

APPENDIX B

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

NRC Inspection Report: 50-285/88-12

Operating License: DPR-40

Docket: 50-285

Licensee: Omaha Public Power District (OPPD)
1623 Harney Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Facility Name: Fort Calhoun Station (FCS)

Inspection At: FCS, Blair, Nebraska

Inspection Conducted: April 4-8 and 18-22, 1988

Inspector:

Gregory A. Pich
G. A. Pich, Reactor Inspector, Operational
Programs Section, Division of Reactor Safety

June 13, 1988
Date

Approved:

J. E. Gagliardo
J. E. Gagliardo, Chief, Operational Programs
Section, Division of Reactor Safety

6/13/88
Date

Inspection Summary

Inspection Conducted April 4-8 and 18-22, 1988 (Report 50-285/88-12)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of licensed operator training programs.

Results: Within the area inspected, one violation was identified (failure to meet operator's license condition, paragraph 3).

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

OPPD

- +*R. Andrews, Division Manager, Nuclear Production
- +*K. Morris, Division Manager, Quality Assurance (QA) and Regulatory Affairs
- +*W. Gates, Plant Manager
- +J. Gasper, Manager, Administrative and Training Services
- +R. Jaworski, Section Manager, Technical Services
- +M. Core, Supervisor, Maintenance
- +*J. Fisicaro, Supervisor, Nuclear Regulatory and Industry Affairs
- *L. Gundrum, Plant Licensing Engineer
- +T. Patterson, Supervisor, Technical
- +A. Richard, Manager, QA
- +R. Kellogg, Acting Manager, Technical Support
- +C. Simmons, Licensing Engineer
- +*J. Fluehr, Supervisor, Station Training
- +*J. Gass, Training Supervisor
- *D. Kobunski, Senior Instructional Technologist
- L. DuFresne, Data Management Specialist
- J. Cook, Training Coordinator
- J. Tesarek, Senior Nuclear Production Engineer

NRC

- *J. Jaudon, Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Safety
- +*P. Harrell, Senior Resident Inspector
- +*T. Reis, Resident Inspector

Other persons contacted include administrative personnel, reactor operators, senior reactor operators, and training staff members.

- *Attended exit interview on April 7, 1988.
- +Attended exit interview on April 21, 1988.

2. Followup on Previously Identified Items

- a. (Open) Unresolved Item 285/8624-01: Failure to Maintain Training Records in Accordance With Regulatory Requirements - This unresolved item was previously discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-285/87-10 and a response to this item was requested in NRC Inspection Report 50-285/87-13. Responses were received from OPPD dated July 30 and November 19, 1987. The discussions in the inspection reports indicated that the licensee had hired a contractor in February 1987 to establish an auditable records system. The licensee's response dated November 19, 1987, listed the operations group training programs, whose records could be produced and obtained upon request.

The NRC inspector verified actions taken by the licensee to create a training record tracking system which could be audited (the Online Personnel Training Information Management (OPTIM) System) through discussions with the contractor hired to develop the system. The NRC inspector determined that the training programs consisted of courses which may be sorted (further subdivided) by course content and/or a list of students who were enrolled. The program could provide for any student the courses required to be attended, attendance date and/or absence from the courses, the course instructors and other computer sorts which exhibit increased detail, as required. Another program utilized is based upon the "Smart" (sic) system. This program schedules the upcoming training cycle courses.

The licensee's training programs were being expanded based upon Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) criteria. All course material for these training programs were not yet developed. In addition, all the necessary lesson plans developed for some training programs were not entered into the OPTIM database at this time. There were courses in the database that were not yet assigned to any training program; however, data relative to the courses could be obtained such as the lesson plan. All nonlicensed operator (NLO), reactor operator (RO), and senior reactor operator (SRO) curriculums were developed. It was estimated that the OPTIM database would be fully functional by the first quarter of 1990.

A QA Training Records Management Audit was planned. Based upon the findings of this audit, the licensee will prescribe a plan and estimated completion date for having records archived and a procedure developed to describe the records management process.

The NRC inspector reviewed OPTIM printouts which listed, for each individual selected, the requalification courses taken and the emergency operating procedures (EOP) and abnormal operating procedures (AOP) reviewed. There were several entries without completion dates. The reason was not determined.

This item remains open awaiting full implementation of the licensee's programs and subsequent verification by the NRC inspector. This item is considered open.

