

February 1, 1985

Mr. Ron Mulheron
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Mulheron:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and

between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

8502110483 850201
PDR ADOCK 05000266
V PDR

OFFICE				
SURNAME				
DATE				

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Ron Mulheron

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay
H. Denton

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

DISTRIBUTION FOR IDENTICAL LETTERS TO:

Docket Files 50-266/301

LPDR

NRC PDR

TColburn PM/DL

BBoger

OLB R/F

HDenton/DEisenhut

JKeppler, RIII

LSpessard, RIII

JStreeter, RIII

JMcMillen, RIII

SKent, OCA, RIII

DHFS R/F (2)

Leo Kamyszek

Erich Ziller

Ivan Bleeker

Carl Gray

Ron Mulheron

Tom Garot

Ken Draska

Tom Sheley

Mike Wagner

Andy Shedlosky

Jon Johnson

Tim Ross

February 1, 1985

Mr. Tom Sheley
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Sheley:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE							
SURNAME							
DATE							

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Tom Sheley

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

February 1, 1985

Mr. Tim Ross
Training Supervisor
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Ross:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and

between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE					
SURNAME					
DATE					

Mr. Tim Ross

February 1, 1985

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE							
SURNAME							
DATE							

Mr. Tim Ross

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,
Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

February 1, 1985

Mr. Leo Kamyszek
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Kamyszek:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plan on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program. Boy was I glad to see someone at the meeting who had signed my qualification cards when we were together in the NAVY!

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE					
SURNAME					
DATE					

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Leo Kamyszek

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

BEA10/LTR TO OPERATORS

OFFICE	DHFS:D						
SURNAME	HT Thompson:pab						
DATE	2/1 /85						

February 1, 1985

Mr. Erich Ziller
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Ziller:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE	between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.				
SURNAME					
DATE					

Mr, Erich Ziller

February 1, 1985

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC. I asked Bruce to look into your concerns about not hearing from NRC on previous comments and to let you know what happened.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

Mr. Erich Ziller

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,
Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE	DHFS:D					
SURNAME	HThompson:pab					
DATE	2/1/85					

February 1, 1985

Mr. Jon Johnson
Operating Supervisor
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE									
SURNAME									
DATE									

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category I SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

Mr. Jon Johnson

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

February 1, 1985

Mr. Ivan Bleeker
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Bleeker:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE					
SURNAME					
DATE					

Mr. Ivan Bleeker

February 1, 1985

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

Mr. Ivan Bleeker

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

February 1, 1985

Mr. Carl Gray
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Gray:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and

between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE						
SURNAME						
DATE						

Mr. Carl Gray

February 1, 1985

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE							
SURNAME							
DATE							

Mr. Carl Gray

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE							
SURNAME	<i>HT</i>						
DATE							

February 1, 1985

Mr. Michael Wagner
Operating Supervisor
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Wagner:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and

between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE					
SURNAME					
DATE					

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Michael Wagner

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

February 1, 1985

Mr. Andy Shedlosky
Operating Supervisor
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Shedlosky:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plan on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE	between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.				
SURNAME					
DATE					

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Andy Shedlosky

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

February 1, 1985

Mr. Tom Garot
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear M. Garot:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPC accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE									
SURNAME									
DATE									

Mr. Tom Garot

February 1, 1985

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE							
SURNAME							
DATE							

Mr. Tom Garot

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

February 1, 1985

Mr. Ken Draska
Duty Shift Superintendent
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Dear Mr. Draska:

Thank you for meeting with Bruce Boger, Joe McMillen (RIII), and myself at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant on January 16, 1985. I found the meeting to be a very valuable meeting in that it provided me with an opportunity to hear your concerns about the NRC Requalification Audit Program and to identify many of our ongoing efforts to improve the Operator Licensing Program.

While I noted the high level of your frustration with the current program, I do believe that we agreed on a number of key issues that should not only help reduce that frustration, but also contribute to enhanced plant operations. The first issue was the importance of and the need for input into the licensed operator requalification training program by experienced shift superintendents. What action can you take to address this issue? Inform your management of your willingness to identify your crew's training needs sufficiently in advance of the scheduled training so that learning objectives (e.g., ones that both you and your training staff agree are appropriate to address the training needs) and training programs can be developed by the training staff. As we discussed at our meeting, this is not to say that other inputs for the requalification training program, such as operating events at other reactors, new NRC requirements, etc., should be excluded, but you should work with the training staffs to get these needs addressed in a performance oriented context. For my part, I have asked Bruce Boger, Acting Branch Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, to reaffirm to each region our intention that the requalification audit examinations prepared and administered by NRC are not to be "repeats" of the initial licensing examination. These examinations should be more operationally oriented and, where they exist, based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified in the learning objectives of the utility requalification program. Even though the NRC has resource constraints and NRC regulations must be met in order to have your licenses renewed, the requalification training effort should be geared toward addressing agreed upon needs.

In this regard, the efforts WEPCO has taken to achieve INPO accreditation should significantly assist their efforts. The NRC is also taking steps to make our examinations more operationally oriented. We have compiled a catalog that identifies necessary RO and SRO knowledges. Experienced SRO's have reviewed this catalog for completeness and have rated each knowledge for importance. This catalog will be published this spring and can be made Point Beach specific in the future based upon WEPCO input. The real key in this area is close communication between you and your training department and between your training department and the Region III operator licensing staff.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

A second issue that parallels the importance of and need for your input into the facility requalification training program is the need for your input and comments on NRC's proposed rules and proposed Regulatory Guides. You have the opportunity to comment on the current NRC proposals to change the licensing process. To encourage your comments, copies of these proposals have been mailed directly to you. Your comments can be provided directly to NRC or to your training department for preparation of a consolidated WEPCO response. We have set up a program to provide each individual commenting with a copy of the final rules and a letter that discusses the resolution of the comments submitted to the NRC.

The third issue was the role of the resident inspector following a requalification exam. I agree that resident inspectors should not approach individual operators who "failed" the NRC requalification exam to ask what actions are going to be taken against them. The appropriate action is to verify with the training staff that the actions called for in the utilities' approved Requalification Training Program is followed. This was discussed with Region III management and should be the appropriate action followed in the future.

Another area of agreement was that the NRC inspection or audit program should have the flexibility to concentrate on the facilities that have demonstrated poorer performance. The current audit program has that flexibility in that the guidance to the Regional Administrators is to audit average performers once every two years, to audit below average performers once every year and to audit the above average performer once every three years, depending upon the availability of resources. Above average performance for this area is Category 1 SALP ratings or INPO Accreditation.

We agreed that the NRC's requalification audit exam at Ginna was not administered in accordance with the current guidance for that program. Both Region I management and Headquarters have taken steps to ensure that future requalification programs are consistent with the guidelines.

We also agreed on the value of plant specific simulators in training and requalification programs. As you will note in the proposed rule changes, the NRC also recognizes the benefits of evaluating individuals in the environment in which they would be expected to perform. Accordingly, we have proposed that each license candidate demonstrate, on a simulation facility, the ability to operate a nuclear power plant. Because of your strong support for a simulator, I am sending a copy of this letter to WEPCO management so that they are aware of your support, you may wish to amplify.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

Mr. Ken Draska

- 3 -

February 1, 1985

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and share our ideas on the Operator Licensing Program. I'd also like to share one final area of agreement. Namely, it can be cold and snowy in Wisconsin in the winter. I look forward to seeing the beauty of your area in the summer.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr., Director
Division of Human Factors Safety
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: C. W. Fay

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