

# REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8803160243 DOC. DATE: 88/03/01 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #  
 FACIL: 50-250 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 3, Florida Power and Light C 05000250  
 50-251 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 4, Florida Power and Light C 05000251  
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION  
 CONWAY, W. F. Florida Power & Light Co.  
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION  
 GRACE, J. N. Region 2, Ofc of the Director

SUBJECT: Forwards Procedure O-ADM-019, "Mgt On Shift (MOS)," weekly  
 summary rept for wk starting 880222, per NRC 871019 order.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: D036D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 32  
 TITLE: Turkey Point Management Onshift Program

## NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	DRP/ADR-2	1 1	NRR/DRP-1/2	1 1
	PD2-2 PD	1 1	EDISON, G	2 2
INTERNAL:	AEOD	1 1	DEDRO	1 1
	NRR DEPY	1 1	NRR DIR	1 1
	NRR MORISSEAU, D	1 1	NRR/ADP 12-G-18	1 1
	NRR/ADT 12-G-18	1 1	NRR/DLPQ/PEB	1 1
	NRR/DOEA DIR11E	1 1	NRR/DRIS DIR9A2	1 1
	NRR/PMAS/ILRB12	1 1	DE LIEBERMAN, J	1 1
	OGC 15-B-18	1 1	<u>REG FILE</u>	1 1
	RGN2 FILE 01	1 1		
EXTERNAL:	LPDR	1 1	NRC PDR	1 1
	NSIC	1 1		

Change Ltr Encl  
 Pgn 2 1 1 Original  
 Reg Files. 1 1



MARCH 1 1988  
L-88-107

cc: 02

Dr. J. Nelson Grace  
Regional Administrator, Region II  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
101 Marietta Street, N. W., Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Re: Turkey Point Units 3 and 4  
Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251  
Management-on-Shift Weekly Report

Dear Dr. Grace:

Pursuant to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Order dated October 19, 1987, the attached summary of Management-on-Shift (MOS) reports is submitted.

Should there be any questions on this information, please contact us.

Very truly yours,

*W. F. Conway*  
W. F. Conway  
Senior V.P. - Nuclear

WFC/SDF/pw  
Attachment

cc: J. Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, USNRC  
Dr. G. E. Edison, Project Manager, NRR, USNRC  
Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, Turkey Point Plant  
R. E. Tallon, President, FPL

BB03160243 BB0301  
PDR ADCK 05000250  
R PDR

*0036*  
*1/1*  
*Change*  
*4tr Ench*  
*Rgn 2*  
*Reg Files*  
*1*  
*1 Original*

# MANAGEMENT ON SHIFT (MOS)

## WEEKLY SUMMARY REPORT

WEEK STARTING: 2/22/88

PAGE 1 OF 1

Four MOS observers were on shift; Jeff A. West, St. Lucie Nuclear Plant Supervisor (02/22-28/88 days), Paul R. Geddes, Westinghouse Electric Corporation (02/22-29/88 nights), R. C. Sontag, Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, INPO Coordinator (02/22-25/88 nights) and Terry A. Finn, Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Training Superintendent (02/25-29/88 nights).

During the reporting period, both units reached 100% power. Unit 3 returned to full power operations on February 23, 1988 and Unit 4 completed startup to reach 100% power on February 26, 1988.

No immediate safety problems or questionable work practices were identified during the reporting period.

During the reporting period, the MOS observers noted about eighteen recommendations or areas for improvement. These suggestions and concerns included:

1. Six comments were made on work practices including the timeliness of repairs to a nuclear instrumentation channel, PWO work package documentation completion, number of incoming telephone calls to the Control Room, timeliness of completion of Technical Specification surveillances and tracking on non-Technical Specification required surveillances.
2. Five comments were made on plant equipment including three areas of excessive leakage, vibration on one secondary plant line and the design of the stop-reset button on the Emergency Diesel Generators.
3. Three comments were made on documentation supporting plant activities including maintaining the Rod Position Indication Technical Manual current, terminology on control and danger tags and unnecessary prerequisites contained in various general procedures covering plant startup.
4. Two comments were made on training concerning the Unit 3 reactor head leak detection system and fire brigade training.
5. Two comments were made on industrial safety practices including availability of hearing protection (ear plugs) and an access ladder to a tank manway.

