

SAI-136-029-48

TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT
IMPROVEMENTS IN TRAINING AND
REQUALIFICATION PROGRAMS AS REQUIRED BY
TMI ACTION ITEMS I.A.2.1 AND II.B.4

for the
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3
(Dockets 50-277 and 50-278)

August 26, 1982

Prepared By:
Science Applications, Inc.
1710 Goodridge Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102

Prepared for:
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Contract NRC-03-82-096

XA Copy Has Been Sent to PDR

~~1X~~ 8208310332



Science Applications, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
II.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION	1
	A. I.A.2.1: Immediate Upgrading of RO and SRO Training and Qualifications	1
	B. II.B.4: Training for Mitigating Core Damage. .	7
III.	LICENSEE SUBMITTALS	7
IV.	EVALUATION.	8
	A. I.A.2.1: Immediate Upgrading of RO and SRO Training and Qualifications	8
	B. II.B.4: Training for Mitigating Core Damage. .	10
V.	CONCLUSIONS	11
VI.	REFERENCES.	12

I. INTRODUCTION

Science Applications, Inc. (SAI), as technical assistance contractor to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, has evaluated the response by Philadelphia Electric Company for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (Dockets 50-277 and 50-278) to certain requirements contained in post-TMI Action Items I.A.2.1, Immediate Upgrading of Reactor Operator and Senior Reactor Operator Training and Qualifications, and II.B.4, Training for Mitigating Core Damage. These requirements were set forth in NUREG-0660 (Reference 1) and were subsequently clarified in NUREG-0737 (Reference 2).*

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether the licensee's operator training and requalification programs satisfy the requirements. The evaluation pertains to the following Technical Assignment Control (TAC) System:

	<u>I.A.2.1</u>	<u>II.B.4</u>
Unit 2	44185	44535
Unit 3	44186	44536

As delineated below, the evaluation covers only some aspects of item I.A.2.1.4.

The detailed evaluation of the licensee's submittals is presented in Section IV; the conclusions are in Section V.

II. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION

A. I.A.2.1: Immediate Upgrading of RO and SRO Training and Qualifications

The clarification of TMI Action Item I.A.2.1 in NUREG-0737 incorporates a letter and four enclosures, dated March 28, 1980, from Harold R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, USNRC, to all power reactor applicants and licensees, concerning qualifications of reactor operators (hereafter referred to as Denton's letter). This letter and enclosures imposes a number of training requirements on power reactor licensees. This evaluation specifically addressed a subset of the requirements stated in Enclosure 1 of Denton's letter, namely: Item A.2.c, which relates to operator training requirements; item A.2.e, which concerns instructor requalification; and Section C, which addresses operator requalification. Some of these requirements are elaborated in Enclosures 2, 3, and 4 of Denton's letter. The training requirements under evaluation are summarized in Figure 1. The elaborations of these requirements in Enclosures 2, 3 and 4 of Denton's letter are shown respectively in Figures 2, 3 and 4.

*Enclosure 1 of NUREG-0737 and NRC's Technical Assistance Control System distinguish four sub-actions within I.A.2.1 and two sub-actions within II.B.4. These subdivisions are not carried forward to the actual presentation of the requirements in Enclosure 3 of NUREG-0737. If they had been, the items of concern here would be contained in I.A.2.1.4 and II.B.4.1.

Figure 1. Training Requirements from TMI Action Item I.A.2.1*

Program Element	NRC Requirements**
OPERATIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING	<p>Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(1) Training programs shall be modified, as necessary, to provide training in heat transfer, fluid flow and thermodynamics. (Enclosure 2 provides guidelines for the minimum content of such training.)</p> <p>Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(2) Training programs shall be modified, as necessary to provide training in the use of installed plant systems to control or mitigate an accident in which the core is severely damaged. (Enclosure 3 provides guidelines for the minimum content of such training.)</p> <p>Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(3) Training programs shall be modified, as necessary to provide increased emphasis on reactor and plant transients.</p>
INSTRUCTOR REQUALIFICATION	<p>Enclosure 1, Item A.2.e Instructors shall be enrolled in appropriate requalification programs to assure they are cognizant of current operating history, problems, and changes to procedures and administrative limitations.</p>
PERSONNEL REQUALIFICATION	<p>Enclosure 1, Item C.1 Content of the licensed operator requalification programs shall be modified to include instruction in heat transfer, fluid flow, thermodynamics, and mitigation of accidents involving a degraded core. (Enclosures 2 and 3 provide guidelines for the minimum content of such training.)</p> <p>Enclosure 1, Item C.2 The criteria for requiring a licensed individual to participate in accelerated requalification shall be modified to be consistent with the new passing grade for issuance of a license: 80% overall and 70% each category.</p> <p>Enclosure 1, Item C.3 Programs should be modified to require the control manipulations listed in Enclosure 4. Normal control manipulations, such as plant or reactor startups, must be performed. Control manipulations during abnormal or emergency operations must be walked through with, and evaluated by, a member of the training staff at a minimum. An appropriate simulator may be used to satisfy the requirements for control manipulations.</p>

