- B. T. Debs, Reactor Inspector, Operational Programs Section
- T. Rogers, Reactor Operator Examiner, Operator Licensing Section
- T. Norris, Reactor Operator Examiner, Operator Licensing Section

Region II NRC representatives discussed the conduct of reactor operator and senior reactor operator candidate training, specifically Cold Licensee Certification Observation training, and the accuracy of information which has been provided on NRC Form 398(s) with licensee representatives. The details of this meeting are contained in a letter from Mr. James P. O'Reilly to Mr. H. B. Tucker dated May 9, 1984.