ENCLOSURE

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

Docket No.:	50-482
License No.:	NPF-42
Report No.:	50-482/98-02
Licensee:	Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation
Facility:	Wolf Creek Generating Station
Location:	1550 Oxen Lane, NE Burlington, Kansas
Dates:	February 2 to 6, 1998
Inspector(s):	T. O. McKernon, Lead Inspector, Operations Branch, Division of Reactor Safety D. N. Graves, Senior Project Engineer, Branch B, Division of Reactor Projects J. A. Arildsen, Senior Operations Engineer, Human Factors Assessment Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation R. M. Pelton, Training and Assessment Specialist, Human Factors Assessment Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Approved By:	John L. Pellet, Chief, Operations Branch, Division of Reactor Safety
Attachment:	Supplemental Information

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wolf Creek Generating Station
NRC Inspection Report 50-482/98-02

The inspection included a review of maintenance, engineering, and emergency preparedness training in the areas of trainee and program evaluations, Systems Approach to Training Elements 4 and 5 of NUREG-1220, Revision 1, "Training Review Criteria and Procedures."

Maintenance

- Maintenance training program effectively addressed evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback (Sections M5.1, M5.2).

Engineering

- Engineering training program effectively addressed evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback (Sections E5.1, E5.2).

Plant Support

- Emergency Preparedness training effectively addressed evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback (Section P5).

II. Maintenance

M5 Maintenance Staff Training and Qualification

M5.1 Task Analysis, Learning Objective, and Evaluation Correlation

a. Inspection Scope (41500)

The inspectors reviewed the maintenance training program for Subelements 4.1 through 4.4 and 4.6 of NRC NUREG 1220, "Training Review Criteria and Procedures," Revision 1, as follows:

- Relationships exist between job performance requirements and test items.
- Trainee performance is evaluated regularly.
- Remediation is provided when appropriate.
- Continuing training contains performance requirements for difficult, important, or infrequent tasks.
- Evaluations of task performance test the trainees' mastery of job performance requirements.

Subelement 4.5, "Training and Task Performance Exemptions," was not reviewed. The inspection included personnel interviews and the review of selected job task analyses, on-the-job qualification cards, training lesson plans, examinations, and training administrative programs.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors selected nine job task analyses for review. Three tasks in each discipline were selected: mechanical, electrical, and instrumentation and control. For each selected task, the training material associated with that task was reviewed. The training material included lesson plans and on-the-job-training qualification cards. The lesson plans contained appropriate learning objectives such that the knowledge necessary to perform the associated task would be learned if mastery of the objective was demonstrated. The lesson plans were detailed sufficiently and provided industry and plant specific examples that provided a practical application background to the subject matter.

The inspectors noted that no documentation connected the learning objectives in the lesson plans to the knowledge and skills listed in the job task analysis. The licensee training representative acknowledged this and stated that the linking of the task analysis to the learning objectives was a manual process. The representative also stated that a new computer data base system was being acquired and installed and that the new system would include the ability to document the connection of job task analysis knowledge and skills, learning objectives, and test items.

The inspectors selected nine (three from each discipline) on-the-job-training qualification cards. These task cards were reviewed for adherence to Procedure AP 30E-004,

"Training Materials Development," Revision 3. All of the reviewed qualification cards contained the recommended references, prerequisites, performance criteria, acceptance criteria and, with the exception of the instrumentation and control qualification cards, objectives recommended by Procedure AP 30E-004. The formats for the electrical and mechanical qualification cards had been revised within the past year, and the instrumentation and control qualification cards were in the process of being updated to be similar, although in a slightly different format. Similar to the lesson plans, the objectives listed on the qualification cards did not identify which skills and knowledge from the task analysis were being satisfied. Each task was required to be performed a minimum of twice, once with a trainer to provide guidance and instruction, and once while being evaluated. During the evaluation, the trainee was required to demonstrate performance of the task without outside intervention.

