

ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

SESSION NBR: 9103270119 DOC. DATE: 91/03/20 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-315 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Indiana & 05000315
 50-316 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2, Indiana & 05000316
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 ALEXICH, M.P. Indiana Michigan Power Co. (formerly Indiana & Michigan Ele
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 DAVIS, A.B. Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Responds to Martin 910305 ltr re deficiencies in
 requalification program, per Requalification Exam Rept
 50-315/OL-91-01. Addl emphasis placed on job performance
 measure evaluation as result of deficiencies.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: M003D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 3
 TITLE: Operator Requalification Program

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT		COPIES			RECIPIENT		COPIES	
	ID	CODE/NAME	LTTR	ENCL		ID	CODE/NAME	LTTR	ENCL
	PD3-1	LA	1	0		PD3-1	PD	1	1
	COLBURN,	T.	1	1					
INTERNAL:	AEOD/DOA		1	1		NRR/DLPO/LHFB11		1	1
	NRR/DLPO/LOLB10		1	1		<u>REG FILE</u> 01		1	1
	RGN3		1	1					
INTERNAL:	NRC	PDR	1	1		NSIC		1	1

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:

PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
 ROOM P1-37 (EXT. 20079) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM DISTRIBUTION
 LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 10 ENCL 10



AEP:NRG:0992B

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316
License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74
REQUALIFICATION EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 50-315/OL-91-01

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attn: A. B. Davis

March 20, 1991

Dear Mr. Davis:

This letter is in response to the request contained in Mr. Martin's letter dated March 5, 1991 which forwarded the subject examination report for the requalification examinations administered on January 30 through February 7, 1991. In the examination report, we were specifically requested to include in our response the reasons that an individual was not successfully remediated and to discuss our plans to correct any related deficiencies in our program. The remainder of this letter will describe the Cook Nuclear Plant remedial training program requirements, the basis for our conclusion that the remedial training program had been successfully completed, and the actions we have taken to correct related deficiencies in our program.

The Cook Nuclear Plant Requalification Program requires that a licensed individual receiving an UNSAT grade on the annual requalification examination be removed from licensed duty and placed into a remedial training program. The remedial training program content is specifically structured to upgrade knowledge and skills identified as deficient. Following completion of the remedial training program, the individual is required to pass an examination in those areas in which he/she was deficient.

The individual referenced in Mr. Martin's letter previously failed the simulator portion of the requalification examination. Based on that failure, the individual completed a 40-hour simulator training program in January of 1991. This remedial training program was in addition to completing all requalification program requirements. At the conclusion of the remedial training program, an operating examination on the simulator was administered. Performance on the simulator examination by the individual was satisfactory. It

9103270119 910320
PDR ADOCK 05000315
PDR

260131

MD3
10



10

should be noted that three additional simulator evaluations were performed for the individual between July 1990 and November 1990 as part of the regular requalification program. The individual passed those evaluations. Based on the simulator training and satisfactory performance on the previous evaluations, we concluded that the remedial training program was successful. The performance of the individual on the simulator portion of the second retake examination on February 4, 1991 was rated satisfactory by both the NRC and the facility.

The individual also received additional training to address a facility identified weakness for that individual related to their job performance measure (JPM) evaluation. The training was completed in June of 1990. An evaluation of JPM performance was conducted by the facility on June 25, 1990 and resulted in a satisfactory rating. Based on the satisfactory performance, no additional training on JPMs beyond that included in the normal requalification program was deemed necessary. The requalification program included 8 hours of JPM training during the period from July 1990 through December 1990. A subsequent evaluation on February 5 and 6, 1991 of the second retake examination to specifically address JPM performance resulted in an unsatisfactory rating by the NRC and the facility.

1c

An analysis of the requalification program results for all licensed personnel identified deficiencies related to the administration and performance of JPMs for other licensed candidates. As a result of these deficiencies, additional emphasis has been placed on JPMs for the current requalification cycle. Also, training on JPMs has been scheduled on a more frequent basis.

In conclusion, we have identified the remediation process for the subject individual and the steps taken to assure that our remedial training program had been completed successfully. In addition, we have enhanced our requalification program content to address a related but generic deficiency on JPM performance which may have influenced the exam results .

This letter has been prepared following Corporate procedures that incorporate a reasonable set of controls to ensure its accuracy and completeness prior to signature by the undersigned.

Sincerely,



M. P. Alexich
Vice President

A. B. Davis

-3-

AEP:NRC:0992B

cc: D. H. Williams Jr.
A. A. Blind - Bridgman
R. C. Callen
G. Charnoff
T. E. Murley
NRC Resident Inspector - Bridgman
NFEM Section Chief

