



PEACH BOTTOM—THE POWER OF EXCELLENCE

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION

P.O. Box 208

Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

(717) 456-7014

D. B. Miller, Jr.
Vice President

March 22, 1991

Mr. Lee H. Bettenhausen, Chief
Operations Branch
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

SUBJECT: Final Requalification Program Evaluation Report

This report provides the facility evaluation of the Licensed Operator Requalification Examinations administered by the NRC to fourteen (14) licensees at Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS) from March 4-8, 1991.

Overall, Peach Bottom has rated it's Licensed Operator Requalification Program as satisfactory based on criteria outlined in ES-601 of the Operator Licensing Examiner Standards (NUREG-1021). This conclusion also applies to the Philadelphia Electric administered Licensed Operator Requalification Examinations which were conducted from January 7 - March 8, 1991.

The following attachments detail various aspects of the examinations:

- * 1) PBAPS Requalification Exam Results Summary*
- 2) PBAPS Identified Generic Weaknesses and Strengths

If you should have any questions, please contact Mr. Richard Andrews, Supervisor - Operations Training on (717)456-3038.

Sincerely,

9104160280 910410
PDR ADDCK 05000277
PDR

S. RGA
DBM/EAT/RGA/DWM:clg

cc: R. A. Burricelli, Public Service Electric & Gas
T. H. Fish, NRC Chief Examiner
T. M. Gerusky, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
J. J. Lyash, USNRC Senior Resident Inspector
T. T. Martin, Administrator, Region I, USNRC
H. C. Schwemm, Atlantic Electric
R. I. McLean, State of Maryland
J. Urban, Delmarva Power

* Not included based on Privacy Act considerations

ATTACHMENT 2
PBAPS IDENTIFIED GENERIC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The following strengths and weaknesses were determined from a systematic analysis of the examination results. Actions to address the weaknesses will be taken in accordance with established facility processes.

A. SIMULATOR EXAMINATIONS

1. The ability to manipulate the controls was generally good. However, difficulties in manipulating the following controls occurred with sufficient frequency to be classified as a generic weakness.
 - a. Operation of HPCI for level control.
 - b. Re-charging CRDH accumulators following accumulator low pressure condition.
 - c. Completion of tripping turbine on a shutdown to prevent automatic reverse power trip.
2. Use of procedures was generally very good.
3. The frequency with which communications (clear orders, acknowledgements, etc.) did not meet facility standards and indicates that improvements should be approached generically.
4. Use of ON, OT, and TRIP Procedures was generally very good. The following areas for improvement were identified:
 - a. Transition between TRIP's to accomplish the following tasks:
 - 1) Insertion of several rods following a partial ATWS.
 - 2) Level/power control for full ATWS condition (T-101 and T-117 execution).
 - 3) Level restoration following loss of all high pressure feed.
 - b. Hesitancy to begin normal RPV depressurization following plant shutdown due to extenuating plant conditions.
5. Emergency Response Procedures were generally executed in a timely manner and event classifications were accurate for the plant conditions given. However, completion of all Emergency Director on-site call-outs per ERP-200 were not completed in a timely manner.
6. Command and control functions of the SRO's were generally categorized as a strength.

B. WRITTEN EXAMINATION

An analysis of exam results showed repetitive incorrect answers at a sufficient frequency to indicate that re-training in the following areas should be approached generically:

1. 4KV emergency bus interlocks as they relate to breaker closures and Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) automatic starts and determination of "normal" annunciators for a normal EDG start sequence.
2. Diagnosing the cause of main generator lock-out conditions.
3. Diagnosing the operational status of the EHC Pressure Control System and prioritizing the various pressure control systems to be used post-scrum with an EHC Pressure Control System failure.
4. Determining the applicability of performing Off-Normal and Operational Transient Procedures during the performance of TRIP's. Determination of ancillary TRIP's to implement during an ATWS condition.
5. Determination of LCO actions for integrated 4KV, ECCS, and Emergency Diesel Generator situations.
6. Analyzing reactor safe shutdown conditions post-scrum with several control rods remaining withdrawn.

C. JOB PERFORMANCE MEASURE EVALUATION

Overall, performance of JPM's were very good. However, there were repetitive errors in the following tasks:

1. JPM-002C - Load the Diesel Generator to 1600 KW
 - a. Initial kVar loading was above procedure limits.
 - b. Did not check amps on E-12 Bus prior to paralleling.
2. JPM-063C - Terminate and Prevent RPV Injection
 - a. Did not complete all steps in the procedure (i.e., securing stayfull, demin bypass, HPSW to RPV).
3. JPM-024C - Perform a Group I PCIS Isolation Reset
 - a. Question 2597 indicated lack of understanding in the inability to reopen the inboard MSIV's after only turning the inboard PCIS reset switch.

Attachment 4

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: Philadelphia Electric Company, Peach Bottom Generating Station

Facility Docket No. 50-277 and 50-278

Requalification Examination Administered on: March 4 through 8, 1991

This form is to be used only to report observations. These observations do not constitute audit or inspection findings and are not, without further verification and review, indicative of non-compliance with 10 CFR 55.45(b). These observations do not affect NRC certification or approval of the simulation facility other than to provide information which may be used in future evaluations.

During the conduct of the simulator portion of the operating tests, the following items were observed:

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
Meters on EDG panels	All EDG parameters (KW, KVARs, Voltage) oscillate when the EDG system is used.