All of the maintenance personnel interviewed indicated that they were very satisfied with the conduct of the on-the-job-training program and felt no hesitation in indicating to their supervisor, trainer, or evaluator that they needed additional training on a particular task. Each trainee was also required to sign the qualification card indicating that they were satisfied with their ability to perform the task on their own. Once qualified to perform a task, there was no requirement to perform the task to maintain proficiency periodically. All of the individuals interviewed from the maintenance department stated that the tasks they felt most uncomfortable with or had the most difficulty performing were infrequently performed tasks. But, similarly, all of the individuals stated that if they felt the need to obtain additional assistance or training before performing a task, that they would notify their supervisor and would not proceed. This philosophy was stated consistently by both the supervisors and the workers. The department training coordinators maintained the list of individuals qualified to perform specific tasks as well as the list of qualified trainers and evaluators.

The inspectors reviewed examinations associated with 11 different lesson plans that were administered within the past year. In the instrument and control area, two examinations were reviewed which demonstrated good coverage of the learning objectives stated in the lesson plan. The test items were of good quality and appropriately referenced the associated objective. The inspectors reviewed five examinations in the mechanical area. The examinations provided good coverage of the learning objectives, although some test items in the examinations for the normal charging pump (Training Identification No. MM1320101), industrial safety (Training Identification No. MB1331600), and safety valves (Training Identification No. MM1327300) were not challenging and did not discriminate between an individual who had mastered the material and one who had not. In the electrical area, four examinations were reviewed. The examination test items for the D. C. Scout Ground Detection System lesson plan (Training Identification No. ME3323504) did not closely match the learning objectives in the lesson plan, and several test items were not challenging. The remaining three examinations reviewed provided good test item coverage of the learning objectives and contained well developed, challenging questions.

Trainees were consistently given specific feedback about their skills or knowledge that did not meet job performance requirements. Feedback of performance included

on-the-job training and on-the-job evaluations (OJT/OJE), labs, classroom instruction followed by written examinations, self-study assignments followed by written examinations or labs followed by OJE, and others. Trainees were advised of their performance results on examinations and OJEs immediately. In most instances, individuals were given a class break after taking the test while the instructor finalized grading and then let the individuals know the results.

Additionally, the inspectors observed training classes for OJT trainer/evaluator update training, Identification No. TI1431700, Revision 6, dated February 4, 1998. This training was given for the purpose of performing biennial self-assessments of the trainers/evaluators. The self-assessments included program evaluations, certified training instructor observations, OJT/OJE observations by supervisors of training instructors in their groups, and instructor self-evaluations made by video taping a presentation of class instruction. All evaluation results were forwarded to an instructional analyst for analysis of the data and identification of any trends.

A sampling of courses instructed and examination results were reviewed to ascertain whether individuals who did not meet minimum standards on an examination, OJE, or lab were given remediation and retested. Through interviews, inspectors identified an inconsistency between practices of the individual training disciplines. In some instances where the individual failed a lab task and was remediated immediately and reevaluated, the result was not recorded as a failure but rather the individual was given credit for successfully completing the task. As such, an individual's historical performance may not be tracked accurately.

c. Conclusions

The licensee's training program demonstrated a good relationship between job requirements, learning objectives, and test items. Evaluations of task performance generally tested the trainee's mastery of job performance requirements. In some instances, it was noted that test items in several examinations were not sufficiently challenging to demonstrate mastery of the subject material. Inspectors also noted some inconsistencies in recording initial failures. The inspectors concluded that the maintenance training program effectively addressed evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback even within the exceptions noted

M5.2 Training Program Evaluation and Revision

a. Inspection Scope (41500)

The inspectors reviewed the maintenance training program for evaluation of training and qualification program effectiveness and determination of the need for subsequent

revisions to the training programs, Subelements 5.1 through 5.6 of Element 5 of NUREG-1220, "Training Review Criteria and Procedures," Revision 1, as follows:

- Trainee critiques reviewed for potential improvements to the program.
- On-the-job work experience solicitation.
- New job performance Information solicitation.
- Degraded task performance information solicitation.
- Evaluation of external factors.
- Changes in training and training material to reflect changes in job performance requirements.

The inspection included personnel interviews and the review of various training administrative processes and programs.

b. Observations and Findings

Several different mechanisms and processes existed for individuals to provide feedback on training received and to propose new or additional training. The majority of the program was described in Procedure AP 30E-002, "Training Effectiveness Evaluation Program." Formal processes included regular Training Review Group meetings, post-training feedback surveys; end-of-course training and instructional quality surveys; and periodic observation and evaluation of instructors, trainers, and evaluators. Formal self-assessments were performed periodically.