ATTACHMENT: MOS DAILY REPORTS



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/22/88

From: J. A. West  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night**A. Plant evolutions observed**

- ° Morning meeting
- ° U-3 Raising power at approximately 3%/hr.
- ° U-4 Preparations for change into Mode 3
- ° Followup items from last MOS visit
- ° Observed Control Room operations
- ° Brief tour of secondary system
- ° Peak shift pre-brief

**B. Immediate safety problems**

None observed

**C. Questionable work practices**

None observed

**D. Area(s) for improvement**

1. There was a fire drill announced at approximately 1315 and no unit was specified. As it turned out it was on Unit 1 & 2. Due to having a fossil and nuclear side, both sides should be aware of the need to identify units involved.
2. Later during the day at approximately 1550 an actual fire occurred in Unit 2 and the unit was specified in the message over the Gaitronics.

This implies the failure to announce the Unit 1 & 2 in the drill is not a generic problem

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Both day and peak shift conduct of operations were satisfactory. Information dissiminated in peak shift pre-brief meeting was beneficial to the operation of the units and administration of shift routine. I have observed this shift's supervision before and they are consistent in they standards the set and require.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/22/88

Reviewed By: *L. W. Paine*  
Operations Superintendent- Nuclear

Date: 2/23/88

Management  
Review By:

*CJB* 1/2/23/88 *J.D.* 2/23/88  
PM/N Date SVP Date VP

02/22/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/22-23/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- o U-4 Plant heatup and pressurization
- o U-4 Accumulator fill and pressurization
- o U-4 Overpressure test for RCS
- o U-4 Preparation for Reactor protection test
- o U-4 Makeup to Refueling Water Storage Tank
- o U-3 Start of 3A Heater Drain Pump

## B. Immediate safety problems

None observed

## C. Questionable work practices

None observed

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Things went very smoothly.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/22-23/88

Reviewed By: P. W. Pearce  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/23/88

Management Review By: CJB 12/23/88 SVR 2/23/88 VP 1  
PM-N Date SVR Date VP Date  
02/22-23/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/22-23/88

From: R. C. Sontag  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift turnover
- Unit 3 Rod Position Indication troubleshooting
- Unit 3 Condensate Polisher Demineralizer repair
- Unit 3 Conductivity Recorder troubleshooting

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None



## D. Area(s) for improvement

1. The supply box for hearing protectors on Unit 4 was empty at 6PM 2/22/88.
2. It seemed that I & C was slow to respond to the Rod Position Indication (RPI) trouble (F4) on Unit 3. For example: PWO entered at 5:21PM. Work package was ready at approximately 7PM. PSN permission to start work granted at 8:30PM. Decision of troubleshooting technique to use made at approximately 9:30PM. Connection of troubleshooting equipment made at 12:30AM. We should be able to do better.
3. Much improvement is needed in the area of paperwork. Inspection of the RPI (F4) PWO package after the shift change revealed the following: No entry made in journeymen's work report. Two procedures were used and contained entries, neither were signed on the document control stamp signifying verification prior to use.
4. Mechanical Maintenance responded quickly to repair the leaking manway seal on the 3A Condensate Polisher Demin Tank. The leaking manway is at the top of the tank and there is no ladder affixed to the tank. The crew reached the manway by climbing on the surrounding pipes and valves. While discussing this with the foreman he observed that it wasn't a good practice and said that he would have a ladder used. A followup visit to the site disclosed a ladder in use, however the ladder was too short - reaching only half way up the tank.