- b. (Closed) Unresolved Item 285/8624-02: Failure to Provide On-the-Job Training - This item was discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-285/87-10 and the licensee responded to this item on July 30 and November 19, 1987. The inspection report indicated that the licensee had modified the simulator training worksheets to reflect accomplishment of on-the-job training; however, there were no provisions for lecturing on evolutions not able to be simulated. The licensee's response dated November 19, 1987, stated that training on the AOPs that were unable to be simulated had been conducted during the second and third requalification rotations of 1987.

The NRC inspector verified that the lectures were attended during the 1987 requalification cycle. From discussions with the Licensed Operator Requalification Program Coordinator, it was determined that a method was in place to assure that the AOPs would be taught at least once biennially. This item is considered closed.

- c. (Closed) Unresolved Item 285/8624-03: Failure to Provide a Preplanned Lecture Series on Emergency Operating Procedures (EOP) - This item was previously discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-285/87-13. The licensee responded to this item on July 30 and November 19, 1987. The discussion in the inspection report described that some lectures had been provided during simulator training. The licensee's response dated November 19, 1987, stated that all EOPs had been taught to licensed individuals except for one person. The one individual was waived, since he had conducted the simulator training.

The NRC inspector reviewed lecture attendance sheets to verify that the EOP lectures had been given. The Licensed Operator Requalification Program Coordinator described the method in place for scheduling EOPs biennially. This item is considered closed.

- d. (Closed) Unresolved Item 285/8710-08: Failure to Remove SRO From Licensed Duties During Training - This item is very similar to the concerns identified in this report in that a person who had not met all of their requalification training requirements was allowed to resume licensed duties (see paragraph 3). This item is being closed administratively, since the concern will be included in the followup of Item 285/8812-01.

3. Licensed Operator Training (41701)

The NRC inspectors reviewed this program area to determine the effectiveness of the training presented which may have resulted from events that occurred at the facility. The events selected were sampled from 1987 licensee event reports (LER). Each LER had potential operator error. The events reviewed are listed below:

<u>LER Number</u>	<u>Subject</u>
87-001	Entry Into Technical Specification LCO Due to Surveillance Test Performance Error
87-019	Inadvertent Fire Suppression System Inoperability
87-027, Revision 1	Inadvertent Actuation of CIAS

87-033 Water Intrusion Into Instrument Air System

87-036 Inadvertent Auxiliary Feedwater Actuation

For each of the events listed, the NRC inspector selected three members of the shift complement on duty during the event. For each individual selected, the inspector verified that the training received by the individual before the event was appropriate. The training had consisted of practical factors training in actual system operation which had been given during the initial license training. Lectures on system operations were also presented each year during requalification training. The annual requalification training also included programmatic training on personnel responsibilities, shift operations, and technical specifications. Licensee representatives stated that they believed this training was sufficient and that training was not a contributor to or the cause of the events.

Training received after the events included a summary of the LER in the "Special Topics" sessions of requalification training and, if any procedures were changed, the changes were explained during requalification training. For significant changes, lesson plans were revised based upon a technical review of the event. The "Special Topics" sessions were based upon INPO's recommendations for industry events training.

Several procedures were reviewed by the NRC inspector to gain understanding on the licensee's method of conducting training department activities. The Training Administrative Procedures (TAP) and other documents reviewed are listed the attachment.

The licensee had implemented a performance based systems approach to training (SAT) for the licensed operating staff. The requalification program was outlined in the Licensed Operator (LO) Requalification Program Training Program Master Plan (TPMP). The LO Requalification Program TPMP was the requalification program on record and required coverage of the following segments:

- ° Preplanned Lecture Series
- ° Skills Training and Evaluation
- ° Operational Review Program
- ° Annual Examination and Evaluation

The depth of coverage of a lecture topic depended on the results of the annual examination and walkthrough evaluations. The LO Requalification Program TPMP had provisions to increase lectures and/or simulator manipulations in identified weak areas and to de-emphasize those areas where the operating staff exhibited strengths.

The NRC inspector interviewed several members of the operating staff and determined that the training they had received was in agreement with the training program requirement. The operators indicated that previous requalification lectures emphasized the subjects which were on the annual

written examination. There was little training related to increasing operating skill or ability. The operators interviewed stated that the new, two section examination was a more appropriate test because it stressed needed knowledge and required skills for normal and emergency operations. They stated that this allowed for training to complement their on-the-job experience.