Procedure AP 30E-002 required that Training Review Groups meet at least quarterly to discuss training effectiveness, identify needed improvements, identify future training needs, and discuss recent changes in procedures or tasks that may warrant changes in the task analyses. A review of Training Review Group meeting minutes indicated that the groups, one for mechanical maintenance and one for electrical/instrumentation and control, met more frequently than once per quarter and discussed the expected topics.

During interviews with three maintenance supervisors and six maintenance technicians, all stated that they consistently used the End of Course Training Feedback Survey Forms provided by the training department. Interviewees that had requested a reply to comments made on the form stated that they had received an answer. The interviewees also stated that they had received Post-Training Feedback Survey Forms following various training segments. These forms were to elicit feedback from the attendees on training course content, materials, instructor performance, applicability of training, and any other comments related to the conduct of training. The supervisors and technicians stated that the training coordinators requested input from their respective groups prior to Training Review Group meetings. All of the individuals interviewed also stated that they felt very comfortable recommending topics for training through the maintenance

department training coordinators. These topics were brought forward and discussed during the Training Review Group meetings, and a decision was made whether or not the training request would be forwarded to the training department for inclusion in future training or incorporation into existing training. The supervisors and technicians interviewed believed this process was working well and stated that they were very satisfied with the process and the training received.

The licensee had a program in place for field observations by supervisors that provided immediate feedback to the technicians and was also utilized as a source of information in determining whether additional training was needed on observed tasks. This program was a pilot program initiated in October 1997 and was not considered part of the corrective action program but was intended to provide additional information on real time performance of personnel in the field, and identify areas for improvement. The program was controlled by Procedure AI 28D-001, "Field Observation Program." The supervisors interviewed stated that they had been utilizing the program and that they were required to conduct at least one observation a week. The technicians indicated that they had been observed under the program but did not recall any specific feedback from the supervisors following the observations.

With regard to the initiation of training requests, there were two primary processes. The first process consisted of an individual recommending a training item to the group training coordinator and the training coordinator either discussing the subject during a Training Review Group meeting or calling the department training supervisor and requesting it verbally. The training supervisors maintained a list of what requests had been received, and either incorporated the request or initiated training as needed. The second method was through the initiation of a Request for Training Form APF 30E-007-02. The Request for Training Form was a document processed through the initiator's supervisor to the training division supervisor. Although 18 of the forms were initiated in 1996 and 19 were submitted in 1997, the maintenance and training personnel interviewed stated that the form was not often used and that the preferred method of requesting training was verbally through the training coordinators. Individuals interviewed stated that they would be much more willing to initiate a request for training verbally as opposed to filling out another form. Although not well documented, utilizing the training coordinators appeared to be working well with regard to initiating or revising training and updating the task analyses.

The inspectors reviewed five closed Performance Improvement Requests to determine whether corrective actions regarding training had been implemented. Of the documents reviewed, two had thorough, well documented corrective actions. A third, which required initiation of a Request for Training, was still under review. The fourth indicated that corrective actions were completed, but the subject matter was not included in the lesson plans. Through personnel interviews and review of internal memoranda, the inspector concluded that the subject matter had been covered as stated in the Performance Improvement Request. The remaining document (Performance Improvement Request 973036) was unclear as to what corrective actions were intended. The training supervisor acknowledged the poor wording of the corrective actions and indicated that no further actions had been required to close the document.

c. Conclusions

The licensee training program utilized a systematic process to evaluate the effectiveness of the training provided and to make changes or additions to the training program content as necessary. The inspectors considered that the maintenance training program effectively addressed the subelements of program feedback.

III. Engineering

E5. Engineering Staff Training and Qualification

E5.1 Task Analysis, Learning Objective, and Evaluation Correlation

a. Inspection Scope (41500)

The inspectors reviewed the engineering training program for Subelements 4.2 through 4.4 and 4.6 of NRC NUREG 1220, "Training Review Criteria and Procedures," Revision 1, as follows:

- Trainee performance is evaluated regularly.
- Remediation is provided when appropriate.
- Continuing training contains performance requirements for difficult, important, or infrequent tasks.
- Evaluations of task performance test the trainees' mastery of job performance requirements.