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Good troubleshooting logic and methods were used by I & C Specialist John Goble while working on the Unit 3 conductivity recorder.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: R. C. Sontag  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/22-23/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*  
Operations Superintendent-Nuclear

Date: 2/23/88

Management  
Review By:

*[Signature]* 12/23/88 *[Signature]* 12/23/88  
PM/N Date SVP Date VP Date  
02/22-23/88

W/ky

0-ADM-019

**Management on Shift (MOS)**  
**MOS DAILY REPORT**

Page

1

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/23/88

From: J. A. West

(MOS Observer)

Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night

**A. Plant evolutions observed**

- Attended morning meeting
- Attended shift briefing (Mechanical maintenance not in attendance)
- Reviewed deferred surveillances
- Observed portions of Unit 4 Logic Matrix Surveillance, OSP-049.1
- Attended shift brief (peak) meeting

**B. Immediate safety problems**

None observed

**C. Questionable work practices**

None observed

**D. Area(s) for improvement**

Based on observations from my last visit and this current visit there appears to be a tendency to "eat up" the grace period of Tech. Spec. surveillances when they are deferred. There are past due surveillances on the Fire Protection system which were on the plan of the day a month ago. To the best of my knowledge there are no system discrepancies that will prevent these tests from being conducted. The grace period is not as critical on an annual, but this same logic or mode of operation carries into surveillances of shorter duration-last month only two days of the grace period was left after a failed surveillance on nuclear instrumentation (normal grace period 7 days). Last month an annual on the electric fire pump was conducted on the last available day of the grace period. This philosophy is going to "bite you", if it has not done so already in the past. Why leave an opening if it can be avoided?

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Shift supervision cautioned RCO's on the need for adequate trainee control when it appeared it was becoming a little lax.

## F. Recommendations

- ° 0-OSP-700.7 "Plant Startup Surveillances" there are numerous surveillances listed which are not required by Tech. Specs. If a surveillance is not required by Tech. Specs. it is apparently not tracked by Quality Control. This makes it difficult for the shift supervision to determine the last time these particular surveillances were performed. If this occurs on the backshifts or weekends this could potentially delay startup. If a tracking mechanism does exist it needs to be more readily available to the PSN/PSN. I do know Document Control can provide this. There appears to be a need to:
  1. Have Quality Control track these non Tech. Spec. surveillances and play a more pro-active role in surveillance monitoring during startup.
  2. Get these surveillances out of the procedure if not required to meet Tech. Specs. or one of many self imposed commitments.

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/23/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/24/88

Management  
Review By:

[Signature] 12/24/88 [Signature] 12/24/88 1  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date  
02/23/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/23-24/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift turnover
- Unit 3 Ramp to 100% Power
- Unit 4 Turbine Valve test
- Unit 4 placing Turbine on turning gear
- Unit 4 placing Condensate System in recirculation
- Unit 4 Feedwater Regulating Valve stroke test

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None



## D. Area(s) for improvement

There seems to be very little information in circulation concerning the new Canopy Seal Leak Detection System (R-13) on Unit 3. The training brief published was too general to be of much use. Operators need to be trained on this system, and on how to interpret the results obtained from this system. This whole situation came about because of the increasing counts per minute indicated on the system as Unit 3 ramped up in power. No one seems to know how to interpret this data.

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

One brief episode of catcalls on the paging system.

## F. Recommendations

See section D.

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/23-24/88

Reviewed By: *J. J. Lane*  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/24/88

Management  
Review By:

*oib* *2/24/88* *gfo* *2/24/88* *1*  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/23-24/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/23-24/88

From: R. C. Sontag  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Unit 4 Rod Position Indication rod bottom bistable light repair
- End of shift meeting
- Shift turnover meeting
- Observed investigation of flooding of Unit 4 Condensate Polisher Building

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

1. The cause of the Rod Position Indication rod bottom light failure was a bad relay. A new relay was obtained from stores, however there was some confusion as to whether it was the correct part due to different markings. The part could have been verified by referencing the schematic diagrams. The required diagrams were missing from the single technical manual available in the I & C shop. Consequently the old relay was repaired. This caused a delay of about 1½ hours.
2. At 2220 an attempt was made to place a condensate pump in service on Unit 4. A valve misalignment caused the precoat tank to overflow, flooding the Condensate Polisher Building. The inlet valves to vessels B & D were found to be open. This is contrary to the required steps of 4-OP-073, section 5.1, "Startup of First Condensate Pump".