*The requirements shown are a subset of those contained in Item I.A.2.1.

**References to Enclosures are to Denton's letter of March 28, 1980, which is contained in the clarification of Item I.A.2.1 in NUREG-0737.

Figure 2. Enclosure 2 from Denton's Letter

TRAINING IN HEAT TRANSFER, FLUID FLOW AND THERMODYNAMICS

1. Basic Properties of Fluids and Matter.

This section should cover a basic introduction to matter and its properties. This section should include such concepts as temperature measurements and effects, density and its effects, specific weight, buoyancy, viscosity and other properties of fluids. A working knowledge of steam tables should also be included. Energy movement should be discussed including such fundamentals as heat exchange, specific heat, latent heat of vaporization and sensible heat.

2. Fluid Statics.

This section should cover the pressure, temperature and volume effects on fluids. Example of these parametric changes should be illustrated by the instructor and related calculations should be performed by the students and discussed in the training sessions. Causes and effects of pressure and temperature changes in the various components and systems should be discussed in the training sessions. Causes and effects of pressure and temperature changes in the various components and systems should be discussed as applicable to the facility with particular emphasis on safety significant features. The characteristics of force and pressure, pressure in liquids at rest, principles of hydraulics, saturation pressure and temperature and subcooling should also be included.

3. Fluid Dynamics.

This section should cover the flow of fluids and such concepts as Bernoulli's principle, energy in moving fluids, flow measure theory and devices and pressure losses due to friction and orificing. Other concepts and terms to be discussed in this section are NPSH, carry over, carry under, kinetic energy, head-loss relationships and two phase flow fundamentals. Practical applications relating to the reactor coolant system and steam generators should also be included.

4. Heat Transfer by Conduction, Convection and Radiation.

This section should cover the fundamentals of heat transfer by conduction. This section should include discussions on such concepts and terms as specific heat, heat flux and atomic action. Heat transfer characteristics of fuel rods and heat exchangers should be included in this section.

This section should cover the fundamentals of heat transfer by convection. Natural and forced circulation should be discussed as applicable to the various systems at the facility. The convection current patterns created by expanding fluids in a confined area should be included in this section. Heat transport and fluid flow reductions or stoppage should be discussed due to steam and/or noncondensable gas formation during normal and accident conditions.

This section should cover the fundamentals of heat transfer by thermal radiation in the form of radiant energy. The electromagnetic energy emitted by a body as a result of its temperature should be discussed and illustrated by the use of equations and sample calculations. Comparisons should be made of a black body absorber and a white body emitter.

5. Change of Phase - Boiling.

This section should include descriptions of the state of matter, their inherent characteristics and thermodynamic properties such as enthalpy and entropy. Calculations should be performed involving steam quality and void fraction properties. The types of boiling should be discussed as applicable to the facility during normal evolutions and accident conditions.

6. Burnout and Flow Instability.

This section should cover descriptions and mechanisms for calculating such terms as critical flux, critical power, DNB ratio and hot channel factors. This section should also include instructions for preventing and monitoring for clad or fuel damage and flow instabilities. Sample calculations should be illustrated by the instructor and calculations should be performed by the students and discussed in the training sessions. Methods and procedures for using the plant computer to determine quantitative values of various factors during plant operation and plant heat balance determinations should also be covered in this section.

7. Reactor Heat Transfer Limits.

This section should include a discussion of heat transfer limits by examining fuel rod and reactor design and limitations. The basis for the limits should be covered in this section along with recommended methods to ensure that limits are not approached or exceeded. This section should cover discussions of peaking factors, radial and axial power distributions and changes of these factors due to the influence of other variables such as moderator temperature, xenon and control rod position.