The examination results for initial LO and SRO qualification examinations for the last three years were as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Summary</u>
1985	Four ROs and six SROs took their respective examinations with 100 percent of the ROs passing and 67 percent of the SROs passing. Upon reexamination, the SROs had a 100 percent pass rate.
1986	No RO and no SRO examinations were given.
1987	One RO and four SROs took examinations and all passed.

The examination results for the requalification examinations given in the last three years were as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Summary</u>
1985	Fifteen SROs and six ROs took the examination with 67 percent of the SROs and 67 percent of the ROs passing. After receipt of remedial training and reexamination, both the SROs and ROs had a 100 percent pass rate.
1986	Twenty SROs and fourteen ROs took the examination with 85 percent of the SROs and 100 percent of the ROs passing. Subsequently, two of the SROs allowed their licenses to lapse, and one SRO underwent remedial training. Upon reexamination, the remaining SRO passed.
1987	Twenty-two SROs and eight ROs took the examination with 86 percent of the SROs and 100 percent of the ROs passing. The three SROs had remedial training and, upon reexamination, the SROs had a 100 percent pass rate.

The licensee training programs for SROs, ROs, and NLOs were accredited in February 1987, and the remaining seven INPO recommended programs were accredited on April 19, 1988.

The NRC inspectors determined, from discussions with the Supervisor, Station Training, that a feedback mechanism was in place which integrated lessons learned into the training programs. The process utilized was described in TAP-7, "Revision of Training Programs." Changes to the

training administrative manual and lesson plans were made using this process. These changes were initiated by design modifications, procedure changes, changes in the regulations, and/or information notices from the NRC, vendors, INPO, or architect engineers.

Another feedback mechanism, which had been implemented, factored industry related information into the operators' requalification training "Special Topics" sessions. This was the industry events training described in TAP-10, "Lessons Learned - Inputs Into Training Programs Required - Reading Program." The "Special Topics" sessions consider current events and issues which have occurred in industry and had been described in various types of industry documents. They were presented to the operators as they relate to FCS. Some of the documents used include: INPO SOERs and SERs; NRC bulletins, notices, generic letters, and inspection report findings; audit report findings; and information from the nuclear network.

Information that needed to be distributed in a more timely manner was accomplished utilizing the hotline program. The information was received and sent out to the individuals with a required response date. Overall the program was effective; however, there were some people who were consistently slow in returning their sign-offs.

Training on plant modifications implemented during refueling outages occurs in sessions usually conducted outside of regularly scheduled training. A book was prepared which summarizes the change and its effect on plant operations. The training was conducted prior to the reactor going critical near the end of the outage.

It was estimated that the licensee's simulator would be functional during the first quarter of 1990. The licensee expected the simulator to be certified around this time.

While inspecting this program area, some activities being conducted by the licensee were of concern to the inspector. The concerns were related to attendance at preplanned requalification program lectures by two licensed SROs during requalification rotations -3, -4, and -5, respectively.

Based on a review of requalification records and from discussions with licensee employees, the NRC inspector found that 26 requalification courses had been scheduled over the three rotations. The rotations covered the period June 8 to October 5, 1987. As of April 28, 1988, one of the SROs (Mr. W. G. Gates) had failed to attend 14 of the scheduled courses. Through self-study, he had completed makeup sessions after an elapsed time of three months or greater from the originally scheduled course date for 10 of the courses. Mr. Gates had not taken the rotation examinations by the time of the completion of this inspection on April 21, 1988. As of May 12, 1988, the other SRO (Mr. L. T. Kusek) had failed to complete five of the courses. He had failed to attend 18 of the scheduled courses, but had made up 17 of the courses through self-study after an

elapsed time of approximately four months or greater from the originally scheduled course date. He had made up one course by completing an examination approximately seven months after the scheduled date of the course.

The NRC inspector determined that Messrs. L. T. Kusek and W. G. Gates were informed officially by memoranda from Mr. J. K. Gasper that they no longer qualified as licensed senior reactor operators. On October 29, 1987, Mr. J. K. Gasper identified to them, in part, that "10 CFR 55 requires continuous participation in licensed operator requalification training for all licensed individuals. Based upon your attendance record in requalification training, I am no longer able to say that you are in compliance with this regulation."