The review included interviews with engineering staff, training instructors, a review of applicable procedures, and observations of classroom training.

b. Observations and Findings

Interviews with incumbent engineers indicated that they received prompt, objective feedback on their performance during training. Incumbent engineers received a quarterly work performance evaluation in which a work product was reviewed and evaluated by a supervisor. One purpose of these evaluations was to identify weaknesses that could be strengthened through training. Training requests were prepared and forwarded to the training department. It was noted that none of the engineers interviewed had ever required remediation. The engineering support program required all training, not just continuing training, to be evaluated by job incumbents and training personnel to determine performance requirements for difficult, important, and infrequently performed tasks. All the engineers interviewed stated that they would inform their supervisors if they felt uncomfortable performing difficult or infrequently performed tasks. The engineering qualification standards reviewed by the inspectors matched the

job performance requirements and adequately tested the trainees' mastery of the qualifying activity.

c. Conclusions

The inspectors concluded that the training areas reviewed effectively addressed the subelements of evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback.

E5.2 Training Program Evaluation and Revision

a. Inspection Scope (41500)

The inspectors reviewed the engineering training program for Subelements 5.1 through 5.6 of NUREG-1220, "Training Review Criteria and Procedures," Revision 1 as follows:

- Trainee critiques reviewed for potential improvements to the program.
- On-the-job work experience solicitation.
- New job performance Information solicitation.
- Degraded task performance information solicitation.
- Evaluation of external factors.
- Changes in training and training material to reflect changes in job performance requirements.

The inspection included interviews with trainees and training staff personnel, a review of the most recent Engineering Support Program Training Review Group meeting minutes (January 23, 1998), observation of two training sessions (STAR training on AP 15C-002, "Procedure Use and Adherence" and training for engineers on "Yokogawa UT37 Digital Controller Operation"). The inspectors also conducted a review of forms and documentation used by supervisors and managers to evaluate job performance and identify tasks relating to the need for additional training for new job incumbents.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors noted from interviews with engineers (students/trainees), engineering supervisors and managers, and training staff personnel that instructors actively solicited feedback from trainees and observers. The licensee's engineering training feedback mechanisms included: trainee end of course evaluations, management observations, classroom setting instructor observations, and post training critiques. The forms used for this purpose included provisions for comments regarding planning, presentation, trainee evaluation, performance related objectives, accuracy, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, level of challenge to trainees, and timeliness. The inspectors observed that feedback forms from trainees and observers had been routinely entered into a

relational database. However, the relatively low proportion of observation entries appeared to contrast with the known high frequency of observations and caused one member of the licensee's training staff to question whether all the supervisors and managers were correctly recording information as observers rather than as trainees. This relational database for feedback allowed comments to be easily assessed, their associated corrective actions to be tracked, and electronic responses to be provided to the commenters when desired. These comments were reviewed and assessed by a training analyst to identify areas for training improvement and ensure a response back to the initiator. The system was designed to ensure 14 day responses when requested. However, personnel interviewed indicated that some feedback comments were made outside of the formal/documented protocol. This allowed for the possibility of the commenter not being provided information on issue resolution. All licensee personnel interviewed regarding engineering training indicated that both initial and continuing training was job related, adequately prepared them to full job requirements and was appropriately implemented to prepare new hires for engineering positions. The inspectors found that feedback comments were factored into instructor and programmatic evaluations. The inspectors noted that the assignment of managers for specific training observations during the current training cycle was not performed as intended. The licensee had identified this item and had initiated corrective actions.

The inspectors noted from interviews with engineers (students/trainees), engineering supervisors and managers, and training staff personnel that post-training evaluation sheets are sent out to selected individuals and their supervisors 90 - 120 days following training to solicit comments on the appropriateness of the training in preparing the worker for their assigned tasks. The inspectors observed the conduct of two laboratory training sessions in which the students were specifically asked to comment on how that training related to their job and assigned tasks. The inspectors' review of Engineering Support Program Training Review Group meeting minutes found that these quarterly meetings addressed comments regarding this area. Licensee procedures and guidelines were in place to ensure on-the-job work experience and job requirement needs were periodically reviewed to identify training needs. This included the requirement for Engineering Support Program Training Review Group evaluation of quarterly comments identified from Work Product Evaluations for inclusion into training modules. The inspectors noted that comments which had been identified for training enhancement were appropriately entered into the database and incorporated into the training modules.