Figure 3. Enclosure 3 from Denton's Letter

TRAINING CRITERIA FOR MITIGATING CORE DAMAGE	
A. <u>Incore Instrumentation</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Use of fixed or movable incore detectors to determine extent of core damage and geometry changes.2. Use of thermocouples in determining peak temperatures; methods for extended range readings; methods for direct readings at terminal junctions.3. Methods for calling up (printing) incore data from the plant computer.
B. <u>Excore Nuclear Instrumentation (NIS)</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Use of NIS for determination of void formation; void location basis for NIS response as a function of core temperatures and density changes.
C. <u>Vital Instrumentation</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Instrumentation response in an accident environment; failure sequence (time to failure, method of failure); indication reliability (actual vs indicated level).2. Alternative methods for measuring flows, pressures, levels, and temperatures.<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Determination of pressurizer level if all level transmitters fail.b. Determination of letdown flow with a clogged filter (low flow).c. Determination of other Reactor Coolant System parameters if the primary method of measurement has failed.
D. <u>Primary Chemistry</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Expected chemistry results with severe core damage; consequences of transferring small quantities of liquid outside containment; importance of using leak tight systems.2. Expected isotopic breakdown for core damage; for clad damage.3. Corrosion effects of extended immersion in primary water; time to failure.
E. <u>Radiation Monitoring</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Response of Process and Area Monitors to severe damages; behavior of detectors when saturated; method for detecting radiation readings by direct measurement at detector output (overranged detector); expected accuracy of detectors at different locations; use of detectors to determine extent of core damage.2. Methods of determining dose rate inside containment from measurements taken outside containment.
F. <u>Gas Generation</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Methods of H₂ generation during an accident; other sources of gas (Xe, Kr); techniques for venting or disposal of non-condensibles.2. H₂ flammability and explosive limit; sources of O₂ in containment or Reactor Coolant System.

Figure 4. Control Manipulations Listed in Enclosure 4.

CONTROL MANIPULATIONS	
*1.	Plant or reactor startups to include a range that reactivity feedback from nuclear heat addition is noticeable and heatup rate is established.
2.	Plant shutdown.
*3.	Manual control of steam generators and/or feedwater during startup and shutdown.
4.	Boration and or dilution during power operation.
*5.	Any significant (greater than 10%) power changes in manual rod control or recirculation flow.
6.	Any reactor power change of 10% or greater where load change is performed with load limit control or where flux, temperature, or speed control is on manual (for HTGR).
*7.	Loss of coolant including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. significant PWR steam generator leaks 2. inside and outside primary containment 3. large and small, including leak-rate determination 4. saturated Reactor Coolant response (PWR).
8.	Loss of instrument air (if simulated plant specific).
9.	Loss of electrical power (and/or degraded power sources).
*10.	Loss of core coolant flow/natural circulation.
11.	Loss of condenser vacuum.
12.	Loss of service water if required for safety.
13.	Loss of shutdown cooling.
14.	Loss of component cooling system or cooling to an individual component.
15.	Loss of normal feedwater or normal feedwater system failure.
*16.	Loss of all feedwater (normal and emergency).
17.	Loss of protective system channel.
18.	Mispositioned control rod or rods (or rod drops).
19.	Inability to drive control rods.
20.	Conditions requiring use of emergency boration or standby liquid control system.
21.	Fuel cladding failure or high activity in reactor coolant or offgas.
22.	Turbine or generator trip.
23.	Malfunction of automatic control system(s) which affect reactivity.
24.	Malfunction of reactor coolant pressure/volume control system.
25.	Reactor trip.
26.	Main steam line break (inside or outside containment).
27.	Nuclear instrumentation failure(s).
* Starred items to be performed annually, all others biennially.	

As noted in Figure 1, Enclosures 2 and 3 indicate minimum requirements concerning course content in their respective areas. In addition, the Operator Licensing Branch in NRC has taken the position (Reference 3) that the training in mitigating core damage and related subjects should consist of at least 80 contact hours* in both the initial training and the requalification programs. The NRC considers thermodynamics, fluid flow and heat transfer to be related subjects, so the 80-hour requirement applies to the combined subject areas of Enclosures 2 and 3. The 80 contact hour criterion is not intended to be applied rigidly; rather, its purpose is to provide greater assurance of adequate course content when the licensee's training courses are not described in detail.

