

STONE AND WEBSTER MICHIGAN, INC.
P.O. BOX 1963, MIDLAND, MICHIGAN 48640

50-329
50-330

PRINCIPAL STAFF	
✓ <i>Das</i>	DE
A/RA	DRMA
PAO	SCS
SEA	ML
ENF	File <i>has</i>

DATE	3-1-84
J. O. NO.	14509
P. O. NO.	N/A
LTR. NO.	SWM-040
REF.	N/A

VIA

TO D. L. QUAMME, CPCo Midland (site)

DEAR SIRs:

THE FOLLOWING ARE ☒ ATTACHED: ☐ SENT SEPARATELY:

COPIES	PRINTS	REPRODUCIBLES	MICROFILM APERTURE CARDS
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

STATUS		PLEASE NOTE	SENT FOR YOUR	
<input type="checkbox"/> FINAL	<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED	<input type="checkbox"/> REVISIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/> COMMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> PRELIMINARY	<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED AS REVISED AS DEFINED IN SPECIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/> ADDITIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> USE	<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/> NO COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> UNACCEPTABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> COMMENTS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILES	<input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE
<input type="checkbox"/> SUGGESTIONS AS NOTED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLOSED			

YOUR ATTENTION IS DIRECTED TO THE FOLLOWING:

RELEASED FOR: <input type="checkbox"/> FABRICATION <input type="checkbox"/> PURCHASE OF NECESSARY MATERIALS
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE REVISE AND SUBMIT PRINTS REPRODUCIBLES MICROFILM APERTURE CARDS
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE SUBMIT PRINTS REPRODUCIBLES MICROFILM APERTURE CARDS OF <input type="checkbox"/> DOCUMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> DRAWINGS <input type="checkbox"/> SHOP DETAIL
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE RETURN ONE COPY EACH OF THIS MATERIAL BEARING YOUR APPROVAL OR COMMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS MATERIAL BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THE ENCLOSED COPY OF THIS FORM
<input type="checkbox"/> WE TRUST THAT THESE NOTES ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH YOUR UNDERSTANDING. IF NOT, PLEASE ADVISE US

IMPORTANT SHOULD ANY REVISION TO DOCUMENTS OR DRAWINGS RETURNED HERewith INVOLVE A PRICE INCREASE THE SUPPLIER MUST NOTIFY STONE & WEBSTER PURCHASING DEPARTMENT WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS EVEN THOUGH A DEFINITE ESTIMATE CANNOT BE GIVEN AT THE TIME. OTHERWISE, THE PURCHASER WILL CONSIDER THE REVISIONS MADE WITHOUT COST.

The following Closed CIO Item/Hold Point Notification(s) is (are) attached for your action/information:

Item 057

J. E. Karr
J. E. Karr
CIO Program Manager

cc: JGKepler, US NRC
JJHarrison, US NRC
RJCook, US NRC
RAWells, CPCo
CIO Site File (2)
APAmoruso (2)
NIRichel, CPCo
Initiator

8403130195 840301
PDR AD0CK 05000329
S PDR

MAR 7 1984

1021

STONE & WEBSTER CONSTRUCTION IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW MIDLAND NUCLEAR PLANT J.O. NO. 14509		ITEM NUMBER 057		HOLD POINT NUMBER	
		<input type="checkbox"/> TRACKED ACTION ITEM			
		<input type="checkbox"/> TRACKED INFORMATION ITEM			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TRACKED RECOMMENDATION ITEM			
		<input type="checkbox"/> UNTRACKED ITEM			
REFERENCE(S) N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> HOLD POINT NOTIFICATION			
CONDITION DETAILS <p>It was noted that a trainer evaluation was performed during the trainers first class he taught. CIO however was informed that in future training this evaluation may not take place until after a substantial amount of classes have been taught. This would result in training classes given previous to the evaluation being disqualified, if the trainers evaluation is not approved.</p> <p>Since this evaluation is used as part of the trainers "approval to instruct", CIO recommends that evaluation be performed on no later than the first training class taught.</p> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="checkbox"/> YES (PAGE NO.'S) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO </div>					
ATTACHMENTS					
DATE RESPONSE REQ'D. 2/24/84		INITIATOR/DATE <i>Neal F. Wetherell 2/17/84</i>		INITIATION APPROVED/DATE <i>J. Thompson 2/17/84</i>	
RESPONSE Reference Page 2 of attached correspondence, Serial 27325 dated February 24, 1984, GFEwert to BHPeck.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES (PAGE NO.'S) 1 <input type="checkbox"/> NO					
ATTACHMENTS					
EST. CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLETION DATE NA		RESPONDENT <i>[Signature]</i>		TITLE Const SPT	
				DATE 2/29/84	
RESPONSE ACCEPTED <i>Neal F. Wetherell</i>		DATE 3/1/84		RESPONSE VERIFIED/CLOSED <i>A. Beane Jr. & J. Kaur</i>	
				DATE 3/1/84	
SEE ATTACHMENT II					