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

1. The I & C peak crew conducted the repair of the rod bottom light in a timely and professional manner. They should be commended for the repair of the relay and conservative approach.
2. A thorough investigation of the Condensate Polisher Building flooding was conducted by the mid shift PSN, APSN and WE. Their discovery of the cause of the incident enabled the resumption of the startup process, and prevented unnecessary maintenance activities. Very professional.

## F. Recommendations

Positive controls should be exercised over technical manuals to ensure that they are available, accurate and complete.

Completed By: R. C. Sontag  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/23-24/88

Reviewed By: K. W. Pearce  
Operations Superintendent- Nuclear

Date: 2/24/88

Management  
Review By:

C. J. 1/24/88 SVP 1/24/88 VP  
PM-N Date Date Date

02/23-24/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/24/88

From: J. A. West  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night**A. Plant evolutions observed**

- Morning meeting
- Shift brief (days) meeting
- Demonstration of auto-tagging system
- Unit 4 Reactor startup briefing
- Reactor startup
- Shift debrief (days) meeting
- Secondary warmup

**B. Immediate safety problems**

None observed

**C. Questionable work practices**

None observed

**D. Area(s) for improvement**

When the word is passed over the Galtronics that reactor startup has commenced, this should be a precursor for informing plant personnel that Control Room operations personnel are intensely involved with bringing the reactor critical. I lost count of the number of times the telephone rang distracting the PSN from monitoring the startup and one time the reactor operator performing the startup actually stopped and answered the phone. Phone calls to the Control Room from reactor startup to reactor critical should be kept to a minimum and limited to business of an immediate nature.

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

A very informational and well conducted shift brief was performed prior to the reactor startup. Responsibilities were designated, Control Room decorum was established, and precautions, prerequisites, and limits were disseminated. Good job by the shift supervision and operators.

## F. Recommendations

1. The auto tagging system should be a welcomed change. The existing system is impressive and capabilities leave sufficient room for expansion. During the demonstration I noticed that PTN is using what I refer to as the "old" tag. Your present tag has negative human factors implications, i.e., on clearance sheet valve required position is listed as "closed". The tag is written as do not "open". Preferred tag should read position required "closed". These tags are presently in the FPL form system.

Control tag form 3981 Rev. 1/85  
Danger tag form 3981/A Rev. 1/85

2. This is also in line with the INPO good practice on clearances. During the past two days I have noticed that several procedures used during startup or mode changes have prerequisites that unnecessarily delay the timely return of a unit to operation. This morning auxiliary steam and condensate polisher lineups for reactor criticality were conducted. These are only two of many in GOP-301 not required for criticality. I recommend that procedures such OSP-200.1, OSP-200.2, OSP-200.3, GOP-301, GOP-503, and ADM-205 be reviewed for possible segregation of step performance prior to an applicable mode change or important plant evolution such as reactor critical, turbine roll, turbine generator synchronization, etc.

I believe this approach would lead to:

A more logical and systematic approach for conducting the progression of plant evolutions through a sequence of priorities.

A more timely execution of plant operations

More effective utilization of manpower for the tasks at hand

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/24/88

Reviewed By: *P. W. Pearce*  
Operations Superintendent- Nuclear

Date: 2/25/88

Management  
Review By:

*C. J. B.* 12/25/88 *[Signature]* 12/25/88 *[Signature]* 12/25/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date  
02/24/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/24-25/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift turnover
- Unit 4 synchronize to grid
- Unit 4 ramp to 25% power
- Various surveillances

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## -D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

None Very quiet evening

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/24-25/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/25/88

Management  
Review By:

PM-N 12/25/88 Date SVR 12/25/88 Date VP 12/25/88 Date

02/24-25/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/24-25/88

From: R. C. Sontag  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift turnover meeting
- Turbine roll, sequencing and load to 30% power
- Plant tour

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

1. Prior to the turbine roll, the PSN conducted a briefing of the evolution for the Control Room personnel. His talk was well presented and informative.
2. The Site Vice President was in the Control Room for the turbine roll. His interest and presence had a positive effect on the Control Room personnel. Their high spirits and confidence contributed to a successful and professional evolution.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: R. C. Sontag  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/24-25/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/25/88

Management  
Review By:

6/1/88	12/25/88	[Signature]	12/25/88	[Signature]	12/25/88
PM/N	Date	SVP	Date	VP	Date
					02/24-25/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/25/88

From: J. A. West

(MOS Observer)

Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Morning meeting
- Shift brief (days)
- Plant Maneuvering
- Turbine Overspeed Test
- Shift debrief (days)
- Shift brief (peaks)

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

## Coordination efforts:

- N-31 Repair (I & C waiting for a condition not required for job)
- Air leakage Unit 3 (No coordination effort apparent between Chem. & Ops)
- Unit 4 Power Range NI surveillance (I & C never showed up after a commitment for support in the afternoon)

Communications and lack of followup have led to these particular items as still being in an open status.

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Good shift brief prior to turbine overspeed test.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/25/88

Reviewed By:   
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/26/88

Management  
Review By:

 12/26/88  12/26/88  1  
PM-N Date SVB Date VP Date  
02/25/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/25-26/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift turnover
- Unit 4 ramp to 70% power
- Diesel testing

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

None

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/25-26/88

Reviewed By: L.W. Vance  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/26/88

Management Review By: PM-N 1 2/26/88 SVP 1 2/26/88 VP 1  
Date Date Date Date Date

02/25-26/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/25-26/88

From: T. A. Finn  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Unit 4 load increase
- PSN/APSN shift turnover
- End of shift meeting
- Shift briefing
- 'B' EDG Periodic test local
- Plant tour

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

The shift turnovers and meetings are thorough. Shift supervisors are aware of Plant status and pass this information on to the crew.

For the operating problems that occurred during the shift (EDG starting air pressure, RPI indication >12 steps out) actions were taken to ensure compliance and correct the situation.

The NLO performing the 'B' EDG periodic closely monitored the EDG parameters comparing them against the acceptance criteria. He was fully aware of the evolution being performed and what was going to occur next.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: T. A. Finn  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/25-26/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/26/88

Management  
Review By:

*[Signature]* 12/26/88 *[Signature]* 12/26/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date  
02/25-26/88





wky

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/26/88

From: J. A. West  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night**A. PLANT EVOLUTIONS OBSERVED**

- Morning meeting
- Shift brief (days)
- Observed part of OSP-59.4, Power Range Nuclear Instrumentation Analog Channel Operational Test, on Unit 4
- Toured - Secondary (Both units)
  - Water Treatment Plant area
  - Raw Water Tank area

**B. Immediate safety problems**

None observed

**C. Questionable work practices**

None observed

**D. Area(s) for improvement**

1. A Raw Water Booster Pump suction valve has a real bad packing leak (no PWO)
2. A Raw Water Booster Pump inboard packing gland leaking excessively (no PWO)
3. Is there a game plan to repair the two union elbow leaks on the fire pump recirc line? If so, when will it be implemented?

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Routine operations observed were carried out in a satisfactory manner.

## F. Recommendations

The Human Factor group needs to research and resolve the dual function "Alarm reset and stop" button on the Emergency Diesel Generators. Even with the warning sign, the potential for stopping the diesel while attempting to clear alarm is high.

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/26/88

Reviewed By: L. W. Pierce  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

CJB 12/29/88 VP 12/29/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/26-27/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Diesel Generator testing
- Shift turnover
- Rod Position Indication malfunction

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Performance of the shift during the Rod Position Indication (RPI) malfunction (4 rods in Bank D had drifted low in RPI indication - greater than 12 steps from banks indication) was smooth and professional.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/26-27/88

Reviewed By: L. W. Price  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

CJB 1/27/88 NO 2/29/88  
PM-N Date SVF Date VP 02/26-27/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/26-27/88

From: T. A. Finn  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Steady state operation, both units at 100%
- APSN Turnover
- Unit 4 Rod Position Indication >12 steps from step counters
- End of shift meeting
- Unit 3 RCO shift turnover
- Shift briefing
- Plant tour

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

At the halfway point of the midnight shift the Nuclear Watch Engineer gave the Assistant Plant Supervisor Nuclear an update of Plant status to ensure he was meeting the shift objectives. This was an excellent technique to ensure both were up to date, that items were not being overlooked and that they were working in the same direction.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: T. A. Finn  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/26-27/88

Reviewed By: L. W. Pearson  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management Review By: CJS 12/29/88 YH 12/29/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/26-27/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/27/88

From: J. A. West  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift debrief (Mids)
- Observed (Mid-day) APSN turnover
- Shift brief (days)
- Walked discharge area, polisher area, and turbine building ground levels. Discrepancies were noted and turned over to shift supervision.
- Shift debrief (days)
- Shift brief (peaks)

## B. Immediate safety problems

None observed

## C. Questionable work practices

None observed

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None to report



## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Shift Operations conducted in an appropriate manner.