Since the licensees generally have their own unique course outlines, adequacy of response to these requirements necessarily depends only on whether it is at a level of detail comparable to that specified in the enclosures (and consistent with the 80 contact hour requirement) and whether it can reasonably be concluded from the licensee's description of his training material that the items in the enclosures are covered.

The Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) has developed its own guidelines for training in the subject areas of Enclosures 2 and 3. These guidelines, given in References 4 and 5, were developed in response to the same requirements and are more than adequate, i.e., training programs based specifically on the complete INPO documents are expected to satisfy all the requirements pertaining to training material which are addressed in this evaluation.

The licensee's response concerning increased emphasis on transients is considered by SAI to be acceptable if it makes explicit reference to increased emphasis on transients and gives some indication of the nature of the increase, or, if it addresses both normal and abnormal transients (without necessarily indicating an increase in emphasis) and the requalification program satisfies the requirements for control manipulations, Enclosure 1, Item C.3. The latter requirement calls for all the manipulations listed in Enclosure 4 (Figure 4 in this report) to be performed, at the frequency indicated, unless they are specifically not applicable to the licensee's type of reactor(s). Some of these manipulations may be performed on a simulator. Personnel with senior licenses may be credited with these activities if they direct or evaluate control manipulations as they are performed by others. Although these manipulations are acceptable for meeting the reactivity control manipulations required by Appendix A paragraph 3.a of 10 CFR 55, the requirements of Enclosure 4 are more demanding. Enclosure 4 requires about 32 specific manipulations over a two-year cycle while 10 CFR 55 Appendix A requires only 10 manipulations over a two-year cycle.

*A contact hour is a one-hour period in which the course instructor is present or available for instructing or assisting students; lectures, seminars, discussions, problem-solving sessions, and examinations are considered contact periods. This definition is taken from Reference 4.

B. II.B.4: Training for Mitigating Core Damage

Item II.B.4 in NUREG-0737 requires that "shift technical advisors and operating personnel from the plant manager through the operations chain to the licensed operators" receive training on the use of installed systems to control or mitigate accidents in which the core is severely damaged. Enclosure 3 of Denton's letter provides guidance on the content of this training. "Plant Manager" is here taken to mean the highest ranking manager at the plant site.

For licensed personnel, this training would be redundant in that it is also required, by I.A.2.1, in the operator requalification program. However, II.B.4 applies also to operations personnel who are not licensed and are not candidates for licenses. This may include one or more of the highest levels of management at the plant. These non-licensed personnel are not explicitly required to have training in heat transfer, fluid flow and thermodynamics and are therefore not obligated for the full 80 contact hours of training in mitigating core damage and related subjects.

Some non-operating personnel, notably managers and technicians in instrumentation and control, health physics and chemistry departments, are supposed to receive those portions of the training which are commensurate with their responsibilities. Since this imposes no additional demands on the program itself, we do not address it in this evaluation. It would be appropriate for resident inspectors to verify that non-operating personnel receive the proper training.

* * * * *

The required implementation dates for all items have passed. Hence, this evaluation did not address the dates of implementation. Moreover, the evaluation does not cover training program modifications that might have been made for other reasons subsequent to the response to Denton's letter.

III. LICENSEE SUBMITTALS

The licensee (Philadelphia Electric Company) has submitted to NRC a number of items (letters and various attachments) which explain their training and requalification programs. These submittals, made in response to Denton's letter, form the information base for this evaluation. For the Peach Bottom plant, there are two submittals with attachments, for a total of five items, which are listed below.

1. Letter from S.L. Daltroff, Vice President, Electric Production, Philadelphia Electric Co., to P.F. Collins, Chief of Operator Licensing Branch, NRC. April 30, 1981. (1 pg, with enclosures: items 2 & 3). (re: Transmittal, revised Peach Bottom Training Program).
2. "Licensed NRC Operator Requalification Program", Philadelphia Electric Co., Peach Bottom Atomic

Power Station, PA. Undated. (5 pp, attached to item 1).

3. "Replacement Training for Licensed Operators & Licensed Senior Operators", Philadelphia Electric Co., Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, PA. Undated. (10 pp, attached to item 1).
4. Letter from S.L. Daltroff, Vice President, Electric Production, Philadelphia Electric Co., to J.F. Stolz, Chief of Operating Reactors Branch #4, Division of Licensing, NRC. June 08, 1982. (5 pp). (re: Response to NRC's RAI dated May 12, 1982).
5. Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station organization chart as of February 10, 1982, with personnel receiving training in mitigation of core damage worked. (1p, attached to item 4)

The last two items are also in response to an NRC request for additional information (Reference 6). The information contain is taken to be a firm commitment by the licensee with regard to his training programs.