The NRC inspector reviewed the Control Room logs for the last two calendar quarters in 1987 and found that Mr. Kusek had been the shift supervisor on watch on October 10, 1987.

The Code of Federal Regulations 10 CFR 50.54(1) requires that the licensee shall designate individuals licensed as senior reactor operators pursuant to 10 CFR 55 to be responsible for directing licensed activities.

Section (h) of 10 CFR 55.53 requires that licensed operators shall complete a requalification program as described in 10 CFR 55.59. Section (c)(1) of 10 CFR 55.59 requires that the requalification program must be conducted on a continuous basis for a period not to exceed 2 years. Section (c) of 10 CFR 55.59 further requires that the requalification program must include preplanned lectures on a regular and continuing basis.

By failing to attend a majority of the required preplanned lectures, Mr. Kusek had not fully participated in the requalification program and thus his qualification to perform licensed duties was in question. This fact was also raised by the licensee's memorandum of October 29, 1987, as discussed above. Mr. Kusek's questionable qualification status implies that he was not qualified to assume watchstanding duties. Mr. Kusek's assignment to and performance as the shift supervisor on October 10, 1987, is an apparent violation (285/8812-01) of the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(1) as stated above.

The NRC inspectors also noted that Messrs. L. T. Kusek and W. G. Gates had continued to sign on-the-spot procedure changes and temporary modifications as senior licensed Plant Review Committee (PRC) members, after they had been directed to cease these activities. The following table summarizes these activities:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document Altered</u>	<u>Individual Involved</u>
11/09/87	Jumper 87-M-025	L. T. Kusek (per telecon)
11/09/87	Jumper 87-M-026	L. T. Kusek (per telecon)

11/09/87	Jumper 87-E-103	L. T. Kusek
11/09/87	Jumper 87-E-104	L. T. Kusek
11/30/87	AOP-12 on-the-spot	W. G. Gates
11/08/87	MO No. 875106	W. G. Gates
11/06/87	SRDCO 87-42	L. T. Kusek
11/19/87	CP-3142	W. G. Gates
11/11/87	CMP-2.2	L. T. Kusek

In each instance, an individual with a current license had subsequently countersigned for Messrs. Gates or Kusek. It could not be determined when the valid signature was written, since the alternate senior licensed PRC member failed to date his signature. This appeared to be an inappropriate way of changing a permanent plant record.

These facts were particularly troubling to the NRC inspectors because the October 29, 1987, memorandum specifically addressed this issue. The memorandum stated, in part, ". . . it is necessary that you immediately cease performing licensed duty until such time as you have made up any deficiencies in 1987 requalification training. This also means that you may not sign as an SRO-licensed member on on-the-spot procedure changes.

"Please note that the Training Administrative Manual requires that all requalification training must be completed prior to taking the annual exam. Annual exams will begin the week of January 4, 1988."

The memorandum had been issued on October 29, 1987, after conferring with Mr. John Pellet, Acting Chief, Operator Licensing Section, Region IV, on October 28, 1987. The change to this part of the Code of Federal Regulations was issued in March 1987, and became effective May 1987; hence, this clarification should have been solicited earlier. A potential weakness was indicated in the licensee's ability to determine how changes in the regulations affect them.

After further discussions with the Supervisor, Station Training, the licensee stated that he would make more conservative the requirements for "continuous participation in the requalification program." Revision Request No. TAM-88-008 was issued April 21, 1988, to alter TAP-13, Revision 3, "Licensed Operator Requalification Training."

The changes to Procedure TAP-13 upgraded attendance requirements at scheduled classes during each requalification rotation from 50 to 75 percent and stated, "Lectures which are missed may be made up by viewing video tapes provided that the appropriate instructor is available to answer questions or clarify material." This statement only suggests to the individual that they watch the video tapes, but it is not a requirement to attend videotaped sessions. It appears that this fails to meet 10 CFR 55.59 requirements for attendance at requalification program lectures. Another item of concern was Step 4.3 of Procedure TAP-13. Although this step did give some flexibility to the training department, it was too lenient in that a person may not attend training for up to

18 weeks. There appears to be a weakness indicated in the administrative control of training activities.

The followup of these issues related to TAP-13 will be conducted under Open Item 285/8812-02.