The inspectors noted that training comment requests addressing subsequent work task performance were frequently sent to a supervisor 90 -120 days following the training of a subordinate. Supervisors, trainees, and training staff personnel interviewed and inspector review of training feedback data and a sample training module change verified that these comments were provided, entered into the database, evaluated, and factored into the training program evaluation process. Work Product Evaluations were being used to identify performance deficiencies and to provide information for training improvements. Errors, programmatic improvements, and job changes were discussed and actions taken at quarterly Training Review Group meetings.

The inspectors determined that training on recent plant and industry events was incorporated in both the initial and continuing engineering training programs. The inspectors noted that engineering support personnel had commented that plant and industry event information was not being provided in a timely manner. In response to this comment, the licensee began publication of the Engineering Support Program News Letter in January 1998. The inspectors reviewed this newsletter and found it provided recent information on nuclear industry events and deficiencies as well as training information.

The inspectors noted that the licensee used a computer database system to track changes in job performance and task requirements and to provide an audit mechanism for a comprehensive, integrated training response. The system was used in the development and maintenance of lesson plans. In particular, the system required an item to be closed prior to allowing system inputs for such items as training attendance or test results.

c. Conclusions

Based on the interviews conducted with licensee personnel and inspector review of a sample of training feedback documentation and associated Performance Improvement Requests, the inspectors concluded that the licensee employed a systematic process which encourages personnel to provide appropriate feedback on engineering training. The inspectors determined that engineering training feedback was adequately reviewed and incorporated into instructor and programmatic evaluations as needed. Training appropriateness and effectiveness information was being solicited from previous trainees, addressed the right types of information, was evaluated, and was used to make enhancements to engineering training. The inspectors concluded that the areas reviewed effectively addressed the subelements of program feedback.

IV. Plant Support

P5 Staff Training and Qualification in Emergency Preparedness

a. Inspection Scope (41500)

The inspectors reviewed Elements 4 and 5, "Trainee Evaluation" and "Program Evaluation" of NUREG-1220, as related to the emergency preparedness program. The inspectors reviewed results from quarterly drills, quality assurance audits, yearly health physics drills, biennial exercises, and lesson plans being drafted for tasks according to the emergency response organization positions. The inspection scope for the emergency preparedness area was limited due to inspection resources and because emergency preparedness training is structured differently than the maintenance and engineering training programs.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors found that the strength of the emergency preparedness training resided in hands-on training and practical drills. The licensee made a point of generating performance improvement reports (PIRs) from after drill critiques. Ownership of the PIR items were assigned to position holders within the emergency response organization. Action plans for resolving the identified items were developed within 30 days. Additionally, exercise and drill controllers as well as offsite survey teams had initial training on the emergency plan, procedures, and periodic training in the form of drills and exercises. Items identified through these training efforts were also factored into the corrective action program through use of the performance improvement reports. Exercise controllers and evaluators focused on corrective action items during subsequent drills and exercises to verify that problems were not recurrent. As such, trainee evaluations were timely in that identified items were discussed during the end-of-exercise critiques. The licensee also provided timely action on remediating individuals in the emergency response organization. In some instances, the individuals were disqualified from their E-Plan position due to performance in an exercise. The individuals were given remedial training, tested, and reevaluated during a subsequent drill.

Further, the licensee provided emergency plan training to offsite agencies, local and state. Examples included training in handling contaminated evacuees and offsite survey team techniques. The former example involved instruction to emergency room attendants at local hospitals, while the later example involved use of instruments and calculations involved with offsite monitoring.

