



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

MAY 13 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Harold R. Booher, Chief
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

FROM: L. P. Crocker, Section Leader
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT - MEETING WITH RHR

On May 11, 1983, I participated in a meeting at the offices of Rohrer, Hibler & Replogle, Inc. (RHR) in New York City. Also present from the NRC were Glenn Myer, Region I, and Mary Wagner, OELD. We met primarily with Dr. Paul F. D'Arcy of RHR, but also had brief discussions with Dr. John R. Sauer of RHR. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the data used for the report RHR had prepared for GPU, dated March 15, 1983, and titled "Priority Concerns of Licensed Nuclear Operators at TMI and Oyster Creek and Suggested Action Steps."

Members of the TMI-1 revalidation team and other staff members had met with the above mentioned RHR representatives on May 9, 1983, to discuss the content of the report. At that time, the data upon which the report was based were unavailable. We went to the RHR offices to obtain and discuss the basic data. Dr. D'Arcy was the principal contributor to the report, so most of the discussion was with him.

RHR is a large enterprise with offices located in about a dozen U. S. cities and several foreign countries. They were commissioned by GPU in the summer of 1982 to conduct a survey of licensed operators at TMI-1 and Oyster Creek to determine operator attitudes and concerns. In particular, GPU was concerned that operator's morale might be low because of delays in TMI-1 restart and wished to find out priorities for helping operators reduce their frustration, if this were the case. This is the first such undertaking for RHR. Their previous contacts with GPU apparently were limited to psychological screening of a number of prospective management candidates.

Dr. D'Arcy informed us that he first had held discussions with a small group of operators at each site to determine the spectrum of concerns. Based upon the information gathered in these two meetings, and with input from GPU management, both corporate and site, he constructed a survey instrument. This survey was then pre-tested at each site on a small group of about five to six operators to make sure that it was understandable to the operators and did not contain ambiguities. Corrections were made as indicated by the pre-test results, and the final survey was then administered to a total of 86 licensed operators and license candidates, 43 from TMI-1 and 43 from Oyster Creek.

8305250011XA

Dr. D'Arcy met with about 3/4 of the operators in a number of small group sessions. Five such sessions were held at TMI-1 and six sessions at Oyster Creek. In each instance, he had the operators complete the survey and then discussed the results with the group. Each session lasted four to five hours. The survey consisted of 140 statements and required the operators to express the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. There also were a number of questions which asked the operators to rank their concerns, express their views on interaction with other departments of GPU, express their views on the relative importance to public safety of a number of matters, and indicate their feelings regarding actions GPU was taking or could take to improve the operations from the standpoint of public safety.

Results of the surveys were tabulated and, in conjunction with additional information gleaned during the discussion sessions, were used as the basis for the report. For those operators who could not participate in the discussion sessions (about 10-12), just the survey results were used.

Dr. D'Arcy stated that the report is based on the impressions he received while talking with the operators and includes his impression of their beliefs and his hunches regarding their true concerns, as well as the statistical results from the survey instrument. Its purpose was to feed this information back to GPU together with recommendations on where improvements could be made. In terms of their usual relations with clients, RHR feels that this report represents about the first 10% of an improvement program. Further, both Dr. D'Arcy and Dr. Sauer indicated that their primary method of feedback to clients is via discussions with client management personnel. Their reports are not designed to do more than highlight certain areas to be discussed.

We had some concerns with the report, since certain statements of RHR findings seem to contradict the views of the inspection team members. In particular, these included statements relating to operator attitude and capability, operator training, importance of safety versus efficiency, compliance with procedures, and matters related to licensing and requalification. A primary problem, however, was in understanding how much of the statements applied to TMI operators and how much stemmed from Oyster Creek operators. As written, the data from TMI-1 is lumped with data from Oyster Creek so that one cannot distinguish whether certain comments in the report pertain to both sites or to just one site. We felt that if we could obtain the basic data obtained by the surveys, it would help us in our evaluation of the importance of some of the report comments relative to our findings regarding TMI-1.

We did obtain some of the basic data from RHR, although not all. Dr. D'Arcy is attempting to pull other data out of the computer, but it will be several days before it is available. Thus, it will not be available for the team to use in preparing our report by the deadline of May 16, 1983. However, with

Harold R. Booher

-3-

MAY 13 1983

the information we did obtain from RHR, both the data and the discussions, I feel that we can put together a reasonable evaluation of the impact of the report on the team findings.

R. Benedict

for

L. P. Crocker, Section Leader
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

cc: H. Denton
E. Case
H. Thompson
J. Goldberg
M. Wagner
G. Myer
T. Martin
R. Keimig