4. Followup on Previously Identified Concerns

Various concerns related to training were identified in NRC Inspection Report 50-285/87-13 by the senior resident inspector. Each concern was discussed with licensee training management personnel. The licensee's comments were documented in the inspection report, and the licensee's supplemental response dated November 19, 1987, provided the current status of these concerns.

The NRC inspector verified the licensee's actions and reviewed the current status of the identified problems expressed by the concerns. A topical summary and the status of each concern follows:

- a. As originally identified, approximately 75 percent of the training staff was composed of contractor personnel. These contractor personnel taught approximately 85 percent of the classes given from September 1986 through March 1987. None of these contractor instructors had any operating experience at the FCS. Instructors with FCS operating experience could enhance the overall knowledge level of the operators attending classroom lectures.

The NRC inspector determined that two contractors had become OPPD employees. Also, two SRO licensed individuals had been transferred from Operations to Training. The licensee was planning to replace all contractors with OPPD employees within the next six years unless training needs dictate additional help is necessary. During the 1987 requalification cycle, the operations training staff consisted of approximately 60 percent contractor personnel. The instructors taught approximately 73 percent of the requalification sessions presented. The operators who were interviewed during this inspection expressed concern regarding the excessive use of contract instructors who are not or have not been licensed at the plant.

The licensee indicated that it was planned to add senior licensed individuals to the training staff as the licensee obtains additional licensed persons in the operating staff. The licensee plans on adding at least five new licensed individuals in 1988 to the operating staff.

The NRC inspector noted that the licensee's policy of a licensed training staff member critiquing the first week of each requalification training rotation can only be effective if the training staff members maintain their attendance in order to provide that evaluation.

Followup of licensee implementation of the above activities will be conducted during subsequent NRC inspections under open item (285/8812-03). This concern is resolved.

- b. The licensee had not established a method for certification of contract instructors to teach plant systems. Without a certification program, the level of knowledge of contract instructors could not be determined for a specific area prior to allowing the contractor to provide training in that area.

Corrective actions included assigning, to each operations training instructor, specific systems which will aide in the operations training instructor becoming an expert on their systems. Additionally, the instructors were designated to do required reading of the operators' requalification program "Special Topics" information; preplanned courses on instructional techniques were to be held; and they were required to spend eight hours per month in the plant doing activities related to their assigned systems.

The licensee did not have a written policy requiring the training staff members to maintain their certification nor did they have a means to verify that the staff members received eight hours of in-the-plant familiarization. This is an open item and will be addressed in a subsequent NRC inspection (285/8812-04).

- c. A review of 15 lesson plans indicated that 9 of the lesson plans were prepared by a contractor and approved by a licensee employee, neither of whom had operating experience at any nuclear plant. The review also indicated that no operating personnel at the FCS had reviewed the lesson plans.

The licensee stated that 48 safety-significant system lesson plans were identified by OPPD to need upgrading by April 1987. These lesson plans were upgraded, reviewed by a licensed SRO, and reviewed by an SRO on the training staff. To prevent an inadequate review from recurring, the licensee had implemented a Revision Request (RR) program. This program will require changes to lesson plans each time the system design is changed, system operation is altered, or any item as decided by the training staff to affect a lesson plan.

The NRC inspector reviewed the flow path for RR forms to assure that they received a technical review. The flow path for an incoming RR was to the Licensed Requalification Program Coordinator who addressed what operator programs the RR applied. He then forwarded the RR to the appropriate training supervisor for licensed individuals in SRO upgrade, initial RO or SRO, or the LO Requalification Program. The present training supervisor (who was previously licensed at FCS) also conducted a technical review on the RR, or he would route the RR to one of the licensed training staff members. This concern is resolved.

- d. Lesson plans for Sections 1 and 2 (Safety Limits and Limiting Conditions for Operations) of the Technical Specifications (TS), the auxiliary feedwater system, and the EOPs were reviewed for technical content. The results of the review indicated that the lesson plans contained technically incorrect information, that appropriate information had not been included, and that there were typographical errors affecting the technical meaning of the information.

The licensee had revised lesson plans. The NRC inspector reviewed the lesson plans for TS and auxiliary feedwater to determine if the deficiencies had been corrected. The identified deficiencies were corrected; however, some minor errors were identified in both lesson plans. These errors were marked and identified to the licensee. This concern is resolved.