IV. EVALUATION

SAI's evaluation of the training programs at Philadelphia Electric Company's Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 is presented below. Section A addresses TMI Action Item I.A.2.1 and presents the assessment organized in the manner of Figure 1. Section B addresses TMI Action Item II.B.4.

- A. I.A.2.1: Immediate Upgrading of Reactor Operator and Senior Reactor Operator Training and Qualification.

Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(1)

The basic requirements are that the training programs given to reactor operator and senior reactor operator candidates cover the subjects of heat transfer, fluid flow and thermodynamics at the level of detail specified in Enclosure 2 of Denton's letter.

The licensee's training programs are comprised of eleven phases. Phase II is an academic review of 3 weeks duration, one week of which is devoted to heat transfer. The outline for this training indicates that it covers nearly all the fundamental areas identified in Enclosure 2 of Denton's letter. Phase V is oriented toward applications and includes one week on BWR operating characteristics and one week on heat transfer and thermal hydraulics in BWRs. Other phases involve additional time in self-study, review and examination. In addition, in submittal item 4, the licensee further affirmed that the training covered all of Enclosure 2 and involved at least 80 contact hours. The licensee clearly meets this requirement

Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(2)

The requirements are that the training programs for reactor and senior reactor operator candidates cover the subject of accident mitigation at the level of detail specified in Enclosure 3 of Denton's letter (see Figure 3 of this report).

The licensee's training program (submittal item 3) includes 3 weeks in Phase VIII, "Mitigating Core Damage and Selected Review". Although the division of time between mitigating core damage and the selected review is not indicated, the outline presented is in enough detail to suggest coverage of Enclosure 3. Moreover, in submittal item 4, the licensee indicates that 120 hours are devoted to mitigating core damage and makes a commitment to cover all the details of Enclosure 3. As noted above, 80 hours are devoted to the related subjects of heat transfer, fluid flow and thermodynamics. In our judgement, the licensee complies with this requirement.

Enclosure 1, Item A.2.c(3)

The requirement is that there be an increased emphasis in the training program on dealing with reactor transients.

The licensee's submittals do not explicitly refer to an increase in emphasis. However, Phase IV provides 2 weeks of simulator training, 1 week of which is in classroom lectures, related to transients. Two additional weeks of classroom lectures are devoted to transients. Much material related to transients is distributed throughout all the phases. The licensee also notes that additional lecture and simulator time is devoted to transients in the requalification program. We judge that the licensee has complied with the intent of the NRC requirement in this area.

Enclosure 1, Item A.2.e

The requirement is that instructors for reactor operator training programs be enrolled in appropriate requalification programs to assure they are cognizant of current operating history, problems and changes to procedures and administrative limitations.

Training at Peach Bottom is provided by a contractor. The instructors provided by the contractor are on the distribution for "new or revised procedures, plant modifications, plant experiences, plant upsets which are pertinent to operator training". In addition, plant operations personnel review lesson plans for requalification lectures to assure they are current. While this is not a requalification program, it addresses NRC's intent and should be adequate if diligently carried out. We judge that the basic requirement is met, but suggest that an improvement could be made by adding some type of quality control feature that would verify that instructors are in fact cognizant of current situations at the plant.

Enclosure 1, Item C.1

The primary requirement is that the requalification programs have instruction in the areas of heat transfer, fluid flow, thermodynamics and

accident mitigation. The level of detail required in the requalification program is that of Enclosures 2 and 3 of Denton's letter. In addition, these instructions must involve an adequate number of contact hours.

The licensee's requalification program is conducted on a two year cycle and is reformulated annually on the basis of examination results so as to emphasize the areas needing it most. A minimum of 9 lectures are given annually and a minimum of 18 lectures are given each cycle. The lecture topics are drawn from a list of 12 major topical areas, one of which includes heat transfer, fluid flow, thermodynamics and mitigation of accidents involving a degraded core. Although no further detail is provided, submittal item 4 includes a commitment to cover the subject matter set forth in Denton's Enclosure 2 and 3. However, submittal item 4 also indicates that, in a two year cycle, only 32 hours are devoted to heat transfer, fluid flow and thermodynamics and 32 hours are devoted to mitigating core damage. This falls somewhat short of the required 80 hours in the combined areas.