The inspectors also reviewed results from biennial emergency plan exercises, annual audits, post-exercise and drill critiques to ascertain whether identified items were used to upgrade and improve the program. The emergency organization consistently used feedback information in evaluating the adequacy of their training and in developing associated skills coincident with position assignments within the emergency response organization. The licensee routinely solicited feedback from emergency response organization trainees and supervisors within the organization as to difficulties in performing tasks, additional training needed, and improvement methods. The emergency response organization was in the process of developing changes to the task lists associated with emergency plan positions. The licensee used input from external factors to evaluate and identify impacts on job performance requirements. For example, peer reviews from the industry were used to evaluate changes to the program and the training provided to the staff. The licensee had increased the overall number of drills and exercises from the prior year with focus upon improving previously identified weaknesses.

c. Conclusions

The inspectors considered emergency preparedness training programs effectively addressed the applicable subelements of evaluation of trainee mastery and program feedback.

V. Management Meetings

X1 Exit Meeting Summary

The inspectors presented the inspection results to members of licensee management at an exit meeting on February 6, 1998. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented. No proprietary information was identified.

ATTACHMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

M. Blow, Superintendent Chemistry and Health Physics
T. Damashek, Supervisor, Licensing
R. Denton, Quality Specialist
C. Fowler, Manager, Integrated Plant Scheduling
R. Hammond, Health Physics Supervisor
T. Harris, Licensing
R. Hubbard, Superintendent Operations
L. Jones, Superintendent, Maintenance Support
D. Knox, Maintenance Manager
S. Koenig, Supervisor, Quality Evaluation
G. Lawson, Superintendent, Maintenance Planning
B. McKinney, Plant Manager
R. Miller, Superintendent, Mechanical Maintenance
T. Morrill, Assistant to Manager, Human Resources
R. Muench, Vice President, Engineering
C. Palmer, Supervisor Chemistry
R. Parker, Supervisor, Chemistry
D. Parks, Assistant to Training Manager
G. Pendergrass, Supervisor, Engineering Performance
J. Pippin, Manager, Training
C. Redding, Licensing
C. Reekie, Licensing
C. Rich, Superintendent; Electrical, Instrumentation, and Control
R. Sim, Manager, Systems Engineering
R. Skiles, Training Instructor
C. Stone, Quality Specialist
H. Stubby, Supervisor, Technical Training
R. Stumbaugh, Health Physics Supervisor
C. Warren, Vice President, Operations
T. Wilson, Operations, Treatment Systems Supervisor

NRC

J. Ringwald, Senior Resident

INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

41500 Training and Qualification Effectiveness

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Procedures

AI30D-001 Training and Qualification of Nuclear Electricians, Revision 0
AI30D-002 Training and Qualification of Nuclear Mechanics, Revision 0
AI30D-003 Instrumentation and Control Training Program, Revision 0
AI30E-001 Technical Training Job Analysis and Task Analysis, Revision 1
AI30F-001 Engineering Personnel Work Product Evaluations
AP30D-003 Maintenance Training, Revision 0
AP30E-001 Job Analysis and Task Analysis, Revision 3
AP30E-002 Training Effectiveness Evaluation Program, Revision 3
AP30E-004 Training Material Development, Revision 3
AP30E-005 Systematic Approach to Training, Revision 1
AP30E-006 Design of Training Programs, Revision 1
AP30E-007 Training Representative Assignment and Responsibilities, Revision 0
AP30F-001 Engineering Support Personnel Training and Qualification Program
ES 92-883-01 System Engineer Position Specific Qualification Guideline, Revision 1

Engineering Support Program News Letter, dated January 1998,

OJT Qualification Cards

Calibrate Votes System
Conduct Channel Cal on Radiation Monitor (Gas/Part)
Calibrate 7300 Lead/Lag Card (NLL)
Limitorque Butterfly Valve HBC-0 thru HBC-10 Stop Adjustment, Setting, and Lubrication
Install, Replace, Adjust, and Test Target Rock Solenoid Valve
Reactor Trip Circuit Breaker (DS416) Maintenance
Repair Safety/Relief Valves
Perform Bolt Torquing
Replace Rupture Disc

Lesson Plans and/or Examinations

Use of Water Pots and Instrument Isolation Valves
AOV Actuators and Positioners
Industrial Safety
Pre-Outage System Breach and Draining Issue
Procedural/Document Familiarization for Contract Welders
Procedure Review for Work Group Supervisors
Normal Charging Pump
Electrical Print Reading
D. C. Scout (Ground Detection System)
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Concepts
Transformers
Safety Valves