## F. Recommendations

1. May want to have your efficiency/performance personnel look at the excessive vibration due to flow oscillation (reason unknown at this time) in the 4A Moisture Separator Reheater to 6A Heater long bore orifice line. Control Room notified.
2. Followup on MOS report from February 26, 1988 with respect to the A Raw Water Booster Pump packing leak and the packing leak on the suction valve. The ANPO told me that this equipment belongs to the fossil units. They however still need to be repaired by the responsible organization.

Completed By: J.A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/27/88

Reviewed By: L. W. Farrow  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

CPB 12/29/88 VP 12/29/88 1  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/27/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/27-28/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift brief
- Filling Unit 4 Accumulator
- 100% steady state operations both units
- Secondary tour

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Very quiet evening

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/27-28/88

Reviewed By: X.W. Paine  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

1/1/88 12/29/88 2/29/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/27-28/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/27-28/88

From: T. A. Finn  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- 100% steady state operations, both units
- PSN shift turnover
- End of shift meeting
- Shift briefing
- 3B Charging Pump break-in run

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

None

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: T. A. Finn  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/27-28/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

0175 12/29/88 VP 12/29/88 1  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date  
02/27-28/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/28/88

From: J. A. West

(MOS Observer)

Shift: ☒ Day  
☐ Night**A. Plant evolutions observed**

- Shift debrief (mids)
- PSN turnover
- Routine Control Room operations
- Reviewed procedures 3,4-OP-072.1 Moisture Separator Reheaters (No findings)

**B. Immediate safety problems**

None observed

**C. Questionable work practices**

None observed

**D. Area(s) for improvement**

None

**E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments**

No Comments

## F. Recommendations

## Fire Team Training

Less than 50% of those personnel (NWE's, SNPO/NO, NPO/TO, ANPO/AEO) standing qualified watches are qualified as either leader or member. Greater participation in this area will enhance the flexibility of shift composition between shifts when necessary, and will minimize overtime required to fill fire team vacancies with a limited number of personnel thereby reducing the potential for error due to fatigue.

Recommend that the feasibility of incorporating Fire Team Leader and switching training into the SRO upgrade program be investigated. This training is not mentally intensive and should not distract from the license training. This will provide the SRO greater flexibility in being able to relieve the NWE position of these responsibilities, if necessary.

Completed By: J. A. West  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/28/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

*[Signature]* 12/29/88 *[Signature]* 12/29/88  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/28/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/28-29/88

From: Paul Geddes  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- Shift briefing
- Intermediate Range Nuclear Instrumentation test
- 100% power steady state operations

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

A smooth shift. Maintenance is making visible progress on 'catching up' with the PWO backlog.

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: Paul Geddes  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/28-29/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

9/15 1/27/88 [Signature] 1/29/88 1  
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

02/28-29/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 02/28-29/88

From: T. A. Finn  
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day  
☒ Night

## A. Plant evolutions observed

- 100% Reactor Power, steady state operations both units
- PSN/NWE shift turnover
- End of shift meeting
- APSN shift turnover
- Shift briefing
- Plant tour
- Hot license operator training activities

## B. Immediate safety problems

None

## C. Questionable work practices

None

## D. Area(s) for improvement

None

## E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

None

## F. Recommendations

None

Completed By: T. A. Finn  
MOS Observer

Date: 02/28-29/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]  
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 2/29/88

Management  
Review By:

C/15 PM/N      D/15/88 Date      V/10 SVP      12/29/88 Date      1 VP      1 Date  
02/28-29/88