Enclosure 1, Item C.2

The requirement for licensed operators to participate in the accelerated requalification program must be based on passing scores of 80% overall, 70% in each category.

The licensee has implemented this requirement. In addition, operators needing accelerated requalification are given an oral examination to determine whether they should be removed from shift duties while participating in the accelerated requalification. Written re-evaluations are made following the retraining until satisfactory performance is demonstrated. The requirement is satisfied.

Enclosure 1, Item C.3

TMI Action Item I.A.2.1 calls for the licensed operator requalification program to include performance of control manipulations involving both normal and abnormal situations. The specific manipulations required and their performance frequency are identified in Enclosure 4 of the Denton letter (see Figure 4 of this report).

Submittal items 2 and 4 together explicitly identify all the manipulations of Denton's Enclosure 4 and indicate that they are performed with the required frequency. Therefore, this requirement is satisfied.

B. II.B.4 Training for Mitigating Core Damage

Item II.B.4 requires that training for mitigating core damage, as indicated in Enclosure 3 of Denton's letter, be given to shift technical advisors and operating personnel from the plant manager to the licensed operators. This includes both licensed and non-licensed personnel.

The licensee does not describe training directed specifically at the II.B.4 requirement, but the operator requalification program called by I.A.2.1 would serve this purpose since it encompasses requirements essentially identical to II.B.4. As noted earlier, the Peach Bottom requalification program meets the requirements with respect to content but

falls somewhat short (about 20%) with respect to the number of contact hours required. It must therefore be concluded that the licensee's compliance with II.B.4 is also deficient in this respect for operations personnel who are licensed operators.

The licensee has provided an organization chart with the positions involved in training for mitigation of core damage indicated (submittal item 5). These include all positions in the operations chain down to the licensed operators with the exception of the Station Superintendent. Specifically, it includes the Assistant Superintendent, Engineer-Operations, Shift Superintendent, Shift Supervisor, Control Operator, and Assistant Control Operator; it also includes Shift Technical Advisors and numerous other positions not in the operations chain. The licensee does not indicate whether the higher level managers are licensed operators; if they are not, they are not subject to the 80 contact hour requirement. Hence, II.B.4 would have been satisfied for non-licensed operations personnel who have had training in mitigation of core damage.

The requirement includes the plant manager, in this case the Station Superintendent, among those who must receive training in mitigating core damage. The licensee has not met this aspect of the requirement.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evaluation described above, SAI concludes that the Peach Bottom training programs are in compliance with most of the requirements of NUREG-0737 items I.A.2.1 and II.B.4. There are basically two exceptions. First, the I.A.2.1 requirement relating to requalification instruction in mitigation of core damage and related subjects is not fully satisfied because the contact hours of instruction fall about 20% short of the required 80. This same deficiency applies also to II.B.4 because the requalification program apparently provides the mechanism for this instruction. Second, II.B.4 is also not satisfied in that the Station Superintendent has not received training in mitigating core damage.

VI. REFERENCES

1. "NRC Action Plan Developed as a Result of the TMI-2 Accident." NUREG-0660, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. May 1980.
2. "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," NUREG-0737, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. November 1980.
3. The NRC requirement for 80 contact hours is an Operator Licensing Branch technical position. It was included with the acceptance criteria provided by NRC to SAI for use in the present evaluation. See letter, Harley Silver, Technical Assistance Program Management Group, Division of Licensing, USNRC to Bryce Johnson, Program Manager, Science Applications, Inc., Subject: Contract No. NRC-03-82-096, Final Work Assignment 2, December 23, 1981.
4. "Guidelines for Heat Transfer, Fluid Flow and Thermodynamics Instruction," STG-02, The Institute of Nuclear Power Operations. December 12, 1980.
5. "Guidelines for Training to Recognize and Mitigate the Consequences of Core Damage," STG-01, The Institute of Nuclear Power Operations. January 15, 1981.
6. Letter, John F. Stolz, Chief, Operating Reactors Branch #4, Division of Licensing, USNRC to Edward G. Baner, Jr., Vice President and General Counsel, Philadelphia Electric Co., Subject: Upgraded SRO and RO Training and Training for Mitigating Core Damage - Request for Additional Information, May 12, 1982.