- e. Lesson plans had not been completed for Sections 4 and 5 (Design Features and Administrative Controls) of the TS. Without an approved lesson plan, no learning objectives were established and no assurance was made that the licensed operators received the indepth instruction needed to perform their assigned duties.

The licensee stated that the TS lesson plan mentioned in concern (d) was also used to teach Sections 4 and 5. The NRC inspector verified that the lesson plan contained guidance concerning TS Sections 4 and 5. This concern is resolved.

- f. The licensee established a formal program for maintaining up-to-date lesson plans in April 1987. Prior to this time, it was the individual instructor's responsibility to ensure that the lesson plan contained the latest information. As discussed in paragraph c, a review performed on these lesson plans indicated that the information contained in the lesson plans was incomplete or inaccurate. These lesson plan inadequacies were due, in part, to the lesson plans not being updated with the latest information.

In their response, OPPD stated that the RR program would maintain up-to-date lesson plans. The goal of the RR program was to assure that a lesson plan is updated prior to its use. TAP-7, "Revision of Training Programs," contains provisions to prevent using lesson plans that have not been updated.

The NRC inspector had requested the revised version of the AFW system lesson plan. The lesson plan was provided to the NRC inspectors, and it was noted that the revision was dated April 21, 1988. The revision request (87-056), which required correction of the lesson plan in response to the NRC identified deficiencies, was initiated on June 19, 1987. This elapsed time was ten months. The revision time appeared to be excessive and indicates a weakness in that a chance exists for instructing from an outdated lesson plan. The NRC inspector commented to the licensee that the RR process will work only if changes to lesson plans remain timely. This is an open item

awaiting further NRC review to determine how timely other RR have been completed (285/8812-05). This concern is resolved.

- g. The licensee did not maintain an as-given training schedule. The schedule was issued at the beginning of the week to notify appropriate individuals of the classes to be taught. If, for some reason, the class was rescheduled or the class was cancelled, no changes were made to the schedule to reflect the actual as-given training. Without this information, the licensee could not establish that the training required by 10 CFR Part 55 and the licensee's NRC-approved training program was provided.

The licensee's response described that two systems were being used to accomplish this objective: the OPTIM system, and a computerized tracking system which is updated by operations training personnel on a personal computer. Using these systems, it was possible to establish, at any time, an individual's status relative to the training program requirements. Although an as-given training schedule could be obtained from these records, it was not being utilized since the item of interest is the individual's record relative to the program's requirements. Therefore, OPPD believed the current (1987) records met the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55 and their training program.

The NRC inspectors verified, through conduct of his inspection, that the licensee could provide an as-given training schedule. This concern is resolved.

The remaining concern and the comments were determined to be resolved satisfactorily.

No other violations or deviations were identified.

4. Exit Interview

The NRC inspectors summarized the inspection scope and findings on April 7, 1988, and on April 21, 1988, with those persons identified in paragraph 1.

The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the information provided to or reviewed by the NRC inspectors.

ATTACHMENT

The documents [redacted] were utilized during the inspection:

- TAP-1 I [redacted] Revision 2, "Initial Qualification and Certification of Instructor Licensee Operator," dated April 2, 1987
- TAP-1 OI, Revision 2, "Qualification and Certification of Operations Instructor," dated April 2, 1987
- TAP-6, Revision 2, "Evaluation of Training Program Effectiveness," dated October 1, 1987
- TAP-7, Revision 4, "Revision of Training Programs," dated April 1, 1988
- TAP-10, Revision 3, "Lessons Learned - Inputs to Training Programs Required - Reading Program," dated April 9, 1987
- TAP-13, Revision 3, "Licensed Operator Requalification Training," dated January [redacted], 1988
- TPMP, Revision 1, "Licensed Operator Requalification Program," dated September 14, 1987
- Lesson Plan 7-66-1, Revision 0, "Operating Experience," dated September 4, 1987
- Lesson Plan 7-66-2, Revision 0 "Procedure Revisions," dated September 4, 1987
- Lesson Plan 7-51-6, Revision 0, "Technical Specifications," dated November 20, 1987
- Lesson Plan 7-11-1, Revision 1, "Auxiliary Feedwater System," dated April 21, 1988
- Special Topics 87-3, Course Content
- Special Topics 87-7, Course Content