To BHPeck
From GFEwert *JFE*
Date February 24, 1984
Subject MIDLAND ENERGY CENTER PROJECT-
CIO ITEMS 056 AND 057
FILE 24.0 SERIAL 27325
CC DEBeaudoin GEParker
PDJohnson NIREichel
HPNunes RAWells

Item 057
Attachment I
Page 1 of 2

CONSUMERS
POWER
COMPANY

Internal
Correspondence

GFE 61-84

Following is MPQAD's response to the subject Stone and Webster CIO Items:

ITEM 56

Part A

This part reports that the MPQAD lesson plan for PQCI C-1.50 in the reference document section referenced Revision 11 of Specification C-306 while Revision 12 is the current issued revision. This is in keeping with current practice in the MPQAD Training Branch and in no way impacts the validity of the training.

MPQAD lesson plans are developed utilizing various documents as references. In order to know the revision of the document when the lesson plan was developed the revision number is included in the lesson plan. Thereafter the revision number is only changed when a revision to the lesson plan is required. Required revisions to lesson plans are determined by appropriate personnel and are based on changes to documents which impact lesson plan source documents which in turn may impact information in the lesson plan.

In this case the revision of Specification C-306 from Rev 11 to Rev 12 did not result in a revision to the PQCI. In turn a revision to the lesson plan was not required. As a result there is no training impact and the training is acceptable.

Part B

This part reports that PQCI C-1.50 Attachment A Table B-2 is inconsistent with referenced Specification C-305 which has a Specification Change Notice No. 13007 against it. This is also in keeping with current MPQAD practice and does not impact training.

In this case the process outlined in the second paragraph of the response to Part A was also followed to determine if the lesson plan required revision. Since the PQCI did not require revision due to the SCN, the lesson plan did not require revision and there is no impact on training.

The basis for not revising the lesson plan is that the SCN is clear and usable by inspection personnel without additional training or revision to the PQCI. Inspection personnel are required by the PQCI General Instructions to research and utilize the latest inspection criteria.

ITEM 57

This item recommends that evaluations that are used as part of the "approval to instruct process" be performed on no later than the first training class taught. MPQAD Training Branch practice is to evaluate on instructor the first time that an instructor instructs a course (lesson plan or lesson plans). This in fact is required by Training Branch Instruction TBI 1.3.

The TBI establishes a process by which an instructor becomes approved to instruct both a first course and additional courses. The TBI does not require that an instructor become reapproved each time a lesson plan is revised. This is not necessary as the instructor has demonstrated capability through the original approval process. The evaluation may take place doing a pilot class, on actual class, or during any other method that allows the instructor to demonstrate capability and be evaluated.

Explanation of Response Acceptance

In following up on this item it was concluded that the trainer D. Liechty had previously been approved to instruct and the class taught was for an additional lesson plan. Since this was one of the instructors additional lesson plans the evaluation was not required to be performed on his first class. The only evaluation to be performed on the first class is the performance evaluation of the instructors initial new lesson plan, which in this case had previously been performed.

This is in accordance with TBI 1.3 and due to this, the response provided is acceptable.